

Greenaway Presentation – Audio 1

Ladies & Gentlemen....thank you so much for coming to this Master Class this afternoon and I want to first of all welcome you here. I'd like in particular to welcome our guest speaker Mr Peter Greenaway and of course to acknowledge the Noongah people, the traditional owners and the custodians of the land upon which we are meeting today.

It is great that you're here. I can tell you that there is another 700 or 800 people who would like to be sitting where you are so you obviously got in early, knew where the venue was, but you are the chosen few for this Master Class and I am sure that the Master Class will intrigue, challenge, delight, perhaps bemuse you, all of those words are entirely appropriate to whatever experience you have this afternoon so well done for being here and choosing to come because in my view Peter Greenaway is worth coming for [great laughter]...anyway, having said that indeed I am sure as you will agree that for me Peter Greenaway and his name and his work is synonymous with his work indeed makes us think about a whole range of values and issues in our lives from truth to fiction to love to deception and many more issues that confront us. His work is quite spectacular.

We had a lunch yesterday which was an interesting lunch at which we traversed a whole range of topics about cinema, Western Australia, the Arts and it was indeed a challenging lunch.

We also got on to second life and I'm sure many of you in the audience will understand second life. We're a little bit slow on the uptake and Peter said "I'm assuming you're all second-lifers?" and the reaction from my staff was "Oh my God, we're not even on our first marriage let alone our second one" and then there were a few other iterations of second life but we've learnt very quickly and now my office is very much into second life so you'll probably see me in a completely different context, a different persona, please refer or blame Peter Greenaway for that but it was a remarkable lunch with a remarkable man and it's been our pleasure as the Government through DCA to be able to support the documentary conference which has actually been happening here in Fremantle over the last couple of days and also to support Peter's journey to Western Australia which is his first visit to our State and they are just examples of the initiatives that I'm wanting the Department to pursue to encourage debate, dialogue and discussion about our future. Peter's views are very clear about cinema, the future of cinema, the future of digital technologies, the importance of bringing various forms together and apart to ensure that there is a future for something, whether it's first life or second life or beyond but Peter is an artist who is supremely comfortable and supremely at the forefront of challenging ideas and I think given his long history in film and the arts he is very well placed to challenge us in such a demanding way and it's very refreshing indeed.

Peter Greenaway is a practitioner who reaches out across art forms including painting as he started off wanting to be a painter although he did reveal yesterday that if he had a third life, and I'm sure he will, he would like to come

back as an architect and you may Peter wish to explain why or why not that's your third life ambition....but of course film and we can talk about the films that are renowned in Peter's profile and portfolio of films but also digital media and he constantly seeks out challenging collaborations with other artists which is so refreshing so you can get the sense that I'm pretty much enamored pretty much with the work of Peter Greenaway over several decades from the work, not necessarily the work of the Sixties I was probably a bit young to understand your work then but certainly the Seventies, the Eighties and I'm now looking forward to seeing your latest work on Rembrandt so I just want to now say welcome Peter, it is a great pleasure and privilege and hope that you can see from the response to your Master Class that people actually want to hear you and think about what you have to say and reflect not only on the cinema but on a diversity of arts in our global community and so now I think all I need to do if you're ready is to ask you to join me in giving a very warm welcome to Peter Greenaway and I ask Peter to come to the stage.

Peter Greenaway

Well that was a rather intimidating prologue and now of course I'm going to have to live up to it. I thought what we'd do...I've been given I think about two hours to stand here and talk to you so let me as it were spend about 90 minutes if I may delivering I suppose some ideas I have about notions of the cinema and then maybe since it's always much more fun and more exciting certainly for me, we will spend the last half hour if this is the way you want to play it with a duologue rather than a monologue. I do like a fight and so far nobody has fought me so I'm expecting some return provocations from you please this time. There is a terrible danger for me to go on to automatic pilot and if you're all going to be very agreeable and nice and very Australian that's very boring for me so don't hesitate, don't even worry about your peer group, just stand up and say what you think you need to say and if I'm speaking a load of rubbish I want you to tell me that. Okay, that's a pact, that's an agreement?

Response: Yes.

Okay, anybody here who was here this morning or rather in the other building? Oh, that's dangerous so I apologize then if you're going to hear some of the same stuff twice, it's almost inevitable because there's a certain amount of polemic here and you heard a lot of that polemic this morning. What I will do then, I really want to talk about this huge project we became involved with called the The Tulse Luper Suitcases and I would like to introduce it and explain the reasons for why it came into existence and I want to show you two clips which I think says that obviously there's a notion that seeing the practice and then comparing it with what I have to say is always problematical 'he didn't say that' 'this doesn't do this' etc. etc. so it's a dangerous business for me but it will exemplify I think very, very quickly and rapidly some of the ideas that I want to try and propound to you certainly in terms of speech, of text.

At the beginning then of the 1990's after I'd already spent about 15 or 16 years making movies of every single description – I've made Omnimax movies, I've made Super 8, I've gone through the whole gamut of the new technologies and followed them through. Primarily I suppose the notion of 35mm celluloid cinema is at the heart of this because this is how cinema was basically in technical terms generated but I've certainly made now a huge embrace I would like to think of all the new technologies, all the cousins and sisters and relatives of the notion of the cinematic experience and I think by the time of the early 1990's I'd made probably about eight feature films and a host of other stuff, stuff that probably would have ended up on television in Europe, minute little films only lasting a minute and a half and then great long films like *The Falls*, I don't know if any of you have ever seen *The Falls* which lasted about five hours, incredibly boring film, but it was in a curious way a sort of calling card. Those early films which for me were very experimental and investigative were for myself laying down a language and a vocabulary.

Francois Truffaut repeatedly said that a filmmaker's first film always gives him or her away and in a curious way the filmmaker spends the rest of his or her life really replicating the same material and the same structures. You may know that anecdote about the two Renouirs, Renouir Father the painter and Renouir the filmmaker son and when he was very young the son asked his father that he desperately wanted to become involved in filmmaking but he wasn't certain that he had anything to say and the father said 'well don't worry, most artists only have one or two ideas and they spend their entire life simply reworking those ideas, but don't worry about that because in a way most people don't have any ideas at all so two is more than enough' and if like me and maybe you've heard this before I think there are only two subject matters; one is sex and the other is death, what else is there to talk about? Balsac suggested money but I don't think that's very useful. There's an awful lot of stupid people in the world have money and money hasn't been around that long, especially not in this country and there's the notion also that money in a curious way if you think about sex and death can be utilised to avoid one and pay for the other.

I suppose the other big subject matter if you think about it is power. These are the big four subjects; sex, death, money, power but power I always think is part of the sexual agenda in some curious way too and all its metaphors and all its symbols and all its I suppose usage of vocabulary and language can easily be superseded again back into these two big subjects; sex and death, eros and phanatos, the very beginning and the very end. I don't know anybody in this room but I do know two things about every single one of you, you've all been conceived and you will all surely die, everything else I don't know at all but that's enough isn't it to make the most intense common ground. Let me ask you a taboo question which is always entertaining for me, you see because I'm not talking about birth, I mean birth is almost an accidental occurrence isn't it? You know, nature picks up the circumstances and goes on and it's almost involuntary and I suppose all the other earmarks of life....I mean, I don't think we can even bother to talk about marriage anymore, it's a totally discredited phenomenon and not many people engage

in this anymore not in any way that our grandfathers would understand anyway but if I were to ask you the audience do all of you know the circumstances of your conception? Silence! Put your hands up those people who do know the circumstances of their conception. Not very many! Is it because you're incurious or you think you're treading on sensitive taboo territory or you have very, very shy and retiring mothers? It's curious that isn't it. There is a way...it's the most important thing that ever, ever, ever happened to you was your conception and yet again it's almost like a subject that, I don't know, are we reticent about it because we're not interested? I can't believe that's true, or is it because it still is such a potentially and one can fully understand why, a taboo and sensitive area that it's something that we just don't go into. Okay, I shall be coming around afterwards with a tape recorder and a microphone and you can tell me the experiences.....

I have a big project coming on in a place called [**Zwala**], fantastic name, in the East of Holland where we're actually going to go around and ask these dangerous questions but remember Holland's not like the rest of the world, Holland's very, very different from the rest of the world so I'm sure people will be dying to tell me what the circumstances are.

I suppose if you look at my filmography you will see these recurring subjects all the time and of course sex and death is such a big subject matter, it's endless, endless speculation and far, far, far more for a single lifetime and when you think about Western culture, Eurocentric culture, I have to talk about that because that's familiar and that's where I come from, also curiously where most of you come from too, there is a way in which I suppose our entire cinema has been concerned with those things. Isn't it extraordinary, especially now I suppose that if you are an actor or an actress sooner or later - and probably sooner rather than later - if you perform in some form of cinematic activity you're going to be asked to fuck or die. Why are we so interested? You just think of all the movies you've seen in the last six months about people fucking and dying but then it's related in some curious way to the notion of suspension of belief; do we believe these actors are actually fucking and dying? We all know in the notorious movies where this is supposed to have happened but there's an awful lot of gossip going on here. Anybody seen a Snuff movie? Do Snuff movies ever exist? Anybody knowingly seen a Snuff movie? So it's all pretense isn't it, it's all pretense. We all know as very, very intelligent people that these people are not fucking and they're not dying but we're all asked to believe this because this somehow becomes central to the phenomenon. Cinema is a very, very curious item.

As I said this morning, look at us now. There you are sitting in the dark, or you will be in the dark in a minute, and man's not a nocturnal animal, what on earth are you doing sitting in the dark and you're all looking in one direction and the world's all around you, there's an awful lot of things going on behind your head and if you're watching a feature film you have to sit still for 120 minutes and I suspect even in sleep your body doesn't stay still for 120 minutes, so sitting in the dark, looking in one direction, sitting still....and we've been playing this game now for well at least 112 years if you believe indeed that cinema was invented in 1895 but don't come up with the idea also that

well hey there was something called theatre and there was something called opera before the notions of this auditorium screen phenomenon but it's very interesting how both the theatre and the opera house have copied cinema. You know how most of the European houses are horseshoe-shaped so most people went to the opera not to see what was on the stage but to watch other parts of the audience and again you will find that before, certainly about 1900, the lights in the auditorium of an opera house, and very frequently of a theatre, stayed up and it's only because the opera house and the theatre began to copy the notions of what happens in the cinema did finally cinema management begin to take the lights down in the auditorium. This again I suppose makes curiously cinema such a hybrid and unsatisfactory phenomenon. There you were all sharing your emotions with one another in the dark and let's also remember, I don't quite know how the seats are numbered, but there's only one good seat in any cinema, it's probably G17, where about you're sitting I think, so only one good seat in any cinema because that's the position that the cameraman took the pictures from so in some curious way unlike in the theatre because the theatre's a three-dimensional experience if you think about stages and certainly in the opera house there are many, many good seats in a theatre and many, many good seats in an opera house but not necessarily true about the cinema.

Okay, I think I'm rambling a bit now so I have to come back to the subject matter. So, having as it were experienced all this stuff both in terms of media and I suppose in terms of content the early 1990's saw me rather I suppose anxious about the notions of what cinema was, what cinema is, what cinema ought to be, where we position ourselves accordingly I suppose, this notion of the seventh art form, the big 20th Century contribution to world and historical culture and for about two or three years we never made any films. I'm starting to sound like the Queen of England already – 'we' – of course I mean 'I' – but you know, an Englishman never ever says 'I' it's far too dangerous but it also has to be a practicality because you know if you're all filmmakers or involved in filmmaking processes it tends to be a very collaborative association and I think there are very, very few filmmakers now that could be actually described as total or [19:34] who do absolutely everything so with a body of people who themselves also were related to filmic disciplines we put on a series of exhibitions throughout the cities of Europe, they were very grand, very ambitious and we were often funded by municipalities or by big bodies of people like Christies, or Sotheby's and it was an attempt to break down I suppose the language of cinema in order to investigate it, almost forensically, to try and understand what in fact were the parts of the language that all of us tried to put together to make a notion of a film, whether that film is documentary by nature or fictional, whether it's 1½ minutes long, whether it's seven hours long. I can never completely remember all the factors but here are certainly some of them.

I think the conditions of cinema have to involve the notion of thrown light, projected light that seems to be whenever you make from whatever position that is the basic notion of what's happening. It's happening here, still image, thrown light. The second I think and this needn't necessarily have been true but it's also happened is the notion of the frame, the parallelogram, four right

ankles, the aspect ratio can change although more latterly it's got more and more rigid but that's also a necessity. It is possible to make films of course without actors but I think they're extremely boring. I hate actors. I hope there are no actors in the room but they are a totally absolutely necessary evil. They are the loose canon. They're the one part of the process you can never completely control and I think all of you have read the criticism that Greenaway is anal retentive so I need to control absolutely everything and the actors are always a pain because they always escape my control. There is a way and again I don't like this idea, I'm trained as a painter and I want to make a visual cinema but it's necessary, the way we manufacture movies, to have a text.

So what have we talked about – we talked about projected light, we talked about the frame, we talked about the actor, we have talked about the notion of text, I would also add questions of scale and that's become very important now. Nowhere practically in the world can we see Kubrick's 2001 in the way it was performed and organised and now there's a general feeling although a lot of us are very anxious about it that cinema is going to implode into the screen on our mobile phones, so scale is really very, very important.

Then there would be other areas, of course again you can make movies without music. A whole series of French filmmakers have done that but again I think that's very, very impoverishing. There's some peculiar association with the notion of sound and that's primarily for me I suppose it has to be in terms of music that particular relationship of image and music which is very, very potent so a film without music somehow is curiously impoverished.

So have a look at that again, that's projected light, that's text, the frame, actor, scale, music....that still hasn't made 10 but there are 10 of them. Oh, property's another one. Can you imagine a Chicago gangster movie without a telephone, a car and a gun, inanimate objects but essential somehow for the script. Could you ever imagine a performance of Shakespeare's Othello without Desdemona's handkerchief, it won't work. Could you in fact imagine a Shakespearean play without a sword, a skull and an aros. There's somehow is a way in which the inanimate object is very deeply metaphorically symbolic and also is a practical concern in order to be a catalyst for activity so one of our other subject matters was the use of the object or the property. This of course relates to all the notion of still life in painting too which cinema has borrowed. Well the first of these exhibitions was really about the notion of the frame. We were invited by the City of Geneva in Switzerland which is a city with a certain sort of post-reformation history which is very interesting. It's also I suppose a city which is right in the middle of all the crossroads that crisscross north and south, east and west across Europe, finally a place for notions of subversion, outsiders and the whole Calvinist phenomenon. I now live in Holland so I know a lot about Calvinism, I have ancestors who lived in Scotland, so again, it's the second Calvinist nation.

Do you ever come across a book by Simon Schama called *The Embarrassment of Riches*, how Calvinists are deeply embarrassed by the notion of riches, that's somehow become a [24:13] though in certain parts of

the world which is really fascinating to play with.....so we made a whole series of I suppose steps or stairs. They looked a bit like as though they might have been designed by Corbusier, they were made of wood, they were painted, sometimes they had three steps, sometimes they had 10 steps, maybe they even had 20 or 30 and we wrapped them around all the buildings in the city of Geneva so some of them acted like periscopes, you had to make a physical effort and this was important...it wasn't going to be totally casual, you had to do as a visitor a certain amount of work to climb the steps, some of them behaved like a periscope so you had to look over a wall, you had to climb the steps to look over the wall, some were wrapped around the corner of buildings so you might be looking that way but by the time you put your eye to this artificial camera you were in fact looking that way and all these stairs ended I suppose with a camera eye piece but there was no lens and there was certainly no film and they were framed up very carefully. This again is an interesting optical exercise because we all have two eyes which tend to spoil the notion of monocular vision. I think that's peculiarly relevant to all sorts of painting activity which I can also talk about in a minute and the idea was to get people to really look at the notion of framing. What does framing mean?

Framing means choice and there has to be a reason for those choices and again how we looked at all the plastic art certainly since about 1300 when painting separated itself from architecture through this notion of the frame so I want you to question all these things and I wanted to question the frame. Is the frame really necessary? Where's it come from? What's it doing there? Can we throw it away? And of course by the 1990's we have all sorts of activities; virtual realities which in some curious way don't need the frame anymore and if you go back I suppose a couple of generations you have American abstract expressionism, all those painters who painted such large paintings, in a curious way the frame was negated. I suppose it's again like the Omnimax experience where the screen is so close to the audience that the edges of the frame are beyond the periphery of human vision so somehow curiously become irrelevant. And I suppose certainly in the 1990's when we thought by now, but it's not true is it, that we would all have 360° cinemas, the notion of the frame would naturally atrophy and fall away.

The second exhibition we held in Munich and it was again about the notions of projected light - so first of all the frame and then projected light - so we put up again....it's always based on 100, a nice convenient number, all over the city we put these projected light situations. We put them on shopping malls, on the Cathedral, on police stations, on carparks, on all sorts of buildings, anything that had a vertical surface. This was of course limited to a nighttime activity that's why we did it in the winter and it again was meant to be a demonstration about the idea essentially that cinema was no more than the notion of projected light.

We had an exhibition in Budapest in Hungary which was about the activity of the actor. You know throughout the whole dramatical history I've always imagined that there are a certain number of character types, archetypes which we constantly rework. Okay, you can make your own list but we made a list of 100: The King, the Queen, the fool, the virgin, the serial king, detective, the

criminal, you know how it goes on...the miser, the prince, the princess.....a whole series of characterizations, archetypes which are constantly reworked, reworked, reworked and of course nowadays of course I suppose the notion of the detective and the policeman is overworked to the point of ad absurd [28:22]. Most of the dramas you see on television every night are about this duality, this phenomenon.

I suppose in the 19th Century it was much more to do I suppose before people like Wilkie Collins who invented this whole notion of the detective story it had other notions I suppose of requited and unrequited love which is such a huge subject matter for example in Shakespeare and the way to manifest this is we engaged ourselves with a whole series of theatrical companies both professional and amateur actors and we dressed them up in costume because there's nothing like costumes to identify a characterization and we put them in glass boxes all over the city. It's very boring to stand in a glass box all day long so we had a roster and we changed I think every three hours so again in carparks, in all the public places, nothing should be hidden, nobody had to pay any money to go indoors but again it was to make that strong presence of the notion of the actor in an urban community which was relative to all the representations we play which is as much I suppose to do with my major interest which is painting as much as to do with cinema.

Then in Trieste we had an exhibition about properties, I've already told you about those so we would have maybe a little tiny box beautifully lit at night which had exactly 100 needles in it but just across the way we'd have a carpark which had 100 cars in it so already in a curious way we're talking about scale and reference.

By the time we got to exhibition number 4 and there were other exhibitions planned for Malmö in Southern Sweden, there was an exhibition going to be planned about notionalship of music in Marseilles, there was a way in a curious way because the examination of all these different artifacts and also because I was beginning to really become very excited about modern methods of communication, post-digital revolution that I began to wean myself back into the possibility, okay, I'm ready to make another film again but what should that film be after this massive investigation, what about all these anxieties, what about all this background, how could we utilise it and we live in an information age so I came up with an extraordinarily ambitious, crazy project of meglamania.

The idea was that we would use the whole world as its location and we would develop the biggest subject around which was the notion of uranium. Okay, I came of age in 1963, so I was 21 in 1963 and the big anxieties at that time were of course the notions both real and assumed and metaphorical about the idea of the atomic bomb and nuclear fusion. I walked backwards and forwards to Aldermaston and I paid my dues as a political activist, I threw ball bearings under the policemen's horses outside the American Embassy in Grosvenor Square so I did all that stuff but it was part and parcel of that huge anxiety about the whole notion of what we felt in those days about the notions of nuclear fusion, the atomic bomb which was symbolized by the idea of uranium

and uranium has an atomic number of 92 so we decided to set up tongue in cheek but also looking for a structure which was essentially non-narrative and didn't belong to the bookshop but this idea that everything in the film should be 92 so we eventually made then this film, or these series of films, or these series of activities called The Tulse Luper Suitcases. There are 92 suitcases in this film, there are 92 actors, there are 92 pieces of action and also it spread right across the board because I was no longer confident that cinema was the imaginatively empowering vehicle that we had heretofore thought it ought to be. The suitcase is obviously a very important metaphor although if you go to the local airport you probably will never see a suitcase as a suitcase, that particular phenomenon made of leather with a handle, everybody carries baggage of a different sort nowadays but I think the concept, the idea, the metaphor of a suitcase is very valuable because it in a sense contains enough space for you to carry what is most valuable in your life.

There are some powerful references here. If you think about the holocaust....knock knock on the door...madam you have three hours to pack a suitcase and off and don't expect to come back...what are you going to take with you? And most people you ask, certainly most females you ask they say their photographic albums. Time and time again that seems to be the case but do you take your dinky toys, your Barbie dolls, your lover's love letters, the hair ribbons and hair cuttings of your first child, what do you take with you? Memories, guilts, things you want to hide, things you want to treasure, and so we devised 92 suitcases which are all full of the circumstances relative to what I've been saying as it applies to one man and that man of course was Tulse Luper. Now it doesn't take you very long to realise of course since most films are autobiographical, I think both Spielberg and Goddard at both ends of the spectrum certainly recognise the most important movies are home movies and both Spielberg and Goddard constantly made home movies, sometimes trashed up or organised in a way that you weren't supposed to think they were home movies but just thread your finger down the list of all the Spielberg films and all the Goddard films, they're deeply, deeply autobiographical home movies.

Okay, is it possible to put everything in your life in 92 suitcases? Well by the time we got going I thought maybe it would be possible to put everything in your life in 46 suitcases; 2 x 46 makes 92. So there is a way again I would need to refer back to an obsession which I think is relative to my cinema practice is this notion of the encyclopedist. I am very entertained, fascinated and excited by the notion of the encyclopedia which pretends to put everything together in one place and throughout the whole history. Certainly with European civilization and afterwards there have been a whole succession of encyclopedists who have done this. We could talk about Dante Alighieri who wrote the Divine Comedy who said of that great work, actually the first work of literature really in a newborn Europe was the purpose of that work was to unite the angels in the their heaven with the stones on the road so almost the ultra, ultra spiritual with the deeply, deeply discardible practical so you had to put everything together but I'm sure you can compile a list of famous encyclopedists.

I suppose the most obvious ones would be people like those French encyclopedists, Diderot and [**Dalambere**] who just before the French Revolution in a sense gathered together everything that was knowledgeable in France and put it in one place. But you could think about people like Samuel Johnson the first person who wrote an English dictionary. You could think about people much more latterly like James Joyce who put together all the narrative tropes he could possibly find and put them together in *Finnegans Wake* for example in such a way that he had to change the language in order to make it accessible and again if you look towards science you could think of Linnaeus, you know the man who put all the flora and fauna in a systemized way so that the Japanese, Eskimos, everybody could understand what everybody else was talking about and again I suppose somebody like Einstein with his attempts to try and put all the physical laws of the universe in one place to make one universal law. I think this is always a human characteristic. It's always a human characteristic which we know is bound to fail. Virginia Wolfe's father set about making a dictionary of national biography in England. There were an awful lot of people in that dictionary and he died before he got to the letter 'K' so there's a curious way you know when you make these huge encyclopedic phenomenon that somehow they're either going to be open-ended, they're not going to be totally inclusive, you can't put everything in the world in 92 suitcases or can you? We think we did and this is a challenge too when you finally come to grips with this product. I would challenge you the audience to tell me something I've left out. I think it's entirely and absolutely inclusive.

Okay, how do we manifest this? Well I'm a filmmaker, I have a long relationship with a Dutch film producer, a man called [**Case Casanda**] who really has and this is an indication of my privilege has been my sugar daddy. We have made I suppose about 300 films now. We've done a host of exhibitions. We're now on our 16th feature film, we're about to make a pornography in San Paolo and that will be movie number 16 and there's a way I suppose since I'm now almost an honorary Dutch citizen, I live in Amsterdam, he has created the circumstances where he worries about the money, he worries about logistics and sets the whole thing up. He once said that it's very important for me not to wish to use Elizabeth Taylor on an American aircraft carrier with a herd of 50 pigs so there were certain limitations he made but I think and I think if you've seen the evidence of what both he and I have been doing now for 22 years that it's a very wide range of activities, a wide range of subject matters and a huge embrace. When I proposed to him this vast project he blanched a little but within I think about six months we had all the seed money and we were ready to go and we have ended up with a seven hour film.

It's in three parts. I wouldn't want anybody to sit on their backside for seven hours, even Wagnerian operas aren't that long, so we divided [38:24] into three parts but what was fascinating for me and also for him because he has a great stake in contemporary technology was the fact that we should make it as a series of DVD's and of course there had to be 92 DVD's, one for each suitcase and the idea was...I didn't want to waste masses of time packing and

unpacking suitcases on the silver screen which is far too wearisome but you could do it on a DVD so every single DVD comes in the fashion you can unpack it, take out all the items and of course in every single suitcase there are 92 items so a little arithmetic here...92 x 92 and you're over 8,000 so that's an awful lot of stuff to play with and if you take suitcase 46, two 46's make 92 it is full of what I call holocaust gold, it's full of 92 gold bars and every single gold bar has a history and it represents I suppose all the gold taken from all the victims of the Third Reich and that's all the way from Dublin to Baghdad, all the way from extreme North Norway to North Africa so it's not just the Jews though of course they primarily are set in there but it's the homosexuals and the malcontents and the communists and the gypsies.

There is a way I suppose certainly right up to the beginning of the 20th Century he or she who owns gold rules the world. I think it's changed now. He or she who owns the notion of uranium, these are the people now who rule the world. I mean don't worry about President Bush concerning himself with petrol or those sorts of thing which are the façade of our newspapers, the real crux here is the notion of power and the notion of power that's represented by uranium and you know, especially locally you regionally know that uranium is being harvested up the coast here so uranium is on its way back, it's going to have to come back, we've got 50 more years probably of fossil fuels and however much of tide power and solar power and wind power and all those other fancy decorative things it's not going to satisfy the huge demands that we're going to need for power in the coming next century so uranium is going to come back and uranium is going to be part of the agenda so in some curious way this project is really I think ready and ripe for continual appreciation.

Let's go back to the media. We make a film because we know how to make a film. We have a distribution system. There are 46 territories of film distribution in the world; we can always command at least 30 of them. With the new film I think we've got about 26, we haven't got Hungary, we've got Israel, we don't have Turkey...you know how it goes, it's like ticking off a list...very valuable though because obviously we want as many people as possible across as many different languages and creeds to see this material so we're making then a feature film seven hours long, we are making 92 DVD's, we have a whole series of television versions of this phenomenon and we have a very big physical, think of the properties concerns again, exhibition. This exhibition was opened by Prince Charles no less in a big country house about three years ago, that's the first manifestation of it. Then we look it to Barcelona. This last summer it's been in San Paolo. All my collaborators are now preparing it for the Tretyakov Museum in Moscow. We've just had an invitation to take it to Beijing and also to Pusan in South Korea and it's also going to go - and this is very eccentric - Ceausescu Palace in Bucharest Romania. Perhaps the one good thing that building was ever intended for, we're going to provide the reason. So it's a manifestation again of a very interactive big exhibition which of course has all the suitcases with all the contents but it has all the ways in which you can look at the suitcases so there are huge amounts of projections; small, big, middle size, all sorts of interactive phenomenon and also a lot of music and a lot of dialogue so it's meant to be

deliberately a very, very multimedia phenomenon supposedly related to my two big anxieties about the future of cinema, it has to be multimedia and it has to be interactive and the cinema we know cannot be interactive and it cannot be multimedia. That's one of the reasons why I think that the great days of cinema are over and the empowering possibilities of cinema as our fathers and forefathers knew it, those days are finished. There's no reason to cry tears over that because what happens next is going to be far more entertaining, far more exciting.

I also wrote a series of plays one of which went on in Frankfurt. That was interesting. That was about again suitcase 46 and it was again about the notion of holocaust gold so that maybe Anne Frank's relatives in Amsterdam putting their trinkets together smelted down by the Nazis end up with one gold bar. Bankers in Rostock again put together their family heirlooms, melt down the phenomena and you have another gold bar so I have a feature film about Anne Frank's concern with gold, a feature film already 120 minutes long and I have a film about Rostock Bankers.

Let's take another example. When the Germans marched into Poland they collected huge numbers of wedding rings, they probably took the finger off as well as the actual wedding ring and these again were melted down into gold bars, all stored in the Deutsche Bank probably in Berlin, so you could see in suitcase 46 with 92 gold bars in it there were 92 feature films just inside suitcase 46 and remember there's another 91 suitcases so the project is huge. Of course we need a lot of people to help, to be associated and I think the laptop generation got very excited about this because it's a project of organisation, new media and we allowed I think enormous amounts of freedom for people. Rather like the communist organisation we had cells all over Europe. We actually had one or two cells in Chicago in New York. We made an interactive video game and all these people became involved. The idea was to create 92 different puzzle areas which had to be solved and the prize would be and since the scope of the whole film was the world was to go to every single place in the world my hero Tulse Luper went to. I understand the prize has now been offered to a man in **[Reciobick]** and I think it's going to take him six months to go to all the places in the world which our hero Tulse Luper went to. There was a rumour since we involved Isabella Rossellini that in fact the second prize was to spend one night with Isabella Rossellini but that didn't happen.....so again, you can see the multimedia splash here, a feeling that cinema is no longer part and powerful enough and empowering enough to be able to engage us in ways which we now expect in the second Guttenberg Revolution.

The first Guttenberg Revolution creates a literacy in the world, creates the reformation, creates the industrial revolution, creates the scientific revolution, empowers us all in terms of knowledge. Now we have the second Guttenberg Revolution which is related to the digital phenomenon, the notion of the worldwide web, access immediately to any information possibly; with a slight coder there...think of what's happening in China with forms of censorship but the possibility again of a new big brand revolution will empower us

exponentially in a way that the first one did and I wanted again to make this film to be representative of these big, big ideas.

I'm a great [**Borgas**] fan. Each generation has a favourite writer, he had enormous influence on me and he wrote two short stories I suppose in the late 1940's and one of the stories was about making a map the same scale as the world so every single one of you would be represented in real scale on this huge massive map. You can see and enjoy the concept I think and you think my god that's impossible, it's absolutely impossible, but is it? You all Google earth now don't you and in a sense haven't we already got there? Don't we already have at our fingertips almost a map, a real scale of the world? The second [**Borgas**] story was this idea that a true history of all the world had to be a history of every single one of its inhabitants living or dead but now we have genetics. We can bring back Marilyn Monroe. We can bring back in a curious way everybody that's ever existed. You have to decide when primates became homonoids but there must be a cut-off point somewhere and why stop there....go back and go back. In a curious way these stories which were incredible science fiction propositions in the late 1940's in a curious sort of way have come true; we now have the tools for that. So to recap, here's the possibility of making a definitive, definitive, definitive encyclopedic film or phenomenon we'd certainly use cinema as its central vehicle of representation but was represented not by the old fashioned celluloid phenomenon which we're all used to, but to embrace all the cousins and sisters and varieties that are associated with it. Well we made this film and I think we showed the first I think maybe 20 minutes at the Cannes Film Festival and everybody was wild with excitement. It was really very exciting and then we finished the whole goddam film and then we showed it at the Venice Film Festival and everybody yawned.

The vehicle is just too big for cinema. It's full of hundreds and hundreds of anecdotes and cross-referencing and side-bars and listings because it's really designed to be an interactive phenomena where you can freeze, where you can stop, where you can rewind, where you can contemplate, where you can re-examine in all the ways that we now know from the uses of our laptop and the worldwide web but it had to be like that in a curious way. It's become a film festival film. I think somebody counted and it had been at some 350 film festivals but it had hardly ever actually hit the high street. It was indigestible but what was exciting was all sisters and the cousins of this phenomenon, and this was most heartwarming because in a curious way it somehow underlined my premise about the death of cinema, everything else seemed to take off extremely well. Our interactive internet site, I think we had 160,000 hits a day for about three years so we had a huge laptop following of the whole Generation X who was deeply engrossed in what we were doing. I've also now become a VJ.

You all know about VJ? Yes? Video jockey! So we stripped down the whole film and broken it up into thousands and thousands of loop. The amazing I suppose state of the art whiz kids in Rotterdam, the centre of these sorts of activity, have made me an amazing touch screen engine so I can manipulate all these loops onto as many screens as I like in a 360° environment.

We were hoping to bring it here but unfortunately it didn't work out. Maybe next time! But we've been able to promote this. We had an audience of 10,000 people at a music festival in Gdansk in Poland but we've also done it in little tiny smoky discotheques with only 250 people and I encourage that there should indeed not be a cinema situation for this and I like the idea of the notion and this is often quite difficult to promulgate is the idea of present tense cinema that's non-narrative. Okay, that's going to be a problem isn't it? Don't you all go to cinema to be told stories, shame on you, and isn't it really that we've ended up with a cinema which is no more than bedtime stories for adults and is that good enough? Of course it's not good enough. So this notion again that every time you see Casablanca, sinking the Titanic, Spiderman, every time you see it I can now make it different so every day of the week I can make that film differently. An incredible headache for distributors but they're going to have to catch up.....so it's the notion that we have with television. You know, okay, so there's a lot of repetition on television but basically our whole evening's entertainment does not repeat itself so let's move cinema into the present tense and make it malleable and reformable and introduce notions of metamorphosis in it in order to make it a present tense medium and don't let us be a slave of the bookshop, don't let us continually make cinema which is no more than illustrated text.

It's a provocation but there is a way that none of you in the cinema have ever seen a film; all you've seen is 112 years of illustrated text. We have a text-based cinema; we don't have an image-based cinema. I suppose those amazing French [51:24] who thought such wonderful things about the future of cinema in the 1910's and 1920's they seeking I suppose an origin for cinema said it was a combination of literature, the theatre and painting. Well there's precious little painting in cinema. There still is 112 years, 100 years later an awful lot of theatre and an incredible amount of the bookshop in terms of literature so I would argue that cinema never reached and I'm already speaking in the past tense here, cinema never reached an autonomous form. If I can make I suppose a rather vulgar comparison with Darwinian evolution you know that zebras and horses can't fuck to produce any other species so in a sense there's a way that the notion of species (52:13) which defines the notion of a separated phenomenon in a sense has happened with all the other six major arts but since cinema can fuck with anything it has become totally unautonomous without its true identity. There is no such thing as a notion of true cinema and every film you've ever seen because of its origins, because of the circumstances can always be deconstructed back into other forms primarily of course literature which again makes it very, very unsatisfactory for me but again let me remind you I'm talking in the past tense because we don't have to worry about this anymore because cinema is now dead. I give you the date....it's 31 September 1983 when the zapper or remote control was introduced into the living rooms of the world...bang....death of cinema. Let's go back to this phenomenon, sitting in the dark looking in one direction. What control do you have of what's on the screen....virtually nothing.

I'm trained as a painter but I've ended up as a filmmaker so I understand the notion of the differences of the timeframe. You could go and look at the Mona Lisa for 3 seconds, 3 minutes, 3 days, 3 weeks, 3 years if you wish, the

timeframe is yours. When I make a film you lose the timeframe, I gain it. I give you my hand from only the position I want you to see it for however long I want you to see it. You've lost the timeframe, I've gained it. So I think in a curious way if you think about that the DVD is the ideal medium not only for me but also for you to engage in both those timeframes. You have control of the material but you can also treat it I suppose like you would treat any other film, sit back and watch the material and of course notions of the DVD which already of course is probably beginning to have its own death nel there's a way that its potentiality certainly when it becomes the phenomena of the web, is limitless, unlimited, it will go on and on with 1,000 links in every single direction so an absolutely ideal medium for the moment but of course its days are numbered. I think you won't be able to buy a DVD in five years time; it will all be subsumed back into the notion of your laptop which probably is a very good place for it.

Okay, this project then was deeply, deeply unsuccessful in the cinema but very, very successful in other places it still goes on. I'm engaged in making all sorts of other things as well because that's very, very important but we've just been commissioned to add two more episodes in Russia and now the whole upcoming new film industry in South Korea injected a lot of money in it. We have to go there to make the films but that's not a problem because Tulse Luper is a rover of the world in maneuvering from excitement to excitement in all sorts of adventures. He's also I suppose - and this is another important metaphor for the project - he's a perpetual professional prisoner and I always think the relationship between a jailer and a prisoner is an extremely intimate one and constantly changing and all of us in some curious way are prisoners and I don't necessarily mean that you have to be barred, windows and closed doors but being prisoners of a profession, of a job, of an attitude, of an ideology. I'm a prisoner. I'm a prisoner now because I'm a filmmaker. There are edges, there are parameters, there are margins, there are boundaries which I know are in some curious way however fake, however I might think about the notion of a gilded gaol it's still a gaol. So another one of the continuous phenomenon then of this film is the notion of the idea of us all as a prisoner and also I suppose the bigger metaphor still is this notion that there is no such thing as history, there are only historians and I think even the recent events, like in America, the 911 phenomenon, it's already becoming mythology. Look how all the participants in the American election they're using this phenomenon. It's disappeared from history; it's become mythology so it's not a question of what happened now it's a question of the subjective way in which it's looked at. Again, there's no such thing as history, there's only historians.

Okay, I'm going to take a pause now and show you the beginning of Part 1 of 14 episodes of a 7-hour film –