

Representation of Lyotard's Philosophical Opinions in Cinema (Case Study: Amour Film by Michael Haneke)

***Sediqeh Pourmokhtar**

Shahed University, Iran

Corresponding Author: s.pourmokhtar@ut.ac.ir

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3048-9276>

****Seyed Reza Hosseini**

Associate Professor of Painting, Art Faculty, Shahed University, Tehran, Iran

reza_hoseini4@yahoo.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5520-2484>

Abstract:

Jean-Francois Lyotard (1924-1998), one of the most prominent critical thinkers of the second half of the 20th century, is most famous for his analyzes of postmodernism and postmodernity. Lyotard believes that the great theoretical metanarratives and the liberation of modernity, useful in organizing knowledge for humanity, have lost their credibility and power in the postmodern world. In another part of his speech, Lyotard considers the role of art to break down reasonableness, and argues that modern and postmodern art refers to the great idea of showing the boundaries of understanding and new possibilities. The reflection of the postmodern situation that he analyzes can see in the film The Amour of the Austrian director Michael Haneke (1942-). This research has done through a descriptive-analytical method and its main purpose is to help better understand the postmodern cinema. It also seeks to answer the question of how the Lyotard postmodern status is portrayed in Haneke's Amour film? Finding and tracking Lyotard's opinions in the Amour film, this article concludes that the film represents the post-modern situation Lyotard describes, in which the metanarratives have lost their effectiveness and the postmodern replaces this situation.

Keywords: *Lyotard, Postmodern Situation, Amour film, Haneke.*

Introduction

Jean-François Lyotard was a French philosopher from 1924 to 1998, a pioneer in postmodern philosophy and one of the most prominent critical thinkers of the second half of the 20th century. He is most famous for his innovative analyzes of postmodernism and postmodernity on human condition. Lyotard's position as a postmodern philosopher has played an important role in most cultural, artistic, and social contexts. This research seeks to examine the veins of these views in contemporary cinema, and in this way, the movie has chosen the Amour of the work of Michael Haneke.

Michael Haneke was born in Munich in March 1942. He studied philosophy, psychology and theater in Vienna and from 1967 to 1970 he worked as a playwright in the early childhood and since 1970 he has been a film director since he wrote and directed a television film *After Liverpool*. Haneke simultaneously staged several shows at theaters in Stuttgart, Düsseldorf, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Munich, Berlin and Vienna, and at the time of making films for teaching at the Vienna Film Academy. He has ever made films in German, French and English. His films often portray the problems of modern society.

Amour is the name of the movie directed by Michael Haneke in 2012, which won the Best Film Award at the 2012 Cannes Film Festival. Haneke's use of the two former actors, Jean-Louis Trintignant and Emmanuel Riva, is very nostalgic and memorable. The honors of the film also paved the way for Europe and won the Best Foreign Language Awards for the American Oscars and Golden Globes in 2013. Other honors of the film are the winner of the best foreign film of the year from the National Film Review National Film Festival, inner of the best film and directorial award and Best Actor of Men and Woman of the Year from the European Film Festival, winning the prize The Best Non-English Language Year of the Year and the Best Actress of the Year for Emmanuel Riva.

The existence of similarities between Haneke's Amour film and Lyotard's statement is an issue that will explore in this study. In this way, Lyotard's ideas will first present, and then the rate of matching the Amour film with Liotour's vote will examine. This research seeks to answer the following questions: 1. what is the relation of philosophy and philosophical opinions with art and especially cinema.? 2. The postmodern Lyotard situation have emerged in Haneke's Amour film?

Literature Review

The relation between film and philosophy can be considered in four aspects. First, "making a film about philosophy", which can be called it the teaching of philosophy with the film, so that the cinema is an example to philosophy, and presents abstract concepts in a perfectly imaginative way. The second is the form of "philosophical approaches to the film," or a philosophical critique of the film, in which the use of philosophical approaches to cinema is presented, and the third part of philosophy is covered by the film "aesthetics of the film". The fourth approach, which in recent years has been the subject of discussion among the professors of this field and based on the views and opinions of Gilles Deleuze, is "the film as a philosophy". The film can be philosophical, and this is different to being example of a philosophical theory.

In this context, the idea of Noel Carroll is also debatable. Carroll in his book “Philosophy of Motion Picture” has a negative attitude to the problem of film and philosophy, he believes: Most of the films that you call philosophy are expressed in advance, and most importantly, we need an external framework of the film that these interpretive frameworks already exist, and we look at the angle of paradigms (Carroll 2008: 86).

In fact, with this look, Carroll wants to violate the relation between philosophy and film. Noel Carroll sets off psychoanalytic and semiotic interpretations in a critique of the film. Carroll is the founder of post-theory. It is a kind of cinematic theory that is opposed to interpretive, psychoanalytic, semiotics and linguistic analyzes, and does not specifically accept Jacque Lacan, Roland Barth and Louis Althusser's attitudes into cinema. Instead of these attitudes, Carroll believes in a kind of interpretation of rational activism. He believes that this rational activity that man performs in everyday life is equivalent to the rational act of the film's audience to understand the film. Therefore, for Carroll, the analysis of the cognitive and physiological system of man in understanding the understanding of the process of watching in the cinema is a fundamental solution (*ibid*, 89).

In contrast, Gilles Deleuze (1995-1925), the famous French philosopher believes that the task of modern cinema is not the representation of the world, but our beliefs in this world. In fact, modern cinema creates new beliefs and imposes these beliefs on us. Gilles Deleuze does not consider cinema solely as another way of presenting stories and information, but in his view the cinematic form has transformed the possibilities of thinking and imagination. Cinema in his view is one of the most important events in modern life, because the cinema moves us from the immobile parts that we impose on time and leads to moving parts. Deleuze believes that in modern cinema, other images have not been interconnected to form logical sequences, but using irrational pieces, a picture of the universe itself is presented, this is not linear and simple time passage but an Escort. Therefore, cinema has the power to bring thought beyond its own images and the world. He believes that it is only with cinema that we can think of a way of seeing that it is not human-looking. Facing the cinema, in his view, provides us a new philosophy, not because we use philosophy about films, but because we allow the creation of films transforms the philosophy (Colebrook, 2002: 68). With this introduction, from the views of Gilles Deleuze, we examine the philosophical views of Lyotard in relation to the Amour film by Michael Haneke. Roy Grundmann in the third part of his book, *A Companion to Michael Haneke*, studied “71 Fragments of a Chronology of Chance” (1994) by Haneke, and believes that since this film questioned the aggression of modern times, it shows a status between modern and postmodern times, therefore, on the one hand it tends to Theodore Adorno's views on the modern era and, on the other hand, to Lyotard's views on postmodernism.

This research could be in line with these studies. The research suggests that Amour film represents the postmodern situation that Lyotard believes in.

Methodology

The research method of this research is a descriptive-analytic approach with a comparative approach. The research tools are collecting information and watching the film. Lyotard's ideas are taken from his works. After reviewing these ideas and comparing them to the Amour film, five criteria were chosen for this research. These opinions, which are one of Liotard's most important ideas, are based on Haneke's film. Accordingly, after describing his ideas, the scenes, samples, and conversations from the film will be presented to prove the research hypothesis.

Theoretical Foundations

Liotard's opinions provide many critical thinkers with a view to using their modernity in their analysis. The postmodern situation described by Lyotard introduced as one of the important sources of various disciplines such as English literature, cultural and media studies, philosophy and social sciences. In 1954, he was a member of the socialism or barbarism group, who sought a new interpretation and use of the statements of Karl Marx. In 1966, he separated from the group and decided to write his experiences. He also participated in the anti-government rebellion of students in May 1968. Under the influence of these events, he began to question the relations between power and knowledge both in the economy as a whole as well as in academic institutions in particular, and led in the book Librarian Economics (1947), in which he rejected the systems of thought like Marxism. In the late 1970s, publishing three important texts on postmodern status, fair play, and a series of striking articles about art, culture, politics and history paved the way for his next stage in thinking about postmodernism (Malpas, 2003: 4-8).

Lyotard's Postmodern Situation

Modern Metanarratives

According to Lyotard, the basis of modernity is a special type of organization of metanarratives and postmodernism is into some kind of suspicion toward this metanarratives (Lyotard, 1979: 54). Lyotard believes that modernity defined in terms of reliance on the metanarratives that narrate the progress of human development. Of course, Lyotard admits that from the earliest human societies ever since, the continuous narrative has been the "pure form of common knowledge". However, the great difference between modern metanarratives and the vast majority of traditional metanarratives is that they refer to a future in which the problems of the progression of society often related to the whole of society solved. Lyotard defines two types of metanarratives for the modern era: The Speculative metanarrative and Emancipation metanarrative (Lyotard: 1984: xxiv).

Speculative metanarrative is rooted in the philosophy of Germany at the beginning of the nineteenth century especially Hegel's philosophical ideas. Hegel's dialectic is a continuous process of changing the relationship between ideas and material reality. This dialectic consists of three steps: (1) a constant concept is assumed (thesis); and (2) contradictions appear in it (antithesis); and (3) leads to a supreme concept that included both the primary concept and its contradictions (synthesis) (Hegel, 1977: 11). Therefore, the knowledge continuously is in progress. The goal of knowledge is what Hegel calls Absolute. All contradictions between ideas and reality in a system of philosophical knowledge solved. The main idea of the speculative

metanarrative is that human life progresses with increasing knowledge. Philosophy brings together all knowledge to provide a universal, universal history for the advancement of human life (Lyotard 1984: 34).

Emancipation metanarrative is the second type of the modern metanarrative. This gives worthwhile to the knowledge because it is the basis of human freedom. From Lyotard's point of view, this metanarrative begins with the French Revolution. In France, after the revolution, the idea of a universal education is being used as a means of liberating all citizens from the hegemonic constraints. The advancement of knowledge is therefore worthwhile to rid humankind of pain and suffering. This liberation and enlightenment is in two dimensions: the idea of liberation of people from superstitions and the other its Marxist version, the emancipation of the workers from the exploitation of the masters and the development of their abilities to control their own lives (ibid, 1984: 35). These two types of modern metanarratives can be compared in the following table:

Table 1: Comparison of Lyotard's Modernity metanarratives

Speculative metanarrative	Emancipation metanarrative
began with the philosophy of the 19th century Hegel	began with the French Revolution and the tendency towards Marx's thoughts
Advancement of knowledge leads to growth	Liberation and freedom of human beings
advancement of science promotes the growth and development of human life	By knowledge reach to liberation
correctness or inaccuracy of any statement is determined by its relation to the whole knowledge (absolute knowledge)	end of the domination of dogmatism and traditional authority (Universal Freedom)
Knowledge and principles are rules in themselves	The epic is a people who liberate themselves from tyranny of oppression by means of knowledge.
Knowledge is at the service of the subject,	the subject's knowledge
Prescriptive implications of science and perceptions	descriptive implications
Purpose: Truth	Purpose: Freedom

From Lyotard's point of view, the changes that have occurred in knowledge over the last half century have raised doubts about these metanarratives: "In contemporary society and culture, the question of the legitimacy of knowledge in another language Expressed by the greatness of metanarratives, whether they are theoretical, or liberation and freedom of credit "(Lyotard 1984: 34). Accordingly, for Lyotard, postmodern knowledge is valued according to its efficiency and

profitability in a world-class economy. Such a change in the organization of knowledge determines Lyotard's concept of postmodernism.

The Postmodern

In his important essay, "Answering the Question: What is Postmodernism?", Lyotard mentions to the art's ability to demonstrate the shortcomings of rational systems. In this article he refers to three types of artistic expression: realism, modernism, and postmodernism. For Lyotard, this division is not a function of historical timing, but realism, modernism, and postmodernism are in all art ages. Both modernism and postmodernism challenge the foundations of realism that are based on common sense, but postmodernism acts in a radical way. From Lyotard's point of view, any work of art can be modernized when at first it will be postmodern. Therefore, postmodernism is not modernism finished, but it is bearing and constantly repeating. Postmodernism is not the successor to old modernity, but in the mode of the birth of modernist transformation, it is repeated throughout modernity (Lyotard, 1992: 7).

From the perspective of Lyotard, modernism is due to its continuous efforts to innovate and progress in a state of constant chaos; and the postmodernism is also an avant-garde force within this chaos. The postmodern challenges the modernist ideas and classifications and provides the emergence of new ways of thinking and action that resist the dominant themes of modernity, namely, innovation and advancement. Thus, for example, *Don Quixote*, by Cervantes, can be counted postmodern, because of being on the basis of breaking the ideas of current chivalry in the late Middle Ages (Malpas, 2003: 60).

The Sublime

In his article, "Answering to the Question: What is Postmodern?", Lyotard defines the Sublime as "showing something unseen able." He therefore elites the term to describe the way in which art and literature can disrupt representational methods, and this is a feature of modern art. From Lyotard's point of view, the Sublime can show the existence of the invisible thing in two distinct ways: one is modern and the other is postmodern. The modernist sublime is struggling with the sense of excitement and postmodern sublime with a sense of defeat of language games: "this feeling says that the former rules have failed, let's discover new ones" (Klinger, 1995: 4).

Therefore, from Lyotard's point of view, since the sublime can reveal something unrepresentable, then it can show a new possibility for thought and action. Modern and postmodern art uses the sublime power to show the boundaries of understanding and refer to the new possibilities, and can break down the impressions that are based on common sense and are evident in realism art (Bill, 2006: 102).

Differend

Differend from the perspective of the critics and Lyotard himself, is the most complicated and philosophical work of him. Its writing began in 1974 and lasted about nine years to complete. Simon Melpas in his book *Jean-François Lyotard*, quotes a true account of the Australian court to clarify the meaning of this concept, which is useful in understanding this innovative concept.

Melpas tells the story in this way: Imagine that you are an Australian judge. Before you are two plaintiffs. The first is a construction company who want to build a new development on an island; the second is a group of aboriginal women who claim that the island is a religious site for their community. If what the women say is true then the development, which has already cost the company many thousands of dollars, must be scrapped and the land returned. This, the company tell you, will probably bankrupt them and force them to make their staff redundant. In order to substantiate their claim, the women must prove in court that the island really is a holy site. But this is where the problem arises. You are told by the women's lawyer that, according to their beliefs, they can only discuss the meaning of the site amongst themselves: the site's holiness rests on the belief that it remains a secret passed down from mother to daughter along the generations, and if this secret is revealed to a man or to anyone outside their group then the site loses its holiness. They are thus trapped. According to the law, if they don't provide evidence in court then they lose the case; if they do speak out then they must reveal the secret, which means that the site loses its holiness in their eyes and, again, they lose the case (Malpas, 2003: 57-8). Lyotard calls that situation before the judge the Diffrend. Lyotard, of course, does not limit the Diffrend to legal issues, and generally defines it as: unstable situation of language, a situation in which something that should be included in sentences cannot yet be matched to that format. (Lyotard, 1974:31).

Amour and Lyotard's Ideas

Michael Haneke believes in his goal of film making that he never starts a movie with the purpose of making it about a particular theme. What is interesting to him is personal experiences, characters, or mankind. Journalists need to compress these things and write about them in a way that they do, but the work of art does not work in that way. Most of them are general. There is no way. But the very thing you can describe with a word is art of the dead. There is nothing else alive and there is no reason to watch the movie. This contradiction always exists in the context of an artistic proposition with an article about which it is written (Interview with Carin Schiefer at the AFC Film Commission's website, May 2012).

The Metanarratives

As noted before, Lyotard considers modern times the dominant period of metanarratives, and the postmodern period is an invalidity period for them. In this film, two metanarratives Speculative metanarrative and Emancipation metanarrative can be found in the main characters of the film, Anna and Georges.

Anna, as the Speculative metanarrative, is a music teacher, and her instrument is piano. These two elements can be considered as the basis of this narrative. She has spent his entire life in teaching music and has taught a lot of students; she is still trying to grow her knowledge at an advanced age. In other words, Anna is the same as Lyotard's Speculative metanarrative who believes that the advancement of knowledge leads to growth. She plays music, she attends at the concert of her student, Alexander, now a well-known piano master, even after the first stroke that was paralyzed on the right side of her body, and her student had come to see him, when Alexander was in the position of Anna. She does not want to talk about it, she wants to talk about

past memories and her advancements. Their conversation when faced with each other is as follows:

Anna: Alexander, welcome, I am very glad to see you.

Alexander: Mrs. Larrett, I'm so glad to see you.

Anna: I'm very proud of you, we were very excited after each concert, Georges would have bought your new CD tomorrow morning.

Alexander: Oh my god! I wanted to get one, but I was gone ...

Anna: No, do not worry ... We also want to contribute to your success, even if you have 20 Euros.

Alexander: you helped me so much, thank you very much ...

Anna: You got it because of your great effort and talent.

Alexander goes on to read about the memories of the past and the harshness of Anna in teaching music. And when Alexander asks about her current situation, she says:

" my right side of my body is numb that's it, when you get old, this happens ... Let's talk about something else."

At the end of the meeting, Anna would be asking Alexander to play a piece of the pieces she had learned in the past, and this meeting ends with his playing.

In other parts of the film, despite her paralyzing half of body, she studies music books, and after the second stroke, her condition gets worse, when he tries to practice exercises to speak, she uses melodic verses.

Georges, the other main character of this film, can also be considered as Emancipation metanarrative of Lyotard. As mentioned earlier, Emancipation metanarrative is based on the salvation of human beings, and uses such tools as knowledge and consciousness to achieve this goal. In the film, Georges also seeks to rid her wife of her suffering. It uses any tool to do this. He reads her book, he reviews her good memories for her wife, despite her inability to do her work alone, he promises that even if she gets worse, he will not go to the hospital because Anna was more relaxed at home, and she hired a nurse for her more relaxed comfort, and ultimately choked her with a pillow for the rest of her life in order to not hurt any more.

The Postmodern

According to Lyotard, postmodernism is a leading force challenging the ideas and categories of modern times. It is constantly challenging the metanarratives and categories about economic issues. Eva, the daughter of Georges and Anna, portrays the Postmodern in this film. She defines for her father her own life, as if it is far better than the life of her parents. She believes that her father has done nothing for the mother: "Why did not you get him to a hospital? Why do not you change his doctor?" in this period, why her illness is not being solved? ". in this condition she can show the questioning feature of the Postmodern. When she came to visit her mother, she only talks about economic issues that this dialogue or, strictly speaking, the monologue, illustrates the other aspect of Lyotard's the Postmodern:

Eva: I think about the best thing is investing in an apartment unit. If the inflation goes high again, the property is the only sure asset. Now the savings account only makes 1.75%.

Now, the best interest rate last year Jeff (Eva's wife) bought a little stock with a little

money, and then everything fell, and now we are very worried. Here the rest of the people, makes the same idea and makes the property price high. Since I came back from Scandinavian, I spent all my time visiting the newspaper adverts to see what time it took to get something.

The Sublime

According to Lyotard's definition, the Sublime represents something unimaginable. The director used the pigeon to show "death" in the film. In this film, the pigeon comes to Georges and Ana twice. Georges drops the pigeon out of the window for the first time; this is when Georges and Anna live with hope, and both hope that she will get better sooner. But at the end of the film Georges closes all the doors and windows and anyway takes the pigeon. And that's when his wife is dead, and he's also very incapacitated.

Diffrend

In Lyotard's view, Diffrend is a conflict between at least two people, which cannot be solved because of the lack of a legal rule applicable to both parties. In the Amour film, Diffrend is seen between Georges and Anna. On the one hand, Anna's condition is worse every day, and staying in the hospital is better for her, but she is not calm in the hospital, and asks Georges, even if her condition worsens, he did not get her to the hospital.

On the other hand, Georges's physical condition is not so good as he can care for his sick wife, but he wants his wife to be calm and therefore promises her not to be hospitalized, while staying in the hospital for both of them is better. So, Diffrend is in going to the hospital or not. On the other hand, if Anna does not rest on the hospital her condition worsens and is deprived of hospital care, and Georges himself, both mentally and physically damaged. Lyotard's and Amour films are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Lyotard's Ideas and Hanek's Amour movie

	Lyotard's Ideas	Scene of Amour Film
1	Speculative metanarrative	Ana is an attempt to grow knowledge. Even after stroke, she is trying to read and follow the success of her disciples
2	Emancipation metanarrative	Georges, an effort to free and liberate, uses every means to rid his wife of the suffering even choking his wife in the same direction.
3	The Sublime	Death by using pigeon
4	Diffrend	Conflict Between Anna and Georges Between Staying and not Staying in the Hospital
5	The Postmodern	Eva Anna and Georges' daughter - Challenging Parents as Metanarratives as well as Worrying Economic Issues

Conclusion

According to the views of the contemporary philosopher Jean-Francois Lyotard, *Amour* by the famous Austrian director Michael Haneke can be seen as a visualization of the postmodern situation of Lyotard. Lyotard considers two types of metanarratives to be the basis of the modern world. Speculative metanarrative observes that the advancement of knowledge leads to the rise of human life. The second, the Emancipation metanarrative that serves the subject and suffers from this tool for the liberation and liberation of man. The purpose of these two metanarratives is to reach truth and freedom. Georges and Anna are the two main characters of the film, in fact, they take the role of these two metanarratives. As a music teacher, Ana is seeking to upgrade her knowledge and apprenticeship even up to oldness. Georges, despite his physical disabilities, tries his wife after a stroke reaches to calmness. He uses any means to get it; employment a nurse, electric wheelchairs, reading Anna's favorite books, reviewing the good memories of the past, and after her stroke, doing prescribed practice and exercise for his recovery, and ultimately for her release and eternal peace chokes her with a pillow.

Their daughter Eva is Lyotard's the Postmodern. She is the result of these two metanarratives, seeks to deconstruct this situation and constantly criticizes the metanarratives. The Sublime that Lyotard believed to be showing unpresentable, Haneke has shown using the pigeon. The Sublime here is death, when Georges and Anna hope for life, it goes out of the house, and when death comes to them, the pigeons are captured by their hands which choke Ana.

Another factor that embodies Lyotard's ideas in Haneke's film is to Diffrend. In Lyotard's view, Diffrend is a conflict that cannot be solved due to the lack of applicable rules and logic. The conflict between Georges and Anna about whether Anna goes to the hospital or not, is Lyotard's Diffrend. Ana is not relaxed in hospital. On the other hand, Georges does not have the ability to take care of Anna, but for the sake of her calmness, he promised that he would not go her to the hospital under any circumstances, although her situation gets worse every day.

In the final scene of the film and after Anna's death, Georges hears the sound of the dishwasher when he goes to the kitchen, he sees Anna, who says that it's over, put on your shoes, and let's go. Then these two metanarratives go out of the house. Following scene, their daughter Eva arrives home from the same door they went out on, sitting on the same seat as her father always, and in some way owning this house-here, the situation after the metanarratives. In sum, by combining these elements in Haneke's film, it is possible to conclude that *Amour* visualizes the Lyotard's Postmodern Situation.

References

- Browne, Nick.(2004). American Narrative Studies of Film: Between Formalism and Postmodernism. *Quarterly Review of Film Studies*, 10:4, 341-346, London: Routledge.
- Burke, Frank. 1988. Aesthetics and Postmodern Cinema. *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*. Vol.XII.
- Colebrook, Claire. (2002). *Gilles Deleuze*. London: Routledge.
- Grunhmann, Roy. (2010). *A Companion to Michael Haneke*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jameson, Fredric. (1997). *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Duke University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel.
- Klinger, Cornelia. (1995). *The concepts of the Sublime and the Beautiful in Kant and Lyotard*. *Constellations* Volume 2, No 2. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois.(1986). “A cinema”. Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology. Columbia University Press. pp: 349-359.
- Lyotard, Jean Francois. (1979). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*.
- Malpas, Simon.(2003).*Jean-Francois Lyotard*. London: Routledge.
- Readings, Bill.(2006) . *Introducing Lyotard Art and Politics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tomiche, Anne. (2015). “Lyotard and/on Literature ”. *Yale French Studies*, No. 99, Jean-Francois Lyotard: *Time and Judgment*, pp. 163-149. Yale University Press.