Pasolini's Cinema of the Outside and the Problem of the Renewal of Marxism: Ontology, Semiology, Semiotics and Pedagogy

by

Massimo Bardin

Oxford Brookes University

Doctor of Philosophy

September 2023

ABSTRACT

My thesis explores Pasolini's work with a twofold purpose, historical and philosophical. It extracts for the first time a consistent political philosophy from his multifaceted activity as an intellectual, literary critic, poet, journalist, and cinema director, spelling out the specific relevance of his cinematic oeuvre for the debate on the crisis of Marxism. In my historical and theoretical reconstruction, Pasolini's cinematic turn in the late 1950s was an early formulation of the problem concerning the conditions of possibility for political dissent. His film production in the 1960s and 1970s, his cinema theory in the mid-1960s, and even the pedagogy of cinema displayed in his latest writings and films in the mid-1970s can all be read as attempts to solve that problem in the face of the changing nature of capitalism. My main point is that Pasolini elaborates a Marxist political theory of cinema while constantly reforming his cinematic language. He conceives the latter as potentially transnational and trans-classist, and hence capable of exposing the hegemonic functioning of capitalism with the purpose of resisting it. What this study defines as 'the outside' of capitalism thus reflects Pasolini's theorisation of 'reality' as the multiplicity of elements that – forgotten, excluded, and denied by capitalism – resist its totalising ideology, as well as his pedagogical commitment to offering his audience the opportunity to perceive the existence of an alternative reality behind the fiction screened by capitalist ideology.

List of Abbreviations

References to Pasolini's works follow this list of abbreviations (details are provided in the Bibliography). Pasolini's main works were published in English. However, other works are not yet available in the English language editions, and from these I have translated directly from the Italian; any errors in interpretation are mine. Original quotations are provided in the Appendix.

References to Pasolini's films follow the English title of the film, wherever possible.

(HE): *Heretical Empiricism*

(CW): *Corsair Writings*

(LL): *Lutheran Letters*

(DM): *The Divine Mimesis*

(PO): *The Selected Poetry of Pier Paolo Pasolini*

(PI): *Passione e ideologia*

(BB): *Le belle bandiere*

(OI): *L'odore dell'India*

(SLA): *Scritti sulla letteratura e l'arte*

(SP): *Scritti politici*

(LE-1): *Lettere dal 1940 al 1954*

(LE-2): *Lettere dal 1955 al 1975*

(TE): *Teatro*

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT **2**

List of Abbreviations **3**

INTRODUCTION **8**

PART 1: Purposes and organisation of the thesis **8**

PART 2: Pier Paolo Pasolini – A Life in Light of the Renewal of Marxism **23**

I. NEOCAPITALISM AND PASOLINI'S RENEWAL OF MARXISM THROUGH CINEMA **40**

1.1 A definition of neocapitalism in Pasolini's political theory **42**

1.2 'The obscene health of neocapitalism' and its guiding language **44**

1.3 'Marxism has gone out of style': the crisis of Marxist theory and language in the 1960s according to Pasolini **48**

1.3.1 The crisis of Marxist theory and its results **50**

1.3.2 The crisis of Marxist language and its rationalism **52**

1.4 Pasolini's militant engagement and the intellectual context of the 1960s **54**

1.4.1 The debate on special languages in the Italian intellectual context **56**

1.4.2 Pasolini and the international contexts of the 1960s **59**

1.5 Pasolini's cinematic turn **65**

1.5.1 Pasolini's cinematic turn in secondary bibliography: continuity or breakthrough? **65**

1.5.2 Pasolini's cinematic turn as a breakthrough for his militant engagement and for his theoretical approach **71**

1.6 An example of Pasolini's cinematic turn as breakthrough and theoretical evolution **75**

II. PASOLINI'S CINEMA THEORY THROUGH THE LENS OF DELEUZE'S PHILOSOPHY OF CINEMA **78**

2.1 Towards a theoretical reconstruction of Pasolini's cinema: why Deleuze? **81**

2.2 Pasolini in light of *Cinema1*: Deleuze's concept of the solid-perception image and political implications in Pasolini's cinema theory **85**

2.2.1 The concept of the solid-perception image: Deleuze interprets Pasolini's cinema style **86**

2.2.2 The political implication of the solid-perception image: Pasolini beyond Deleuze's interpretation **89**

2.3 Pasolini in light of *Cinema2:* Deleuze's concept of the outside and the ontological horizon of Pasolini's cinema **93**

2.3.1 Deleuze's concept of the outside as the definition of the political core of Pasolini's cinema theory **94**

2.3.2 Deleuze's interpretation of Pasolini's semiological thesis on the language of cinema as its ontological horizon **98**

2.4 The outside and reality in *Che cosa sono le nuvole?* **101**

III. PASOLINI'S POLITICAL THEORY OF CINEMA AS THE REALITY OF THE OUTSIDE (1960s) **108**

3.1 Towards an ontology of cinema: realism and the outside **110**

3.1.1 Pasolini's elusive and incomplete work on the definition of his vision of reality **112**

3.1.2 Pasolini's references to Spinoza's ontology in *Heretical Empiricism* and in his films *Pigsty* and *Medea* **114**

3.2 Towards a semiotics of cinema: realism and the solid perception of reality **118**

3.2.1 The iconic sign of itself **120**

3.2.2 The symbolic sign in *La ricotta* **124**

3.2.3 Naturalism **125**

3.3 Towards a political awareness of the cinematic camera within naturalism, conventionalism, and authorship **127**

3.3.1 The cinematic camera and naturalism **128**

3.3.2 The cinematic camera and conventionalism **130**

3.3.3 The political awareness of the cinematic camera and the issue of authorial sovereignty **131**

3.4 The cinema of the outside **133**

3.4.1 The political role of profilmic content **133**

3.4.2 The aesthetic dimension of audio-visual techniques **137**

3.4.3 The relationship between audio-visual techniques and profilmic content to elicit sympathy and love for the outside **140**

3.4.4 *Theorem* as a paradigmatic example of Pasolini's cinema of the outside **143**

3.5 Pasolini's cinema of the outside and the renewal of Marxism **148**

IV. PASOLINI'S CINEMATIC TURN AS A PEDAGOGY OF THE OUTSIDE (1970s) **150**

4.1 The changing nature of capitalism and the concept of adaptability **153**

4.1.1 Neocapitalism as a new form of fascism and an anthropological mutation **154**

4.1.2 The concept of adaptability **157**

4.2 *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*: Pasolini's adaptability and his counter-pedagogy **159**

4.2.1 *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* – the film narrative **161**

4.2.2 *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* – the political connotations of the title through the conjunction 'or' **162**

4.2.3 *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*: the 'iconic sign of itself' of Pasolini's cinema of the outside **164**

4.2.4 *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*, the final scene and Pasolini's adaptability as a counter-pedagogy **167**

4.3 'Gennariello', a pedagogical treatise in favour of an audio-visual pedagogy **169**

4.3.1 'Gennariello' as a pedagogy 'in the scornful shadow of de Sade' **172**

4.3.2 'Gennariello' as an audio-visual pedagogy and counter-pedagogy **174**

4.3.3. 'Gennariello', a counter-pedagogy in favour of a minority of the young **178**

4.4 Learning 'to think in images' **180**

CONCLUSION **185**

AFTERWORD **201**

BIBLIOGRAPHY **203**

APPENDIX **219**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS **224**

INTRODUCTION

The introduction is split into two parts. The first part illustrates the purposes and the organisation my thesis on the political theory of Pasolini's cinema. It explains my innovative view of Pasolini's work, and introduces key terms, relevant concepts, main topics and academic context. The second part is Pasolini's political biography. It deals with his life in light of the renewal of Marxism: his training, his relationship with the Italian Communist Party, his militant engagement in Literature and Poetry and then in Cinema, and it also reveals something of his personal history, of his urgent need in addressing political problem of the crisis of Marxism and eventually of his murder that remains a mystery, whose investigation has recently been re-opened.

PART 1: PURPOSES AND ORGANISATION OF THE THESIS

> 'My obsessive need to return to Marxism … that protects me from the loss of reality.' (HE, 72)

> 'My vision of cinema as language is therefore a "diffused" and "continuous" vision, a reproduction of reality as unbroken and fluid as reality. Here, my love for reality embraces in an abstract sense all of reality, from top to bottom, from head to toe; it is a declaration of love as an undaunted and theoretical act of faith.' (HE, 226)

> 'Nietzsche founded geo-philosophy by seeking to determine the national characteristics of French, English, and German philosophy. But why were only three countries collectively able to produce philosophy in the capitalist world? Why not Spain or Italy? Italy in particular presented a set of de-territorialized cities and a maritime power that were capable of reviving the conditions for a "miracle". It marked the start of an incomparable philosophy. But it aborted, with its heritage ... in Italy and in Spain lack[ing] a "milieu" for philosophy, so that their thinkers remained "comets"; and they were inclined to burn their comets.' (Deleuze, Guattari, 1994: 100-101)

My thesis explores Pasolini's work with a twofold purpose, historical and philosophical. It extracts for the first time a consistent political philosophy from his multifaceted activity as an intellectual, literary critic, poet, journalist, and cinema director, spelling out the specific relevance of his cinematic oeuvre for the debate on the crisis of

Marxism. In my historical and theoretical reconstruction, Pasolini's cinematic turn in the late 1950s was an early formulation of the problem concerning the conditions of possibility for political dissent. His film production in the 1960s and 1970s, his cinema theory in the mid-1960s, and even the pedagogy of cinema displayed in his latest writings and films in the mid-1970s can all be read as attempts to solve that problem in the face of the changing nature of capitalism. My main point is that Pasolini elaborates a Marxist political theory of cinema while constantly reforming his cinematic language. He conceives the latter as potentially transnational and trans-classist, and hence capable of exposing the hegemonic functioning of capitalism with the purpose of resisting it. What this study defines as 'the outside' of capitalism thus reflects Pasolini's theorisation of 'reality' as the multiplicity of elements that – forgotten, excluded, and denied by capitalism – resist its totalising ideology, as well as his pedagogical commitment to offering his audience the opportunity to perceive the existence of an alternative reality behind the fiction screened by capitalist ideology.

My work reveals how Pasolini aims to replace the dialectic of contradiction with a constant attention to the emergence of exclusions and growing invisibilities caused by the everchanging nature of capitalism. In my view, a dialectic of inclusion-exclusion constitutes Pasolini's political theory in order to present his audiences with sufficient 'scientific' clarity on how ideology and reality are connected, where such connection leads, and what political action can do to influence and mark out its course. The ideology is thus defined as the inclusion and simultaneous exclusion of parts of reality, which in turn are determined by the power of the language emitted by the various audio-visual technologies which coexist in a given historical moment. Political action related to dissent and antagonism takes place on the screen by mirroring the ways in which capitalism hides its functioning and by showing what is invisible because it has been excluded.

Likewise, I uncover that Pasolini changes over time the means of his militant engagement, his cinematic subjects, and his struggles and antagonisms, eventually defining his Marxism as a battle on move. In a way, Pasolini's renewal of Marxism assumes an adaptation to the trends of capitalism that is continuously based on the search for a political way to intervene in 'the time of now'. This entails both a positive vision of technology and the present time, and equally it is aimed at establishing how and to what extent political action is possible and produces effects in the perception of

reality. In short, Pasolini encourages Marxist debate into a transition from an endless reinterpretation whose revisions contain polyhedric versions and irreconcilable theoretical contradictions to an actualisation of its practical options that aim to pragmatically intervene in reality to transform it. The result is that in his militant engagement Pasolini as cinema theorist and director reveals an entire anticapitalist body of work.

The inspiration for the study is my admiration for what I define as Pasolini's cinematic turn. At the end of the 1950s, Pasolini abandons his militant engagement in literature to directly connect Marxism to the languages and techniques of cinema. The urgency of a paradigm shift from literature to cinema emerges from the rise of neocapitalism – what Pasolini calls the alliance between productive forces and audio-visual technologies. This alliance entails a direct relationship between capitalism and reality on the screen, through which ideologies are depicted not only in the workplace and in the superstructural apparatuses of school, church, and literature, but everywhere – through the conventional patrimony of images spread universally by television, the blockbuster and advertising – engendering what Pasolini calls the ubiquitous selectivity of the guiding language of neocapitalism.

Paying attention to the historical and academic context of his time, Pasolini understands that the rise of neocapitalism, and its new guiding language, implies not only a new definition of capitalism, but also a crisis for Marxism and for its language. He believes that the ubiquitous selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language was and would continue to be a real danger for people and for Marxism. It ideologically and extensively includes and excludes parts of reality on the screen, pedagogically subduing people's imaginations to the power of capitalism and disconnecting the working class from the reality of Marxist struggles.

In Pasolini's militant engagement, this awareness produces a trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics, and it is from this encounter that my historical and theoretical reconstruction marks an original understanding of the political unity and consistency of Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre. Pasolini accepted the crisis of Marxism, he had the courage to look the new language of neocapitalism in the face and he understood that the crisis of Marxism necessitated a renewal of Marxism and its language. So Pasolini immerses himself in applying his cinema theory to his film

production because he realises that it is necessary to modify the forms and practices of antagonism and that the best practice for Marxists was to learn the new technologies of neocapitalism, adapting their militant engagement to the shift from words to images in order to discover how one can use audio-visual language against capitalism.

With these perspectives, this study defines Pasolini's cinema as 'the cinema of the outside' and understands it as aimed at pursuing conditions for the renewal of Marxism through the concept of adaptability. I repeat: 'the outside' witnesses what remains of reality after the embedding of ideologies spread by neocapitalism's guiding language. Pasolini's adaptability reveals that Marxism should be oriented towards the languages and techniques of so-called 'now-time' to resist and to struggle against the changing nature of capitalism. Hence, the title of my thesis, 'Pasolini's cinema of the outside and the problem of the renewal of Marxism', articulates a political unity and consistency in his cinematic oeuvre and that it lies in recognising that his militant engagement is never static but is rather always a battle on the move: (a) his cinematic vision of the realities outside capitalism changes with the changing nature of capitalism, and (b) his adaptability is aimed at the renewal of Marxism, which ultimately this study defines as the affirmation of a radical anticapitalism. The subtitle 'Ontology, Semiology, Semiotics, and Pedagogy' identifies the disciplines engaged by his cinema theory and demonstrates my recognition of how Pasolini grounds his materialist trajectory in order to develop and express and adjust his political theory. He turns to ontology, semiology, semiotics, and finally the pedagogy of cinema in order to (a) confront the loss of reality due to the rise of neocapitalism; (b) reveal what remains of reality in the face of the totalising power of capitalism; and (c) counteract capitalism through a wider perception of reality for the viewer on the screen.

In my view, these disciplines are not only seen as the essential basis of Pasolini's cinema theory, but they also constitute a fundamental aspect of his political theory: Marxism must be capable of criticising and re-elaborating its own practices and languages if it is to confront the changing nature of capitalism. What ultimately arrives is a recognition of the philosophical and political legacy of Pasolini's militant engagement: his cinema theory is the condition for political dissent. It must adapt to the new hegemonic means of capitalism and orient the struggle towards what remains of reality in 'now time'. This is, for Pasolini, the militant way to be part of the present time and to remain Marxist and anticapitalist.

The work intertwines three lines of research: the debate on contemporary Marxism, the recent academic attention in political science to the relationship between politics and cinema and, of course, the forum of Pasolini studies. All these approaches are the more general academic context into which this study is inserted, and they have helped me to assess and explore how Pasolini's cinema offers and provides elements and conditions for political dissent. The questions that have guided this thesis are as follows. What do the concepts of the outside and of adaptability reveal to current scholarship on Marxism? How does Pasolini's militant engagement between cinema and Marxism follow the current academic attention to the relationship between political theory and film? And, lastly, what does the essential political unity and consistency of Pasolini's cinema add to the body of work on Pasolini studies?

My work begins with Pasolini's cinematic turn at the end of the 1950s: the shift from literature to cinema as a political means to counteract the rise of neocapitalism – what I have called a 'paradigm shift'. In chapter 1, differently from those scholars who suggest the continuity of Pasolini's militant engagement in light of Gramsci's legacy, a historical reconstruction of Pasolini's cinematic turn identifies how his shift from literature to cinema creates a breakthrough in his militant engagement and in his theoretical approach. Through his awareness of the successes of neocapitalism throughout society, and the consequent crisis for Marxism that means it 'has gone out of style' for the masses (HE: 125), Pasolini considers the full possession of audio-visual language alongside the aim of a wider perception of reality on the screen, the purpose of which is a necessary trans-disciplinary encounter between his cinema – which is aimed at protecting people from the loss of reality – and his political theory, which seeks Marxism's renewal. Pasolini's part in the political debates of the 1960s is described, revealing that this trans-disciplinary encounter needs to be put together with a new definition of the nature of capitalism, its power, and its language; with an awareness of the political inefficacy of poetic and literary language; and eventually with a new cinema theory aimed at recognising the conditions for a transnational and trans-classist language in favour of Marxism within neocapitalism. This transnational and trans-classist language is the theoretical and practical result of Pasolini's militant engagement throughout his cinematic oeuvre.

In chapter 2, the problematic hesitation between the search for unity and consistency

that traverses Pasolini's oeuvre, and his scattered, fragmented, and contradictory work is resolved through a critical reference to Deleuze's books on cinema. Differently from other scholars who remedy and integrate Pasolini's creative disorganisation and his extravagant interdisciplinarity through the theoretical approaches of prominent philosophers such as Lacan (Chiesa, 2016), Žižek (Vighi, 2002), Barthes (Brisolin, 2011) and Althusser (Hamza, 2016), this study looks at Deleuze because he takes seriously Pasolini's theorising and conceptualisation of cinema. Deleuze develops the concept of creative disorganization in Pasolini's cinema theory and absorbs his conceptually incomplete work, eventually offering a method to discover a systematicity and consistency in it. Although Deleuze is far from grasping the political meaning of Pasolini's cinema theory, his interpretation of Pasolini is shown to be notable and sophisticated. Deleuze states he is the only scholar who has adequately understood Pasolini's thesis on the language of cinema as the written language of reality. He grasps the theoretical horizon of Pasolini's thesis through two concepts: the solid-perception image, referring to Pasolini's status of the cinematic image; and the outside, referring to Pasolini's aims for his film production.

A redefinition of these concepts will be convincing for my theoretical reconstruction of Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre in chapter 3, which articulates the centrale nodes onto which my own unique reading of Pasolini is grafted. Chapter 3 will be clearly split into two parts. The first part theoretically defines, explores, and illustrates the status that Pasolini gives the cinematic image. Deleuze's concept of the solid-perception image is redefined as pure immanence: the cinematic expression of the violent, singular, and physical presence of reality in line with a materialist ontology. The result is obtained through two uncharted territories in Pasolini studies, focusing on his references to an interpretation that defines Spinoza as materialist, and on his endorsement of Morris's semiotics. Here, again differently from most scholars, this study will provide the philosophical bases of Pasolini's cinema theory, showing that its ontology, semiology, and semiotics converge on the reality of a singularity excluded by capitalism, which in turn becomes the compelling condition for Pasolini's anticapitalism in 'now-time'.

The second part of chapter 3 shows how Pasolini produces his cinema of the outside in practice. In following the development of and in illustrating his cinema, this study will identify the political role of the concept of the outside through his cinematic subjects which are associated with different singularities excluded by capitalism over time. It

will demonstrate how his cinema is oriented towards displaying any elements excluded by capitalism – not only the marginalised condition of poor people as most scholars maintain – and how these always relate to the changing nature of capitalism. Likewise, this study will show how the aesthetic dimension of 'Pasolini's use of audio-visual techniques' elevates any singularity to a place of love, beauty, and sympathy. This aesthetic dimension will entail the awareness that Pasolini's cinema is aimed at affording a wider perception of reality for viewers through these very singularities. Thus, my theoretical reconstruction will demonstrate that (a) there is a discovery of unity and consistency in affirming the radical anticapitalism of his cinema, and that (b) there is a recognition that his militant engagement is never static but rather dynamic, always requiring knowledge of the changing nature of capitalism and a materialist trajectory to grasp what remains of reality.

The results of the theoretical reconstruction are confirmed in chapter 4. This final chapter reposes the problem of the relationship between capitalism and reality on the screen by showing how Pasolini's last essays and films – before his murder in November 1975 – promote another 'paradigm shift' from literary to cinematic language in the education of young people. Pasolini defines this paradigm shift as the sign of his adaptability to capitalism. For this study, Pasolini's concept of adaptability still entails – and even sums up – the unity and consistency of his militant engagement. Aware that several scholars have dealt with Pasolini's pedagogical effort, this study suggests that in the mid-1970s Pasolini's adaptability produced an audio-visual counter-pedagogy providing analysis, tools, and actions to counteract the functioning of capitalism and find a way to show the reality outside capitalism, offering a wider perception of reality. Adaptability is the concept through which Pasolini reveals his awareness of the changing nature of capitalism over time and his presumption that Marxism can be renewed over time. Adaptability is ultimately the political consequence of Pasolini's trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and antagonism over time.

Therefore, my historical and theoretical reconstruction is an original interpretation of Pasolini's work, recognising for the first time a consistent political philosophy in his cinematic oeuvre, in light of Marxism's renewal. Pasolini's political theory about his cinema derives from his awareness of the changing nature of the hegemonic functioning of capitalism and, in a way, from his conviction that Marxism can survive and adapt to the new challenges of capitalism. This has allowed me first to consider Pasolini within

the contemporary debates on the crisis of Marxism and on its renewal. To simplify these endless debates, my reading of Pasolini's philosophical approach, which is based on the outside and its adaptability, compares him with the authors of the Frankfurt School, especially in the importance they attribute to issues about the relationships among mass media communication, aesthetics and the totalising power of capitalism (e.g., Adorno, 1966; 1968; 1970; Habermas, 1979; 1987)[1], and about the development of anti-authoritarianism and anticapitalism starting from marginalised people (e.g., Marcuse, 1964; 1972)[2].

The Frankfurt School reconstructs the relationship between the class struggle and the hegemony of Marxism in terms of a dialectic of contradiction. Here the task of sociology (and consequently of politics) is to recognise not only how capitalism becomes totality, but also how it is continuously traversed by contradictions ready to explode. The emphasises of these prominent philosophers of the Frankfurt School for the political role of the concepts of negation and rupture, and for the political role of minorities, will be compared with the political theory within Pasolini's cinema. If, for Adorno, it is the incommunicability of art that can break the successes of the totalising power of capitalism, for Pasolini it is sympathy for what has been rejected by capitalism as excluded, forgotten, denied, that has this potential.

With this perspective, while Adorno looks at high culture and avant-gardism, Pasolini looks at cinema as popular medium – with both attempting to make the viewer

[1] This thesis, particularly, refers to Adorno's aesthetics. Adorno becomes increasingly convinced that the culture industry has quickly commodified any artistic experience and reduced all art to consumption. With this perspective, Adorno considers any attempt to enact a political proposal or to ascribe a political role to an artwork will end in being assimilated by, and in confirming the logic of, capitalism. It is the same for film production. About cinema, he considers the 'commodity character' of films of the culture industry and argues that blockbusters represent the dreams of the alienated consciousness of the masses (Adorno, 1968). However, Adorno claims the right of avant-gardism to show a fractured totality in which beauty, rationality and the meaning of art must, somehow and paradoxically, mimic their own death in order to save itself in a completely commodified and reified world (Adorno, 1970). In this sense, Adorno's aesthetic theory reveals a 'negative totality', which is broken, fractured, and unresolved, and in which the contradictions of capitalism can, at least, be revealed. This is a negative dialectics (Adorno, 1966) is Adorno's attempt to challenge the totalitarian vision of his time. In this, he attributes a political minority role to the artistic avant-garde in critical terms. For example, he considers the non-tonal music of Schoenberg as perennially problematic for audiences, having a critical effect precisely because it completely denies previous modern classical music as well as the pop and rock music of his time. He claims that the hermeneutical impenetrability and commercial uselessness of the artistic avant-garde are the sole experiences capable of a critical undertaking.

[2] Marcuse describes the absence of an awareness of capitalistic contradictions as the main result of the totalising power of capitalism on the masses. From this perspective, Marcuse argues that the political force of minorities that are outside the system is produced by 'outcasts and outsiders, the exploited and persecuted of other races and other colors, the exploited, the unemployed and the unemployable' (Marcuse, 1964: 256).

encounter what remains of a reality crushed by capitalism. Likewise, if Marcuse sees a positive role for marginalised groups (as they are by and large outsiders where capitalism is concerned), Pasolini considers the whole concept of the outside as one of the essential conditions for political dissent. While Marcuse looks for a political subjectivity, Pasolini asks for an involvement with reality and with what remains of reality. In this, I will show how Pasolini argues that Marxism needs a dialectic inclusion-exclusion both in order to understand capitalism and to design actualised political action.

Likewise, my recognition of a dialectic of inclusion-exclusion in Pasolini's political theory of his cinema is grounded in my discovery of a materialist trajectory aimed at producing an encounter between the outside and the viewer's sympathy. Pasolini's approach to Marxism substitutes politically resonant ideas of the French tradition or inspiration for dialectical theory, whose philosophy is concerned with ideas of 'event' and 'difference'. Here, it is possible to recognise an analogy between Pasolini and the aleatory materialism of Althusser (e.g., Althusser, 1965; 1976)[3]. Pasolini's political theory sees cinema as a technology that can produce social effects, thus enhancing conditions for an encounter between what is outside capitalism and the viewer's perception and sympathy.

In this, Pasolini's semiotic attention to the pragmatic effects of images, as well as his idea of cinema as a pedagogical drive for audiences, makes for a theory of history in which the political process is clearly without subject and in which unpredictable, non-necessary and dormant elements can encounter (and modify and break) the fixity of political, cultural, and social ideology. I will show how this is revealed within Pasolini's political theory, through his references to the political actions of cinema as offering contact, possibility and event (rather than it being the political mandate of the intellectual), and as therapeutic conquest of the viewer, according to Gramsci's legacy.

[3] Between the late 1960s and the early 1980s, Louis Althusser formulated criticisms of the totality and challenged Adorno's negative dialectics. Starting from this critique, and putting together Epicurus and Marx, Althusser provides a new ontology based on 'contingency' that he called 'aleatory materialism', or the materialism of the encounter. This aleatory materialism is crucial for the renewal of Marxist political action in France. Reality is not without structure, but its structure is aleatory in terms of it being the random effect of multiple encounters. That is, a contingency is not an exception to the fixity of reality. On the contrary, Althusser contends, fixity is the effect of the contingency. The same reality is therefore structurally revolutionary insofar as it is always unstable and variable. Althusser develops a vision in which reality is metonymic and aleatory because its structure consists of effects in which immanence results from a circumstanced combination of its elements.

However, I will also demonstrate how Pasolini's aim of working in and against audio-visual technologies shows how his political theory in fact aims to remain politically engaged in preparing conditions for the event.

With this perspective, although Pasolini does not always make it explicit, my emphasis on a positive conception of technology, which is implicit in his adaptability, allows his cinematic turn to be inserted into the problem of the relationship between antagonism, perception, and technology. To map Marxist debate on technology is difficult.[4] However, I recognise two basic Marxist positions on technology, held by those who argue that technology is completely (and negatively) in the hands of capitalism (Marcuse, 1941; Habermas, 1989), and alternatively by those who assert that technology positively produces new possibilities for the struggle against it. This latter position is, in my opinion, represented by philosophical perspectives insisting on the necessary renegotiation of political subjectivity in the face of contemporary technological innovations (e.g., Negri, 1990; Guattari, 1995; Wark, 2015; 2019)[5]. While the modern subjectivation produced by industrialisation reveals social and economic roles for individuals, post-modern subjectivation produced by technological innovation triggers actions and reactions, behaviours, attitudes, and postures by capturing and controlling the perceptive elements of the viewer's body and mind. I will show how Pasolini understands that the transformation of technology entails a transformation of the perception of reality and a new subjectivation, which also result from the replacement of the cultural apparatuses of capitalism by neocapitalism's guiding language of audio-visual technology. Pasolini takes heart from Marx's lessons on technology, about technology changing and creating different relationships between ideology and reality over time.[6] This will also be the basis for Pasolini's pedagogy of cinema, in which I

[4] See: Bidet, 2008; Harvey, 2010; Fine, 2012.

[5] Negri is convinced that Marx's prophecy on the relationship between capitalism and technology is realised by the general intellect (Negri, 1990). Guattari argues that subjectivity is produced by a multiplicity of elements and in this sense it is plural and polyphonic. It is, however, conditioned by the semiotic productions of 'mass media, informatics, telematics and robotics' that must be taken into account in relation to individual subjectivity. In this sense, technologies are to be included in the general production of collective and social values in relation to singular individiduation (Guattari, 1995). Wark questions 'the rapid development of the forces of production [that] generated a combination of approaches to both the question of what technology is, but also to what Marxism itself could be or become' (Wark, 2019: 64).

[6] Marx defines the changes of capitalism as the internal revolution of processes in terms of labour, skills, technology, work organization and conflict over work control. 'Before his time, spinning machines, although very imperfect ones, had already been used, and Italy was probably the country of their first appearance. A critical history of technology would show how little any of the inventions of the 18th century are the work of a single individual. Hitherto there is no such book. Darwin has interested us in the history of Nature's Technology, i.e., in the formation of the organs of plants and animals, which organs

confirm the value of his renewal of Marxism as his shift from a political theory made up of words to one made of images.[7]

The relationship between technology, perception and antagonism is related to a general debate on the crisis of the political role of art, which is here presented by the following question: how can cinema help to produce political transformation in a world increasingly dominated by a cultural industry and its commodification?[8] In relating Pasolini to this debate, I will inquire how cinema may usefully and pragmatically promote dissent and enact antagonistic strategies capable of transforming the present. Certainly, inspired by a philosophical trajectory running from Deleuze to Ranciére via Foucault, prominent academic scholars look at cinema, identifying how it produces a break in perception and has a shocking effect on the viewer's attention, in order to produce an emancipated viewer. These scholars consider aesthetics as relatively autonomous, and define the political role of cinema as a liberating collective act (e.g., Ranciére, 2000; 2009; 2010; Žižek, 2000; 2001; Badiou, 2015).[9]

serve as instruments of production for sustaining life. Does not the history of the productive organs of man, of organs that are the material basis of all social organisation, deserve equal attention? And would not such a history be easier to compile, since, as Vico says, human history differs from natural history in this, that we have made the former, but not the latter? Technology discloses man's mode of dealing with Nature, the process of production by which he sustains his life, and thereby also lays bare the mode of formation of his social relations, and of the mental conceptions that flow from them. Every history of religion, even, that fails to take account of this material basis, is uncritical. It is, in reality, much easier to discover by analysis the earthly core of the misty creations of religion, than, conversely, it is to develop from the actual relations of life the corresponding celestialised forms of those relations. The latter method is the only materialistic, and therefore the only scientific one. The weak points in the abstract materialism of natural science, a materialism that excludes history and its process, are at once evident from the abstract and ideological conceptions of its spokesmen, whenever they venture beyond the bounds of their own speciality' (Marx, 1887: 300).

[7] Recently, Lazzarato has related Pasolini's cinema theory to Guattari's semiotics. According to Lazzarato, both work on the necessary renegotiation of political subjectivity in the face of contemporary technological innovations (Lazzarato, 2015). However, according to Guattari's legacy, Lazzarato refers to the distinction between signifying semiotics and a-signifying semiotics in order to distingish two different levels of techno-production – discursive and representative, and mechanistic and non-representative. With this perspective, Pasolini's awareness of the semiotics of cinema is part of the first level.

[8] The question opens a theoretical battlefield between Pasolini and his time, but that goes beyond Pasolini. My reference is to three different philosophical and political positions, which, in a way, have arisen from the works of Adorno, Althusser and Guattari: (a) post-Althusserian, opposed to post-Structuralist avant-gardist experimentation (e.g., as described by Badiou, 1998; Rancière, 1998; Žižek, 2000) and claiming a political role for modern art as the only art form that helps society to break free from the sterility of the culture industry; (b) 'the technologist' as post-structuralist, opposed to the modernism of post-Althusserians (e.g., Lazzarato, 2015; Stiegler, 2018), which seeks political strategies from the relationships between artistic experimentation and technology; and (c) 'the sociologist of cultural production', the position of Critical theorists opposed to post-Althusserian and post-structuralist positions (e.g., Bourdieu, 1993; 1995; Baudrillard, 1996) who deny the political autonomy of art as it always is embedded within the symbolic field of social structures.

[9] These philosophers are post-Althusserians. They theorise an idea of cinema, and art in general, as an immanent rupture, arguing that the principal role of art is to shock viewers out of a fixity of opinion. Cinema plays a pedagogical role, exposing a lack of truth in a historical situation and prompting audiences to engage in political action. For example, Rancière, suggests that the perception of the reality

These works are the main references for an academic field which illuminates the relationship between cinema and politics and which has recently attracted academic attention, albeit not extensively. Some scholars analyse the aesthetic subject of a film (e.g., Shapiro, 2013; 2020; Rushton, 2013; Nelson, 2013; Fraser; 2018) to recognise fundamental criticisms of the present time, to formulate political problems and to enhance our understanding of a particular political theory; other scholars consider how audio-visual language and techniques can develop and reveal a discontinuity in a habitual perception that allows viewers to experience 'interrupted perceptions', which politically are a harsh criticism of current ideology and which aesthetically develop a wider relationship with the social and political context (Casarino, 2002; Thompson, 2006; Panagia, 2013). These scholars seek a cinematic mode of political theorising that overcomes the literary approach to political theory and encourages an examination of films in order to 'think the political'. They argue that a film is more complex than a written text and for this reason it can be composed of multiple layers of elaboration; it can also combine a constellation of political problems in a single artistic gesture and break into habitual perceptions, helping to produce the conditions for political dissent.

The question is: how can politics be cinematically discussed (in order to extract conditions for dissent) when that very research remains literary and focused on the cinematic subjects and reflections of films? Taking on Pasolini's political theory of his cinema requires looking at not just comments and interpretations of a film, but attention to its ontology, semiology and semiotics. My reading of Pasolini proposes the same

in which we live is embedded in a determinate aesthetic distribution of the sensible. Ranciére argues that an aesthetic distribution of the sensible revolves around what is seen and what can be said about what is common to the community, the forms of its visibility and of its hierarchical organisation. Hence, he declares that the relationship between politics and images defines how people can participate in democracy and how they can perceive it. This perception is in fact identical to that of the shackled prisoners in Plato's cave. The cave is not only the place where images are taken for realities, but also the place in which the relationship of the power between images is made possible (Ranciére, 2009). Contrary to Rancière, Žižek claims that another distribution of the sensible remains ideological. Žižek utilises the psychoanalytic theory of Lacan to show how reality is always a fiction that conceals real opposition, radical antagonism, and a fundamental void of the sense of the real. What Rancière calls 'the common' or 'the distribution of the sensible' is the very essence of hegemony for political theory. Hegemony becomes indeed the suture of fundamental trauma where radical lack of synthesis and unity are concerned. This suture constructs a symbolic order that populates the individual and collective imagination and in which differences, polarisations and meanings are positioned. In this sense, the production of images is always an ideological field of concealment of radical lack. According to Žižek, the current symbolic order is related to a re-naturalisation of capitalism that colonises the imagination, generating images of aims, of struggles, of desires and of fears (Žižek, 2001). Badiou argues that the political relevance of cinema can only be compared to the public importance of the great Greek tragedies. Cinema is political insofar as it allows for proposing universalisation, and the sharing and confrontation of common values. In this, Badiou associates political cinema with Plato's myths, which are capable of leading from the image to the very place of Truth (Badiou, 2015).

starting points of this academic field: that we live in a society of the image; that our perception of reality is determined by the field of the visible created by audio-visual language; and that the screen is always political. However, I will reveal how Pasolini works on the philosophical bases of cinema, on audio-visual language, on the cinematic camera and techniques, and even on the pedagogy of cinema, first as a director and then as a philosopher. Looking for the renewal of Marxism by means of his cinema, Pasolini reveals how Marxism as political theory is not a superior law or idealistic understanding of reality, but a theory that traverses and intertwines with the technology, techniques, and languages of the 'time of now'. Not only this, but Pasolini's militant engagement in film production also claims the right of struggling inside the system of mass media communication while rejecting conceptual and theoretical approaches to the system. With this perspective, Pasolini's political theory also becomes a synthesis of his own awareness as director and cinema theorist and of his militant engagement 'in situations'. Hence the pragmatic search for the political impact of cinema as the total unifier of his political theory, resulting in his pedagogical drive to encourage dissent and antagonism.

It is important to refer to the visits I have made to the Pasolini Archives in the house in which Pasolini was born, in Casarsa di Friuli; to the Pasolini Cinematic Archive in Bologna; and to the Pasolini Archives in Florence, where his personal library has been rebuilt. In Florence there is a particular epistolary archive and some personal papers which have been very informative. I have found non-edited documents, including a preparatory manuscript for an interview, which help and confirm my contentions – these are confirmed in sections 3.4.3 and 4.1.2. This archival material has contributed to the insertion of this study into previous interpretative horizons in the forum of Pasolini studies, which rarely concentrate or even mention his militant engagement in favour of Marxism.

A multifaceted presentation of Pasolini's oeuvre has become canonical in Pasolini studies. Pasolini is internationally known as a poet, novelist, scriptwriter, director, playwright, and as a literary critic, cinema theorist, political polemist, intellectual, reporter, and even a painter. Never has he been identified predominantly as a Marxist or a political theorist. His eclectic career (Stack, 1968: 7) has influenced a wide range of disciplines – linguistics, semiotics, sociology, anthropology, psychoanalysis, cybernetics – and especially certain cultural fields such as gender studies, cinema studies, Italian

studies, and post-colonialist studies.[10] His idiosyncratic lifestyle, and his mysterious and violent death have prompted hagiographic tendencies (Pacchioni, 2008: 14) in those who consider Pasolini an icon (Felice, 2016: 245), a martyr (Schwartz, 2017) and even a prophet (Sassetti, 2009: 115) of a variety of social and civil contemporary struggles.[11] However, these approaches have in common that they generally underrated the impact of the political problem of Marxism[12].

In reviewing the general lines of inquiry and predominant thematic and ideological concerns of Pasolini studies, it is preferable to keep in mind this multifaceted presentation. It is a panorama in which three common directions are outlined in the secondary bibliography: (1) a full consideration of interdisciplinarity as a definite trait in Pasolini's studies (Gordon, 1997; Pacchioni, 2008); (2) a clear recognition of Pasolini's continual process of re-interpretation (Viano, 1993), of creative disorganisation (Gordon, 1997), and of the dis-organic intellectualism (Marrano, 2010) in which Pasolini's oeuvre is situated; and (3) an open identification of the pluralist interpretative horizons applied to Pasolini's oeuvre (Felice, Larcati, Tricomi, 2016).

One of the reasons for justifying and confirming these common directions of inquiry is traditionally the reference to Pasolini's passionate, critical, and controversial militant engagement in the intellectual and historical context of his time. His militant engagement extravagantly relates issues and methods that 'no academic scholar would have dreamt to pulling together' (Viano, 1993: 21), not only inviting 'a cross-fertilisation between disciplines' (Patti, 2016) but also 'a peculiar friction' (Pacchioni,

[10] Pasolini's oeuvre has been reviewed and assessed through an extensive secondary bibliography in light of the different disciplines and through their interpretative assumptions. The main part of the panorama of Pasolini studies are those in the international academic sphere, which are drawn from specialist and in-depth single papers interpreting and discussing how Pasolini has illegitimately contaminated and experienced disciplines not his own, often with genial insights but without a systematic conceptual framework.

[11] It has been noted (Pacchioni, 2008) that a sort of canonisation is derived through the impact of two of the most important biographies of Pasolini published in the international academic context (Siciliano, 1982; Schwartz, 2017). These two texts have given wide space to Pasolini's neurotic homosexual identity, to his queer poetic and aesthetic performances, to his desperate vitality and to his violent murder in light of his militant engagement. This canonisation understands his individual vicissitudes as a political programme strictly connecting his personality and his oeuvre. This means that specific elements of his life have often been exalted by transcending the very reasons for Pasolini's militant engagement. This canonisation is also presented by Abel Ferrara in his film about Pasolini's last days entitled *Pasolini* (2018) and in which the title role is played by Willem Dafoe.

[12] Two monographs on Pasolini's cinema do not grasp the problem. Viano underrates the relationship with the problem of the renewal of Marxism, defining Pasolini's militant engagement as homeopathic care in favour of Marxism (Viano, 1993: 21). On the other hand, Greene (1990) validates the problem of the crisis of Marxism via a long journey between Pasolini's critical position on Marxism and his films, but she does not see any renewal of Marxism bringing Pasolini towards a reactionary and regressive politics.

2008: 141) resulting from the rationale of academic research meeting the disorganisation of his work (Gordon, 1997: 185). Scholars are finally forced to recompose an organised whole (Marrano, 2010) from fragmented pieces of a puzzle that is dispersed among films, poems, essays, interviews, newspapers, and letters, and that is sometimes lacking and, in a way, is yet to be completed. As Pasolini himself remarks, his work was 'to be considered a scattered and incomplete work, a contamination of contradictory moments and inconsistencies whose systematicity and consistency was and is fully to be entrusted to the singular interpretation of the reader' (CW: 4). As a result, within these different ways of analysing and understanding Pasolini, there is no general debate on the essential unity and consistency of his enterprise.

While embracing the reasons for different interpretative horizons, my thesis in fact recognises how the concept of the outside and Pasolini's adaptability reveal the political unity and consistency of his cinematic oeuvre in favour of the renewal of Marxism. Against this background, my work aims to contribute to a reversal of perspective in Pasolini studies, enhancing how he politically looks and adapts to the present and finds his way to intervene and struggle with 'the time of now'. Consequently, this thesis argues that even though Pasolini seemingly had no political theories, his cinematic turn, his cinema theory, his film production and eventually his pedagogy of cinema are all due to his need to remain Marxist, indicating his fidelity to anticapitalism, whose fundamental demand is still how to understand reality in order to transform it.

PART 2: PIER PAOLO PASOLINI – A LIFE IN LIGHT OF THE RENEWAL OF MARXISM

From *Gramsci's Ashes*:

> 'The scandal of self-contradiction—of being with you and against you; with you in my heart, in the light, against you in the dark of my gut.
>
> Though a traitor to my father's station—in my mind, in a semblance of action—I know I'm bound to it in the heat of my instincts and aesthetic passion; drawn to a proletarian life from before your time, I take for religion its joyousness, not its millennial struggle—its nature, not its consciousness.
> It is man's primordial strength, having been lost in the act, that gives this faith the joy of nostalgia, the glow of poetry. More than that I cannot say, without being right but insincere, expressing abstract love, not heartbreaking sympathy . . .
>
> Poor as the poor myself, I cling tight, like them, to demeaning hopes; like them, every day of my life I fight just to live. Yet in my disheartening condition as one of the dispossessed, I still possess—and it's the most thrilling of bourgeois possessions, the ultimate state of being. Yet as I possess history, I am possessed by it, enlightened by it: but what good is the light.' (PO, 2014: 175-177)

Background and life

Pier Paolo Pasolini was born in Bologna on 5th March 1922. His father, Carlo Alberto, was born in Romagna from a noble family and was in the military. His mother, Susanna Colussi, was a teacher from a petit-bourgeois family in Casarsa del Friuli. Carlo Alberto met Susanna, his future wife, in Casarsa.[13] The demands of his father's military career

[13] Pasolini did not have a friendly relationship with his father, whereas he was always very close to his mother. Pasolini's father was a nationalist and a fascist. He participated in the Second World War and was captured by British forces, whereafter he was imprisoned in a war camp in Kenya. He returned to Italy after the war, and died in 1956. Pasolini's mother belonged to a wealthy Friulan peasant family. For her

forced Pasolini's family to periodic transfers in northern Italy (Parma, Conegliano, Belluno, Sacile, Idria, Cremona and eventually Bologna), but Pasolini always recognised the region of Friuli, and the town of Casarsa, as the home of his childhood and his training. Here, Pasolini learnt two elements that became fundamental to his militant engagement: an attention to multilingualism and a passion for poetry. He declared:

> 'The Friulans of Casarsa are trilingual: first Friulan, which is their old language, which is a real language in its own light, not a dialect; second, Venetian, which was the language of the ruling class, brought under Venetian rule; and third, Italian… I began to write poetry in Casarsa in Friulan, Venetian and Italian. I learnt poetry as a sort of mystic act of love, a kind of fébrilisme, like the Provencal poets' (Stack 1969: 15).

In 1936 Pasolini's family was in Bologna. He went to the Galvani *Liceo* (a boarding school) and started to attend university there, at the department of Literature. The *Liceo* and university were where Pasolini made his first and decisive contacts with a real and rich cultural environment. There he also met two of his closest friends, Roberto Roversi (1922-2012), poet and novelist, and Francesco Leonetti, reporter and writer (1924-2017), and with them he founded first the poetry review *Eredi* ['Heirs', 1941][14] and then the literary review *Officina* ['Laboratory', 1955-1959]. In Bologna, Pasolini also met Roberto Longhi (1890-1970), one of most important Italian academic and art historians of the twentieth century. When Roberto Longhi died in 1970, Pasolini wrote a heartfelt memoir of the professor who had taught to him to understand and love the medieval and modern art of Masolino, Masaccio, Piero Della Francesca and Caravaggio. Thanks to Longhi, Pasolini said, his attention to the power of images and his love of semiotics were born.[15]

Evacuated to avoid the bombing in Bologna in 1942, Pasolini with his mother and his brother Guido (1925-1945)[16] settled in Casarsa del Friuli anew. Pasolini lived there till the end of 1949. In Casarsa, he started to undertake some decisive experiences in his political training. He discovered the alienated conditions of the *braccianti*, the 'day

entire life, she lived by the side, and partly in the shadow, of Pasolini and his idiosyncratic lifestyle. She died in 1981.

[14] Many of the texts mentioned are not translated from the Italian; for these I offer an English translation in brackets. To see the works in English by Pasolini, please refer to the list of abbreviations at the beginning. All texts are in the complete bibliography at the end.

[15] The relationship between Pasolini's cinema and Longhi's legacy is deemed fundamental by scholars in Pasolini studies (Lucci, 2015: 145; Salsano, 2017: 47; Tommasini, 2017: 131).

[16] Pasolini's brother Guido was anti-fascist and fought with the partisans after the Armistice between Italy and the Allies in 1943. He was killed fighting in 1945.

labourers' for the big landlords of Friuli; he read Marx and Gramsci and became a Marxist in 1947, and he was named as the secretary of the local section of the Italian Communist Party of Casarsa in 1949. Discovering the situations of the poor, he claimed:

> 'For the first time in my life, I found myself physically absolutely unprepared because my anti-fascism was purely aesthetic and cultural, it was not political. For the first time, I found myself faced with the class struggle and I had no hesitation: I sided with the *braccianti* at once… I embraced communism, just like that, emotionally. Then I read Marx and some Marxists' (Stack, 1969: 12).

In Casarsa, Pasolini published his two first books of poetry, *Poesie a Casarsa* [Poems in Casarsa, 1942] in Friulan language and *Poesie in Italiano* [Poems in the Italian, 1945], and he edited two collections of poems in Friulan language: *I pianti* ['Tears', 1946], and *Dov'è la mia patria* ['Where is my Homeland', 1949]. Pasolini also continued his critical literary activity by creating a review of poetry in Friulian language, *Stroligut di cà da l'aga* ['Review Here from the Water', 1944], along with *Academy of the Friulan Language* (1944), and in addition he collaborated with a Bologna review, *Il Setaccio*, where he published poems in Friulan and in Italian verse, as well as several notes of literary criticism. In the same period, he also began to paint pictures, works that became known only after his death,[17] and he graduated in Italian Literature with a thesis about the poetics of Pascoli, who was one of the most important Italian poets of the nineteenth century.

Pasolini started to teach and to implement his pedagogical inclinations that would accompany him in various ways throughout his life (Bondavalli, 2015). During the war, he had opened a kind of school in his own house in Casarsa for children who could not go to school because of the conflict. Then, in the post-war period, Pasolini taught at the secondary school of Valvasone, a little town not so far from Casarsa (1949). These experiences of teaching were also, for him, his first contacts with the pedagogical roles of language, theatre and cinema.

The political environment in Italy at the end of 1940s was completely split between two areas of ideological and missionary fervour. There were the Christian Democrats, who were arguing that Communists posed the greater danger for Italy, and Communists, who

[17] Conceived for the 100th anniversary of the birth of Pasolini (1922), an exhibition project in 2022 was organised by the Gallery of Modern Art in Rome: 'Pasolini pittore' (Pasolini as a painter). There were more than 150 works focused on bringing attention back to a relevant artistic aspect, often neglected by critics, in the overall creative context of the writer and director.

considered Christian Democrats to be a continuation of the previous fascist regime. This was creating a climate of hatred and suspicion and even a moralistic and Manichean vision of society divided by a dichotomy of opposite and apparently incompatible political positions. This involved Pasolini also at a personal level: in October 1949 he was accused of child molestation at school by a group of the bourgeois self-righteous parents who were supported by the local Christian Democrat party.[18] The Communist Party was forced to expel Pasolini, even before the facts were addressed in his trial, in which he was sentenced to three months in prison. The episode deeply marked Pasolini's life for several reasons: (a) it made public his homosexuality, which he had kept hidden until then;[19] (b) Pasolini lost his work as a teacher; (c) it forced him to distance himself from the idealistic vision both of the Communist Party and from the romantic vision of the countryside of Friuli; and (d) it caused him to suddenly move to Rome at the end of 1949. Pasolini's dramatic personal and political experiences called him to write a novel which, however, was not published until many years later, in 1962, with the significant title of *Il sogno di una cosa* ['The Dream of a Thing', 1962].[20]

The first years in Rome were economically very difficult. In the early 1950s, Pasolini made a living teaching privately from home and working as proofreader, while his mother was forced to work as a family maid. However, after a period of adaptation, for Pasolini, Rome had become the place of new poetic, literary and then cinematic inspirations, an environment where intellectual friendships and academic experiences had arisen amidst a cultural and secular milieu in which Pasolini had found success and fame. From the mid-1950s, Pasolini was collaborating on a number of reviews in literary criticism and poetry and was again publishing collections of poems: *La meglio gioventù* ['The Best Youth', 1954], *Le ceneri di Gramsci* ['Gramsci's Ashes', 1957], *L'usignolo della Chiesa Cattolica* ['The Nightingale of the Catholic Church', 1958], and eventually *La religione del mio tempo* ['The Religion of My Time', 1961]. These works develop his doubts on the Communist Party of his time, his desires for a real

[18] This trial for indecency was the beginning of a number of trials in which Pasolini underwent sentences for his homosexuality, his atheism and his anti-conformism.

[19] Several scholars in Pasolini's works consider his personal issue of homosexuality a central core of his militant engagement (Siciliano, 1982; Golino, 1995; Mantegazza, 1997; Hardt, 2009; Bondavalli, 2014; Bazzocchi, 2015;).

[20] The title is drawn from a letter from the young Marx to Arnold Ruge in Paris in September 1843: 'Instead, we shall simply show the world why it is struggling, and consciousness of this is a thing it must acquire whether it wishes or not. The reform of consciousness consists entirely in making the world aware of its own consciousness, in arousing it from its dream of itself, in explaining its own actions to it. Like Feuerbach's critique of religion, our whole aim can only be to translate religious and political problems into their self-conscious human form' (Marx, 1843).

Marxist revolution, and his pantheistic vision of reality as opposed to the transcendent one of the Catholic Church.

At the same time, Pasolini began to be aware of the poor environments in the peripheries of Rome and the social conditions of those who were excluded, forgotten, and denied by capitalism. He wrote two novels, *Ragazzi di vita* ['The Boys of Life', 1955] and *Una vita violenta* ['A Violent Life', 1959], describing the free vitality of Rome's young subproletariat and the atmosphere of moral ambiguity and freedom in which they still lived. Owing to these two novels, Pasolini underwent further public accusation, social persecution, and trials politically motivated by the Christian Democracy Party once more connecting Pasolini to the Italian Communist Party.

Along with the two novels and poems, Pasolini collected his intense critical essays of the 1940s and 1950s (*Eredi* and *Officina*) in his book *Passione e ideologia* ['Passion and Ideology', 1960]. Here it is possible to note his original and subtle reflections on dialect and the popular poetry of Italy, on the most important poets of Italian tradition, and his reiterated considerations about the relationship between linguistics and politics in light of Gramsci's legacy. However, already in the mid-1950s, Pasolini was attracted by filmmaking and film production. His active interest in cinema had begun with his participation as scriptwriter for Mario Soldati's film *La donna del fiume* (1954). Further scripts with prominent directors of that time followed: *Il prigioniero della montagna* (director: Trenker, 1955), *Le notti di Cabiria* (director: Fellini, 1957), and a highly-defined collaboration with Mauro Bolognini on scripts and subjects in *Marisa la civetta* (1957), *Giovani mariti* (1957), and *La notte brava* (1959). In 1961 Pasolini made his debut as film director. His first film, *Accattone* (1961), was a great success among both critics and audiences, and Pasolini was suddenly becoming one of the most important directors in Italy – until his death, allowing him to shoot one film a year. His cinema was clearly political, the use of nonprofessional actors recalling and simultaneously renewing the season of Italian neorealism, the environment of the Roman peripheries and the vitality of the subproletariat young becoming real protagonists on the screen and scandalising the bourgeoisie. Pasolini explained the political meaning of his films as follows:

> 'The accusers of my film *Accattone* showed the racism of the Italian bourgeoisie ... In 1961 the Italian bourgeoisie saw the underclass people as the American racists saw the blacks ... The characters of *Accattone* were all thieves, pimps, and people who lived until today ... yet they were very nice characters and beyond bourgeois moralism ... The reason is that I wanted to say that what was

> happening was a genocide of the underclasses … that this genocide was changing the political meaning of collective story and personal existence ... that other genocides were witnessed by Marx ...' (Betti, 1991: 27).[21]

Further films followed in quick succession in the early 1960s, a time in which Pasolini defined his cinema as national and popular (1961-1965: *Accattone,* 1961; *Mamma Roma*, 1962; *La ricotta,*1963; *La rabbia*, 1963; *Comizi d'amore*, 1964; *Sopralluoghi in Palestina*, 1964; *Il Vangelo secondo Matteo,* 1964; *Uccellacci uccellini*, 1965). Almost every film of this period provoked legal actions against Pasolini, who was accused of being atheist and a-moralist, as well as of insulting Catholicism as the state religion.

Surprisingly, his masterpiece *Il Vangelo secondo Matteo* [*The Gospel According to St Matthew*, 1964] was an international success and led Pasolini to international fortune, sparking a heated debate on the political nature of film. For many scholars and Marxists, the film was a betrayal of Marxism, whereas for others it was a declaration of Pasolini's conversion to Catholicism, while only a few scholars understood that Pasolini looked at the Gospel in light of Marx. One of these latter was Sartre, who met Pasolini in Paris in the November of 1964. We know that one of the issues of their meeting was the renewal of Marxism and in particular the problem of the relationship between Marxism and irrationalism (Macciocchi, 1964).[22] Sartre's endorsement and even his defence of Pasolini's film in the French cultural milieu has fostered and facilitated Pasolini's successes in France.[23] About the film and the *querelle* between Marxists and Catholics on the nature of the film, Pasolini explained how his *Gospel* (1964) was cinematically and politically related to *La ricotta* (1963). He shows how what is interesting for him is to show something to which audiences are not accustomed.

> 'In *The Gospel according to St Matthew*, as in *La ricotta*, there is a demystification of iconography as it is understood according to the schemes of tradition: so, in the film, the traditional iconography is just a pretext for building something antitraditional' (Betti, 1991: 106).[24]

The mid-1960s were years of political rethinking and of an awareness of his cinema. Pasolini started to study the semiotics of cinema and to ask himself how his cinema was

[21] My translation.
[22] This issue will be approached in chapter 1 of this thesis (1.3.2; 1.4.1; 1.4.2). Pasolini met Sartre in an elegant place on the Rive Gauche, at the bar of the Hotel du Pont Royal. Other issues of their meeting were religion and poverty as related to Christianity and the Global South, and illuminism and Marxism (Macchiocchi, 1964).
[23] Pasolini's fortune in the French philosophical environment is witnessed by Deleuze, Guattari, Foucault and recently Badiou (Libasci, 2016).
[24] My translation.

really political. He was invited to several national and international conferences about the foundation of a political cinema; the results of these conferences were rearranged in the form of an essay and punctually published in the critical reviews of that time. A selection of these essays is collected by Pasolini in *Heretical Empiricism* (1972). From Pasolini's theorising on cinema had also arisen his interest in a variety of disciplines, from psychoanalysis to anthropology, via linguistics, sociology and ethnology. This period coincides with a refinement of his cinematographic technique and with a greater formal refinement, to the point that Pasolini ironically recognised that his cinema had become a 'cinema for the elite'. Indeed, at the end of 1960s, he merged the current events of politics with the myths of the past (*Oedipus Rex*, 1967; *Theorem*, 1968; *Pigsty*, 1968; *Medea,* 1969).

For some scholars, these films are indeed addressed to an intellectual elite, that is, those who do not allow themselves to be influenced by the false attractions of mass culture (Bondavalli, 2007; Scalia, 2012). Other scholars consider these films mirror a new interest in Pasolini in the theatre (Gragnolati, 2018): in the same years, Pasolini had translated Aeschylus and Plautus and written six plays in the summer of 1966 – *Calderon, Pylades, Affabulazione, Pigsty, Orgy, Bestia di stile*, whose subjects are related to the conflicting relationships between the individual and the collective, the risk of political utopias, and the authoritarian danger of mass civilization. These are themes that in the same years Pasolini had dealt with in his poems published in the two collections *Poesia in forma di rosa* [Poems in the shape of the rose, 1964], a kind of spiritual diary still vibrant with hope, and, above all, *Trasumanar e organizzar* [Trans-humanising and organising, 1971], in which Pasolini dealt with a poetic version of the renewal of Marxism. Here he argued what he presented through his films and theatre: the end of the bourgeoisie crushed by the changing nature of capitalism and the consequent request for new organisations in favour of Marxism and a new means of renewal for the struggle. He thus writes about the end of bourgeoisie and the personification of the renewal of Marxism:

> 'We used to mean so much for you, and now we no longer mean anything.
> Oh, well. We're dying. But what is beginning for you, who are no longer obsessed with your salvation? Where are you going, outside the circle, along that straight line?' (PO, 2014: 405).
> …
> 'The future lies before me, where I should proceed totally free.
> Free, that is, from: first, Religion; second, Utopia—
> A freedom never before seen in history.
> There is no model for this free image of me' (PO: 2014: 409).

Meanwhile, the revolution of 1968 had also arrived in Italy. Pasolini was not particularly enthusiastic about the global protesters of the young. His political theory – which as we discover in this thesis was continuing to ask him to look outside capitalism in order to renew Marxism – would lead him to counteract the requests of the Italian young and talk later about the fascism of the anti-fascists and about the essential lack of difference between the social and consumerist desires of fascists and anti-fascists. The most sensational episode in that period was the publication of the poem entitled, 'The P.C.I. and the Young' about the Battle of Valle Giulia. The School of Architecture at Sapienza, the most ancient and famous university in Rome in Via di Valle Giulia, became the battlefield of the violent encounter in Italy between the student movement and the police. In commenting on that violent encounter, Pasolini counteracted young people, because they were all bourgeois and petit-bourgeois and their dreams still were to be and to remain bourgeois. While on the other side, Pasolini argued, there were policemen who were from the poor and proletarian peoples of southern Italy, who had the same dreams: to become bourgeois. Thus, he writes:

> 'When yesterday at Valle Giulia you and the policemen were exchanging blows,
> I sympathised with the policemen!
> Because policemen are some of the poor
> They come from urban or rural outskirts.'
> …
>
> 'They are twenty, your age, dear friends.
> We agree, of course, in being against the institutions of the police,
> But try to fight against the Judges and you will see what happens.
> The young policemen who were hitting …
> Are from a different social class.
> At Valle Giulia, yesterday, there was a fragment of class struggle:
> You, my friend (although in the right), were the rich;
> and the policemen (although in the wrong), were the poor' (PO, 298).

According to Pasolini, the central issue for young people and policemen was to misunderstand the hegemonic functioning of capitalism – for all of them consumerism was the model each one looked to. In short, they all were unaware they were included in capitalism, aspiring only to becoming consumers and customers, and never looking elsewhere. Pasolini therefore described a fascism that goes beyond fascism. It was a fascism that goes beyond the narrow temporal horizons of a precise and complete historical parable. In his last writings he says (and they keep repeating it to us) that they are full of worries for the future but are not resigned.

This new form of fascism, that is, the conformism of people and the lack of difference between the desires of left and right wings led Pasolini's cinema to a further breakthrough. What Pasolini called 'The Trilogy of Life' (*The Decameron*, 1971; *The Canterbury Tales*, 1972; and *Arabian Nights*, 1974). It was a political attempt to scandalise people and to show them in an enjoyable and accessible way the secrets of their repressed sexuality. The insistent and often banal exhibition of nudes and erotic scenes was aimed at awakening people to what was politically invisible to their eyes: the revolution of 1968 had not changed their sexuality, which remained embedded within the forms permitted by and prone to the conservation of capitalism.

However, Pasolini was ready for a further turn. He realised that the scandalising aims of the 'Trilogy' were clearly overcome by the mid-1970s. Capitalism was replacing the repression of the sexes with the liberation of the sexes, and his films were going in the same direction. The results of his political actions were not external to the system, but completely internal. Thus, aware of the dangers inherent in his cinematic operation and using the expression 'repudiation' to comment on his political failure, Pasolini gave the trilogy up and started to work in a new political field. This is witnessed by his last writings (*Corsair Writings*, 1974; *Lutheran Letters*, 1975) and by his last film *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* (1975). Already in January 1973, Pasolini had begun activity as a political journalist in newspapers and weekly reviews, in which he openly attacked the power of the Christian Democracy Party, its collusion with the media and information output, and its being a form of fascism. In this, he asked for a further renewal of the Italian Communist Party (a selection of these papers are collected in *Corsair Writings*) in order to struggle against this totalising power. At the same time, he started to write a pedagogical treatise in which he was suggesting a paradigm shift in pedagogy. In this he aimed to develop a new generation of young capable of analysing and struggling against the images spread by television and advertising in order to be aware of the so-called 'time of now'.

This triggered a reaction among conservative political forces in Italy. Pasolini, who had long suffered persecution and slander and faced controversy and trials, was threatened and publicly attacked yet again. However, the idea of a new pedagogy of cinema, the dream of working for a minority of young people, and his dedication to teaching them about cinema, allowed him to keep his optimism and his enthusiasm for militant engagement. But it was over in an instant. On the morning of 2nd November 1975,

Pasolini's body was found at the sea-plane base in Ostia. He had been murdered. Pino Pelosi, a 17-year-old boy with whom Pasolini, in his private homosexuality, would have spent the night, was accused of the crime and sentenced for 9 years. Pasolini's murder in fact remains an unsolved mystery, an indelible wound and an irreparable injury in the civil life of Italian society.

Personality

Pasolini was very protective of his personal life. For his entire adult life he lived with his mother Susanna and with his cousin Graziella in anonymous buildings in the suburban zones of Rome. In addition, the complexity of his work and interests makes it difficult to delineate his personality. His life, personal, political and artistic, has always been characterised by singularity and originality, his aesthetic and political position constantly on the move. In Italy, Pasolini was esteemed and repeatedly rewarded, but he was also harshly criticized and brought to trial for his unconventional ideas and his harsh criticism of the bourgeoisie and class society. Pasolini underwent 33 trials during his life; but it is possible to argue that he was in fact forced to deal with a single and uninterrupted trial that lasted twenty years. Italian bourgeois society and its political reference, the Christian Democracy Party, accused him of the same object and with the same purpose. It questioned the legitimacy of the existence of such a political, artistic and cultural personality as Pasolini, someone who was a heretical, alternative and divisive figure within the conformism of Italian society and culture. Indeed, Pasolini embodied the travails of the political and cultural transformations of the Italian twentieth century, and the successes and the fame of his art and his thinking were dangers for the Italian establishment. The main accusations were related to his portrayal of apparent obscenity, what was seen as his contempt for religion, and his aiding of homosexuality and even armed robbery. In addition, one can be struck both by the variety of crimes ascribed to Pasolini, and by the no less colourful company of accusers in his films: famous magistrates (*La ricotta*) and prosecutors (*The Gospel*), provincial praetors (*Theorem*), private citizens (*Pigsty*), Catholic associations (*Accattone*), the Franciscan friars (*Canterbury Tales*), and the National Army Association (*Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*). Starting from the legal proceedings, some scholars speak of persecution and martyrdom, exalting and mythicising Pasolini as a model of the 'engaged intellectual' (Siciliano, 1982; Kirchmayr, 2015; Schwartz, 2017). Other scholars highlight his solitude in the face of that hatred and his progressive pessimism

about Italian society (Fusillo, 2012; Trentin, 2013; Pierangeli, 2017).

Pasolini had several enemies, albeit his friends described him as a 'gentle man'.[25] I argue that the reason for such enmity was that Pasolini was a communist, but outside the Communist Party. He was an intellectual, but outside the academic context of his time. He was a homosexual, but he never showed himself to be proud of the fact or flaunted his orientation. In short, Pasolini was a heretical intellectual, a heretical communist and a heretical homosexual: he couldn't have been more different from a modern Italian society that had become conformist and massified. His alternative personality has entailed the most diverse interpretations and multifaceted and pluralistic understandings of his oeuvre, a diversity that has become rather the norm in Pasolini studies. His militant engagement has been extolled in three artistic fields: poetry, literature, and cinema. In addition, Pasolini committed himself politically in conferences, essays and articles, and in a wide range of comments in newspapers and weekly journals. But such commitments seem to be mixed, fragmented and often seemingly inconsistent with each other, with an interplay between artistic forms and everyday life that makes it impossible to clearly identify his thoughts.

However, this thesis aims to show, for the first time, that Pasolini's militant engagement was completely immersed in political theory, from his initial engaging with Marxism through to his lifelong attempts to address the problem of its renewal in the face of his awareness of the changing nature of capitalism. His being outside 'the system' is in fact focused on two central issues, both of which focus on the renewal of Marxism. From his adolescence Pasolini had been very attentive to the humble, clarifying on paper and then on the screen that within the most painful aspects of the lives of the most disadvantaged classes were sublime expressions of what is real and excluded by capitalism. In this, his persistent and consistent anticapitalism lay. Fascinated by dialects, multilingualism and freedom of expression, his was far from a centralised political vision, and he looked at freedom in term of singularity. In this lay also his struggle against the disciplinary role of the State and any form of power, and the main result of his political theory in favour of the renewal of Marxism is his cinematic oeuvre. Four main areas of Pasolini's cinema will be described: first, his cinematic turn, the shift from his militant engagement through literature to one in film production; second, his entire cinematic oeuvre split

[25] https://www.cittapasolini.com/pasolini-raccontato-dagli-altri.

into different moments but which can be seen to be unified through his political aims; third, his cinema theory, which is the foundation of his political theory and action; and fourth, his pedagogy of cinema that looks for new interlocutors for the Marxist struggle.

Pasolini's relationship with the Italian Communist Party

Despite his expulsion from the Italian Communist Party for 'political and moral unworthiness' (1949), Pasolini remained tied to the idea that Marxism was the only political theory capable of analysing the present time and of helping people to struggle against the alienation and exploitation of capitalism. Initially, and certainly until the publication of *Grasmci's Ashes*, he was Gramscian, arguing that the mandate of the intellectual was to make the subaltern classes aware of their rights and their roles as protagonists in history.

In 1956, Pasolini's Marxism was dealt a body blow by the Khrushchev report that revealed Stalin's crimes, as well as by the Soviet invasion of Hungary. At the time, Pasolini asked Marxists and intellectual academics to act courageously against the Soviet dictatorship of Eastern Europe. The act of courage did not come, and Pasolini instead became the object of distrust and often harsh judgments by the Communist Party. Particularly, the publishing of his second novel *Una vita violenta* ('A Violent Life') attracted harsh criticism from Marxist intellectuals. The main accusation was that Pasolini was politically pessimistic and defeatist.

By the end of the 1950s, Pasolini was elaborating on his observations on the internal revolution of capitalism in Italy, what he called neocapitalism. He was considering the crisis of Marxism and the defeat of the political role of the working class, completely embedded as it was becoming in consumerist masse society, and the reality that Marxists too were becoming bourgeois and destined to be fully allied with capitalism. These claims and criticisms were expressed by Pasolini both through his cinematic turn and through a column written by him in the weekly political and cultural publication *Vie Nuove*. However, his claims were not oriented to a definitive defeat of Marxism, but in fact to the renewal of Marxism in the face of the crisis.

For his entire life, Pasolini tended to identify the Italian Communist Party as a form of regressive Marxism. In contrast, his renewal of Marxism was looking for allies, friends

and supporters in his audiences, via his cinema. At the same time, it must be highlighted that Pasolini always declared having voted for the Italian Communist Party (PCI), because there was no real alternative within the Italian political context. So, in a way, his relationship with the PCI was somewhat ambivalent. In the 1970s, although Pasolini accused the PCI of being far from reality and from the problems of the people, and of being conservative and bourgeois, he still trusted in the PCI. However, his favourite interlocutors, more than the leaders of the Party, were the young people of the FGCI (the Italian Communist Youth Federation), who he invited to another politics and another pedagogy. With this hope, and vision of utopia, he died in 1975.

Today Pasolini's legacy is still disputed in political movements and left-wing parties. There are those who believe that his thinking opposes the ideals of the political left. And there are those who argue that Pasolini was instead a lucid thinker about the contradictions of leftist thinking, which was (and is) crushed between two opposing sets of values: progress as a social and political ideal, versus the problem of development as an immediate economic exploitative fact. There are those who sanctify and idolise Pasolini, making him a martyr, prophet or even a master. And there are those who consider that Pasolini's political progression was from left to right.

Pasolini's Library

In the Pasolini Archives in Florence, his personal library was rebuilt in 1988. The curator of the library is Graziella Chiarcossi (1943), who is Pasolini's cousin. I met her twice in Florence and e-mailed with her for a long time about Pasolini's library. The Archives houses only a part of Pasolini's library because in addition to the works in the Florence Archives, Pasolini's books may also be found in Casarsa and in Torre Chia.[26] The library in Florence is divided into several sections:

1. The books of Pasolini's training in Bologna and Casarsa
2. Italian literature
3. Italian poetry
4. Dialect poetry
5. Popular poetry

[26] Pasolini bought a holiday home in 1970 in Torre Chia in Tuscany. It became his refuge during the last two years of his life.

6. Foreign Poetry
7. Foreign Literature
8. Essays of literature, linguistics, philology, and semiology
9. Essays of history, philosophy, psychology, anthropology, politics and sociology
10. Biographies
11. Art
12. Theatre
13. Cinema
14. Religion
15. Ancient Greek and Latin literature
16. Other books

I have consulted sections 8, 9 and 13. In section 8, the semiological interests of Pasolini are widely reported. Fundamental books are: *Theory of Literature* (ed. Todorov, 1965); *Proust and signs* (Deleuze, 1967), *La struttura assente* (Eco, 1968); *Le forme del contenuto* (Eco, 1971); and *Una teoria della prosa* (Sklovskij, 1974). Section 9 presents a wide range of texts from the Marxist tradition, by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, Mao Tse Tung, and Gramsci, as well as the main essays on the debate about the situation of Marxism in Italy in the 1960s and 1970s. Marx is presented by his *Complete Works* (1953) and by the *Spinoza Notebooks* (1841), (ed. 1972), while Gramsci's books are: *Prison Notebooks* (1953), *Prison Letters* (1953), and Gramsci's monographs on Machiavelli (1953) and Croce (1953). In addition, it is interesting to note Gramsci's text on the political mandate of the intellectual (1953). There also are fundamental texts on psychoanalysis by Freud, Jung, Adler and Laing. Several books from anthropology (by Frazer, Levi-Strauss, Eliade and De Martino) are also present, along with other books about the theory of communication (Chomsky, McLuhan). Philosophy is represented by Spinoza (*Ethics*, 1966; *Philosophie and Politics*, 1967), Nietzsche (*Human Too Human*, 1965), Merlau-Ponty (*Sense and Nonsense*, 1974), Heidegger (*Being and Time*, 1974), and Foucault (*The Order of Things*, 1967). Section 13 is on Cinema. There are a number of scripts by Fellini, Antonioni, Bellocchio, Kruger, Olmi, Bertolucci, Bresson, and Lattuada. There are monographs on Fellini, Antonioni, Godard, and Ferreri, and fundamental essays on cinema and its semiotics by Bazin (*What is Cinema?*, 1973); Godard (*Cinema is Cinema*, 1971), and Metz (*Essais sur la signification au cinema*, 1968).

Pasolini's murder

Following Pasolini's murder in November 1975 came a clear accusation, a fast trial and a definitive sentence. Pino Pelosi was sentenced to 9 years in prison. According to the court, the murder had arisen in a homosexual environment caused by banal reasons, jealousies and envies. Notwithstanding, it was clear enough for the court, even though Pelosi's reconstruction of the facts was full of inconsistencies and contradictions. In addition, the reasons for the unjustified cruelty on Pasolini's body were unclear. Pelosi declared that, after having violently hit Pasolini, he killed him by passing several times over his body in a car. But when the dead body was found the next morning, it was too torn and disfigured, and the injuries too gross to have been carried out by a minor street criminal.

As a result, the question of who really killed Pasolini started to spread very soon. A few weeks following the murder in Ostia, the weekly *L'Europeo* published a famous counter-inquiry into the unclear background of the crime for which Pino Pelosi had immediately declared himself solely responsible. A group of journalists (Paolo Berti, Duilio Pallottelli, and Gian Carlo Mazzini) were in doubt over Pelosi's version, questioning the possibility of the presence of other aggressors, and highlighting the flaws and contradictions of the investigation into an incident hastily filed as a sordid 'life incident'. With impetuous indignation, one of the most important reporters in Italy, Oriana Fallaci, a great writer and sincere friend of Pasolini, some days after also intervened to try to clarify the manner of his death. Fallaci revealed many disturbing details collected from certain informants who said they knew about the facts but then did not come out of anonymity and did not want, or did not have the courage, to declare their truth.

In 1992, 17 years after Pasolini's death, Giorgio Galli, a prominent historian and political theorist, inserts the crime into the heated context of the Italian 1970s, which were full of destabilizing tensions, deviant services, massacres and state mysteries. Galli argued that Pasolini, with his anguished personal contradictions and his relentless indictment against the system of power embodied by the Christian Democracy Party, could be the most emblematic target to hit and ostracize. Hence, one theory put forward was that Pasolini's murder was politically motivated, and that he was killed in a punitive

action that had perhaps gone beyond the intentions of a simple 'exemplar' punishment. On 7th May 2005, Pino Pelosi spoke on television about another version of the crime. Unlike his first version at the trial in 1976, he described the presence of other people at the scene of the crime. On a wave of emotion about these new sensational revelations, Italian public opinion seemed to be asking seriously about reopening the inquiry on Pasolini's murder.

In 2007, one of Pasolini's closest friends, assistant director Sergio Citti, then came to the fore to say that his own investigations had produced evidence entirely overlooked: bloodied pieces of a stick left close to the football pitch and a witness, ignored by the official investigation, who had seen five men drag Pasolini from the car. Thus in 2009 came a new step in the search for truth about Pasolini's death. In light of Pelosi's claims on television and Citti's revelations, Italian detectives asked to reopen the inquiry on the murder. Their request was accepted by the Prosecutor's Office of Rome, who entrusted the case to magistrates and detectives. However, there were also those who took different positions on Pasolini's murder. Edoardo Sanguineti, poet and friend of Pasolini, spoke of his death being due to a sado-masochist game. A different theory, held by Pasolini's cousin Nico Naldini – also a homosexual poet – explained that Pasolini had a passion for fetishist rituals, along with an attraction for criminal boys who made him lose his sense of danger (Naldini, 2022).

Cinema, too, has dealt with Pasolini's murder. The film investigation by Marco Tullio Giordana (2008) highlighted the idea that Pelosi was not alone that night, and that the crime was committed by three other people. Abel Ferrara's film on Pasolini (2014) instead portrayed Pasolini as having been beaten up and then run over by a car driven by common criminals and for banal reasons.

In 2020 a further new lead reopened the case, suggesting that Pasolini was killed not for sexual reasons but because of his attempt to recover some stolen film containing the last scenes of *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*. This alternative hypothesis had arisen from the final report of the Parliamentary Commission on Antimafia. It suggests the possibility of the theft having been organised by neo-fascist groups, and then covered by false leads and operations by the secret service. The commission followed Pelosi's claims of 2005 when he had put forward a new version of the facts, indicating that he was informed about the stolen film and had helped Pasolini as mediator to get the film

back. As a result, the commission denounced the omissions of the investigations, blaming false leads and a bad initial hearing of witnesses. It argued that the moment in history in which to get to the truth was gone, and that there was no longer sufficient evidence to justify continuing the inquiry.

CHAPTER 1

NEOCAPITALISM AND PASOLINI'S RENEWAL OF MARXISM THROUGH CINEMA

> 'Admitting that there may be some truth in this simplification, it follows that technological language as the typical and necessary language for technocratic capitalism contains within itself a nonhumanistic inexpressive future. Instead, technological language as a specialized and elliptical "part" of Marxism contains within itself, obviously, a humanistic and expressive future. To understand and distinguish why such a phenomenon may happen, in what terms it may happen, etc., etc., is one of the fundamental acts of the "renewal of Marxism" if such a renewal, above all for the PCI—which is considered and is in the avant-garde of such an operation—is owed to the appearance of new strata of reality to the unforeseen development of certain social situations beyond the limit of the previsions of Marx and of Lenin.' (HE: 38)

> '… in such a case a renewal of Marxism would be presented as one of the many returns to the Gospel in the history of the Church, and one knows that all such returns are "made part" of the glory of the Church. It is certainly necessary to reread Marx and Lenin, but not as one rereads the Gospel. The "new technological spirit" is a fact without precedent and without equivalents in the past—and it was not foreseeable, because the concrete scientific realizations were not foreseeable, and thus the quality of their quantity was always more immense.' (HE: 39)

Chapter 1 formulates the urgency of the political problem from which Pasolini's 'cinematic turn' emerges in the late 1950s, resulting in not only a paradigm shift in his expression of his militant engagement, but also in his grasp of the potential of cinema to foster conditions for the renewal of Marxism.

A historical reconstruction pays attention to the social and academic context of that time and appreciates Pasolini's choice of militant engagement in film production rather than in literary form. The argument is that Pasolini's cinematic turn should be regarded through a trans-disciplinary encounter between his political theory concerning the renewal of Marxism in the face of the rise of neocapitalism and the dominant language of his time – audio-visual language. In section 1.1, I offer a definition of neocapitalism

for Pasolini, and then in section 1.2 look at what Pasolini intends by 'the obscene health of neocapitalism': the alliance between productive forces and audio-visual technology (HE: 126). Pasolini claims that the result of this alliance is neocapitalism's guiding language, which changes people's perception of reality and, as a result, the political theory and action of Marxism.

The main successes of the rise of neocapitalism will be explored in section 1.3: neocapitalism seems to have no theoretical alternatives nor political opponents thanks to the power of audio-visual language. This is why for Pasolini (a) the perception of reality is now completely in the hands of audio-visual technology and (b) 'Marxism has gone out of style' for the masses and for the working class (HE: 125). These first three sections have thus formulated Pasolini's political problem. Pasolini argues that Marxism's renewal in the face of the rise of neocapitalism is 'the most political problem of his time' (HE: 27), because 'Marxism can protect us from the loss of reality' (HE: 72). Section 1.4 highlights how Pasolini's attention to Marxism's renewal characterises his place within the debate among Italian and international intellectuals in the 1960s. He is looking for 'a technological and specialised language' (HE: 37) capable of facing the massive force of neocapitalism's guiding language and offering a wider perception of reality.

It is with this perspective that 1.5 identifies Pasolini's cinematic turn creating a breakthrough in his militant engagement and in his theoretical approach: the full possession of audio-visual language alongside the aim of a wider perception of reality on the screen needs to be put together within a trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics, ultimately as a condition for Marxism's renewal.

Thus, Pasolini's definition of neocapitalism and his awareness of the successes of neocapitalism in society drive his criticism of official Marxism and his attention to a Marxist renewal; additionally, it is not only necessary to produce a political cinema, but above all a theoretical apparatus able to support it, in order to struggle against the changing nature of capitalism. Together these create a coherent historical and political framework with which to understand his cinematic turn at the end of 1950s. The short film *La ricotta* (1962) will be considered in 1.6, a good example of Pasolini's cinematic turn as breakthrough and theoretical evolution.

1.1 A definition of neocapitalism in Pasolini's political theory

The term 'neocapitalism' has not received great critical attention in Pasolini studies. Most scholars take account of the political questions of neocapitalism by focusing on Pasolini's emphasis on the social effects of a new phase of capitalism, rather than give a clear definition. This indicates a need to understand what Pasolini intends by the term neocapitalism.[27] In addition, there is often a degree of uncertainty around the very effects of neocapitalism, the most common of which might be subsumed under the term 'anthropological mutation of society'. The anthropological mutation of society is a term frequently used in the literature to refer to Pasolini's sociological and critical reflection on the transformation of society in the late 1960s and the early 1970s.

The first reference for these studies is Pasolini's essays collected in *Corsair Writings* (1975) and *Lutheran Letters* (1976). These explore and conceptualise the fact that, for Pasolini, Italian society becomes completely consumerist, fascist, *en masse*, in the 1970s (Ravetto, 2003; Righi, 2011; Bondavalli, 2015). But such approaches ignore a column written by Pasolini in the weekly political and cultural publication *Vie Nuove,* an open dialogue with his readers which, albeit with various interruptions, goes from 25 June 1960 to 30 September 1965 and which antedates his attention to the nature of neocapitalism and the consequent crisis of Marxism.[28] Indeed, Pasolini introduces some topics that eventually become fundamental to his thinking in the mid-1960s and are next expressed in his collected essays in *Heretical Empiricism* (1972).[29]

In his weekly column, the term 'neocapitalism' is already used by Pasolini to explicitly name a new phase of capitalism associated with an alliance between productive forces and audio-visual technology (e.g., television, cinema, and marketing)[30], an alliance aimed at disconnecting the working class from Marxism and presenting, justifying, and promoting capitalism as the best possible world to the masses.

[27]The term 'neocapitalism' is traditionally defined as a new form of capitalism characterised by its moderation of the excesses of capitalism through the intervention of the economic state. In this there is an implied economic freedom in the alliance between industrial/private property and the social well-being of citizens.

[28] Pasolini's answers to his readers are collected in 'Le Belle Bandiere' (BB, 1977).

[29] Pasolini writes most of the *Heretical Empiricism*'s essays in the mid-1960s (between 1964-1966) as single papers for newspapers, reviews and cinema studies. These essays were published by Pasolini in 1972 with the title *Heretical Empiricism.*

[30] Throughout this work the term 'audio-visual technology' is to be understood as any medium that generally uses audio-visual language (cinema, television, advertising et al.)

In addition, answering his readers, Pasolini starts to understand that such an alliance would bring about a theoretical and practical crisis within Marxism. He writes that 'neocapitalism tends to integrate the working class' (9 November 1961), (BB: 130); that 'neocapitalism is the new power and the new conformist normality ... the triumph of a culture of Readers Digest, tabloid and gossip for the masses through audio-visual technology, above all, television' (20 September 1962) (BB: 192); that 'Marxism cannot grasp the irrationality of the masses by its ideological tools and positivistic rationality' (9 July 1960) (BB: 30); and that 'there is a theoretical and practical error of Marxist intellectuals with regards to the masses and the subproletariat' (22 March 1962) (BB: 164).[31]

The fundamental importance of these claims for this study is that they can be compared and related to those in the *Heretical Empiricism* essays of the mid-1960s in which Pasolini specifies that this alliance is settled through the cultural and social hegemony of a specific form of audio-visual language (HE: 16): neocapitalism's 'guiding language'. This language is made up from words and images aimed at selecting and reducing the perception of reality via what is on the screen. For Pasolini, it is this selection and reduction of the perception of reality (HE: 28) that produces first the linguistic transformation of society (HE: 64) and then the anthropological mutation of the masses (HE: 70). Pasolini argues that neocapitalism is therefore a revolution of society, but internal to its capitalism. It has two essential aims: (a) to select and reduce reality to capitalism and (b) to offer a universalist and quasi-metaphysical sense of the eternity of the values and meanings of capitalism to the masses (HE: 37) through the ubiquitous language of audio-visual communication.

Therefore, unlike previous studies, the hypothesis of this thesis is that from the end of the 1950s through to the mid-1960s, Pasolini was formulating his political problem: he correlates the rise of neocapitalism with the crisis within Marxism, creating his awareness of his 'cinematic turn'. This study considers that Pasolini's cinematic turn is forced and justified by the need for Marxism's renewal, in order to face the rise of

[31] Hence, Pasolini was aware of the transformation of society into a fascist, consumerist, and mass society before the 1970s. As a result, in this chapter the term neocapitalism will be used exclusively to refer to the alliance between productive forces and audio-visual technology, enabling a discussion of the relationship between neocapitalism's guiding language and Pasolini's shift from literature to cinema, what I call 'his cinematic turn'.

neocapitalism. From this perspective, I discuss first how Pasolini is aware of the changing nature of capitalism as an immanent system that constantly revolutionises itself and constantly selects some parts of reality over others. Second, I suggest that the awareness of the failure of Marxist aims – the impossibility of grasping the irrationalism of the masses, of accepting the role of a working class completely embedded in neocapitalism's values and meaning, and of tolerating the end of the dream of revolution – leads Pasolini to ask questions about a language and theory capable of confronting neocapitalism and its guiding language. This will result in an understanding of what kind of struggle it is possible to produce at the level of militant engagement. His cinematic turn, for Pasolini, is not meant to abandon Marxism, but to renew it.

Third, the focus is on how Pasolini's search for a new language and theory for Marxism entails his interest in audio-visual language both as a constituent dimension of power and as a determinant of social life and eventually as a means of resistance. Rather than the social contradictions or the consciousness of the subordinate classes, Pasolini will look at the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language and the conditions internal to cinema theory to confront it.

This will suggest that the use of audio-visual technology is always political and that the language of audio-visual imagery brings about selected values, meanings and perceptions of reality – and obviously inferences, judgements, and bias. This implies a breakthrough and an evolution in Pasolini's militant engagement: the possibility of using the language of cinema not only to give viewers a wider perception of reality in the face of the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language, but also to develop cinema theory in order to establish a new basis for reality. A close reading of Pasolini's cinematic turn will thus suggest the development of a trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and political theory.

1.2 'The obscene health of neocapitalism' and its guiding language

Pasolini grasps a fundamental point within his historical and intellectual context: the rise of neocapitalism is related to the ubiquitous language of audio-visual technology. The power of audio-visual language becomes a key phrase in the first part of *Heretical Empiricism*, focused as it is on linguistic questions collectively entitled 'the language'. For Pasolini, neocapitalism is a new phase of capitalism in which productive forces and

audio-visual technology are allied, in order to integrate the working class and to present capitalism as the best possible world to the masses (HE: 17).

Pasolini writes that what distinguishes earlier capitalism from neocapitalism is that not only does neocapitalism spread itself through the culture industry (cinema and advertising) and of course through the massive force of television on the masses, but it also entails a socio-linguistic revolution of society and consequently a new perception of reality (HE: 64). Pasolini argues that the changing nature of capitalism puts the production–consumption cycle at the centre of the everyday life of the masses (HE: 37). Expanding neocapitalism requires developing consumerism and commodification in order to disconnect the working class from the meanings and values of Marxism and produce within the masses a new type of subject: the consumer (HE: 33).

These critical issues could be compared to the sociological vision of 'the massed society' by the German–Marxist thinkers of the Frankfurt School, in which a new type of worker is completely integrated into capitalism through the culture industry. Some scholars have clearly considered this comparison in light of the debasement of the relationship between art and the culture industry (Ravetto, 2001; Vighi, 2001; Schwartz, 2017; Merjian, 2019). In my view, for Pasolini, this critical vision of society is in fact secondary to the linguistic analysis of the political role of audio-visual language. It appears to Pasolini that the literary language of superstructural entities such as the Church, the educational establishment, and political parties is being replaced by a new language of the image, promoting a new linguistic model, a new guiding language of society, a new perception of reality (HE: 63).

For Pasolini, the term 'replacement' is a radical concept that well articulates how neocapitalism is even more dangerous and powerful than earlier capitalism. Pasolini explains this replacement by referring to what was happening at the time in Italy. One theme in Pasolini's analysis is that neocapitalism's guiding language is aimed at making other forms of language for the masses superfluous (HE: 37). According to Pasolini, the ubiquitous language of television (a) denied the multilingualism of Italy among its people (HE: 18); (b) reduced the cultural power of literature, poetry and politics to mere communicative purpose (HE: 19); (c) resulted in a reduction, an exclusion, and a negation of low and high Italian culture; and (d) was based on the contemporary reduction, exclusion and negation of traditions, human experiences, and social realities

(HE: 20).[32] In short, neocapitalism was articulating a selective perception of reality and a reductive vision of society. Audio-visual technology had expanded to produce a new culture and a new humanity fully compliant with the meaning and values of neocapitalism.

To express this expansion, Pasolini gives some strong and hard analogies with totalitarian regimes: neocapitalism's guiding language is aligned with racist hatred (HE: 26), the fascist period (HE: 27), and concentration camps (HE: 135). These analogies clearly indicate that Pasolini's attention to linguistic questions must be related to the subliminal discriminatory powers of neocapitalism to integrate and simultaneously eliminate parts of reality and society. With this perspective, Pasolini asserts that it is neocapitalism's guiding language that not only reveals the process through which neocapitalism looks at, transforms, and creates perceived reality, but also how the changing nature of capitalism functions.

Pasolini argues that capitalism constantly revolutionises itself through an internal revolution that historically coincides with a technological revolution and socially entails the inclusion and simultaneous exclusion of parts of cultural and social, individual and collective reality. On the one hand he writes that the internal revolution is first technological:

> 'the "internal revolution," [is] due to the application of science (which is thus to be seen as the most important phase for humanity after that of the first sowing along the Nile twelve thousand years ago – which, establishing the bases of agricultural and artisan civilization, remains the dominant manifestation of all human history and art until a few years ago)' (HE: 63).

On the other hand, the internal revolution entails the transformation of the language and 'of the spirit', as well as the mutation of the dominant class. He writes:

> 'This happens when the establishment enters into a developmental crisis because of a "revolution created by itself." Let us suppose precisely the transformation of a capitalistic society into a neocapitalistic one, which would be a simple evolution if it were a question of a purely extensive fact, of an improvement of a reformist type, etc., etc. – and instead is a revolution because the transformation of a society from capitalistic to neocapitalistic coincides with the transformation of the "scientific spirit" into the "application of science," and with the anthropological mutations that this

[32] For example, what Pasolini calls multilingualism, that is the particularistic variety of Italian dialects, is reduced by television and cinema to the status of a marginal, folkloristic expression that no longer belongs either to the linguistic model of a fully industrialised Italy or to the guiding language of audio-visual language (HE: 1).

implies' (HE: 64).

As a result, the internal revolution also entails a crisis of continuity in the structure of society and its institutions, which Pasolini relates to the relationship between the rise of neocapitalism and the old institutions of the first capitalism. He argues:

> 'But such continuity is illusory; we see it today. Abruptly, in fact, the irradiating and homologizing function of the language of intellectual elites (law, religion, school, literature), is ceasing – with the passage from capitalism to neocapitalism through its "internal revolution," which coincides with the technological revolution. It is replaced by the analogous function of the languages of technicians. Therefore, the languages of the infrastructures, let us simply say the languages of production, are guiding society linguistically. It had never happened before' (HE: 63).

In addition, in a way that is rather far from academic and scientific research, but which is close to Marx,[33] Pasolini even tries to articulate through examples how technological revolutions run through all historical eras from 'the first sowing along the Nile twelve thousand years ago' (HE: 63), via the 'scientific revolution' (HE: 64), to the most recent revolution of the application of scientific spirit to technology (HE: 64). This means that Pasolini historically asserts that every change of technology produces changes in production, culture, dominant class and language (HE: 64). And considering the present, this means that (a) Pasolini understands that what runs through the audio-visual technology of neocapitalism is a broad stream of social reductionism, and that (b) this fact is tied to the transformation of people's perception of reality. For these reasons, Pasolini warns the reader in the Introduction to *Heretical Empiricism* that the process of transformation in neocapitalist society makes political sense only if it is analysed comparatively through linguistic questions about the communicative but abstract language of audio-visual technology (HE: 1). And he emphatically adds, 'The search is under way; the book is open. It's a question, after all, of understanding if a writer should acquire a kind of anguished fatalism in the presence of which nothing can be done, or if he should be urged to continue his linguistic research with more determination' (HE: 1).

As a result, for Pasolini, neocapitalism's guiding language empirically shows the emergence of an ideology that tends to make the pragmatism of capitalism both natural and ontological (HE: 194) and that teaches us not only to reduce our perception of reality, but also to think more pragmatically about reality through the very process of selecting and reducing it. The 'obscene health of neocapitalism' (HE: 126) lies thus in

[33] Marx, 1887: 300. See introduction of thesis.

its universalist and quasi-metaphysical sense of the eternity of capitalism (HE: 37), which revolutionised itself to transform the perception of reality. Replacing an economic base with a technological revolution suggests a crisis, as discrepancies widen between theoretical and operational fields as well as between linguistic and technological ones. With this perspective, section 1.3 relates how Pasolini openly states that neocapitalism has produced a crisis for Marxism: the failure of its historical and social theory is also the failure of its own very language.

1.3 'Marxism has gone out of style': the crisis of Marxist theory and language in the 1960s according to Pasolini

'Marxism has gone out of style' (HE: 125). This is 'the mundane euphemism' that Pasolini uses to explicitly refer to the crisis of Marxism in the rise of neocapitalism.[34] Pasolini declares that Marxism is losing its authority over the masses, while the rise of neocapitalism entails the clear successes of the capitalistic lifestyle among the working class (HE: 126). Pasolini's emphasis on the successes of neocapitalism is first aimed at defining a painful and difficult reality for Italian Communist Party and Marxist intellectuals.[35] These groups do not admit, rather they often repress, and even completely deny, that Marxism is in crisis. 'They do not have the authority to render valid the arguments which correctly oppose this decline' (HE: 126). But such an emphasis is also aimed at outlining how the changing nature of capitalism must result in re-defining Marxist theory and strategy. For Pasolini, Marxist traditions are insufficient for facing neocapitalism and its guiding language. This awareness leads him to reject the traditional Marxist tendency to conceive history in terms of contradictions in the production process, because the very condition of the changing nature of capitalism is an irrational tendency to pragmatically select and signify some parts of reality over others. This tendency becomes cumulative through a linguistic transformation which, in turn, implies the anthropological mutation of society.

[34] At the end of the 1950s, most Italian left-wing intellectuals still think of Marxism as a historical and social theory through which the nature of capitalism is understood. They look at Marxism as a coherent theoretical framework in favour of emancipation from the social arrangements of capitalism, which recognises why the power of capitalism is rapidly increasing in the country, how the working class is developing its own class-consciousness, and where the class struggle is becoming real. Against this background, Pasolini is a heretic voice.

[35] Pasolini uses 'the crisis of Marxism' to refer to the goals of the political mandate of the intellectual and working classes according to the Togliatti version of Marxism.

Hence something deeper marks the distance between Pasolini and official Marxism: for Pasolini capitalism is inscribed in a pragmatism that includes and excludes parts of reality, but it cannot be rationalised. So, Pasolini argues, intellectuals need to stop reading Marx and Lenin 'as one reads the Gospels' (HE: 38), and re-think Marxism as a body of work in progress rather than as a dogmatic or finished political doctrine. Marxism must have the courage 'to look the reality of neocapitalism in the face' (HE: 47) and must radically change in both theory and strategy, in order to be part of the present and to operate within reality (HE: 48). In short, Pasolini identifies how the political problem of the rise of neocapitalism brings about a re-definition of Marxism – what he calls 'Marxism's renewal' – which would mean a fundamental theoretical change (HE: 37).

It is at this point that, surprisingly, Pasolini claims the right of considering himself a Marxist in recognising that Marxism is the only political theory to affirm that reality is not an ideology (HE: 72). In this sense, Pasolini argues that the linguistic transformation of society (HE: 63) is not to be thought of as 'a value judgement but as a point of fact' (HE: 28) and that, as a result, the solution – after clearly defining what sort of capitalism produces this transformation – is to take possession of neocapitalism's guiding language as a cultural and political issue related to Marxism's renewal (HE: 20). He adds that such possession is the only way to deal with the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language, in order to offer a wider perception of reality, and that through new philosophical integrations of Marxist theory a second philosophy can be extracted from the language of cinema to replace the rationalism of official Marxism in its understanding and grasp of reality (HE: 249). Hence the conditions for Marxism's renewal lie in a trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics.

In my view, Pasolini's awareness of the political problems of his time should be regarded as original: that the changing nature of capitalism entails the changing nature of Marxism. Pasolini focuses on what, in the rise of neocapitalism, impedes a Marxist theoretical account of the historical dynamics of capitalism, and on how the linguistic transformation of society reduces Marxist political language among the masses. This awareness offers us clarity in terms of Pasolini's methodological orientation. Pasolini's attention to Marxism is to be understood neither as a definitive 'back to Marx' nor as a further interpretation of Marxism. Rather, in discussing the crisis of Marxism, Pasolini searches for a way to re-style Marxism for his present time, i.e., to redefine the

theoretical and practical processes through which Marxism is, in its broadest sense, associated with both a systematic emphasis on anticapitalism and a creative planning of forms of resistance to exploitation. He clearly comments on the political situation of his time:

> 'At this moment, then, Marxist parties and organisations no longer have the strength to impose the fashion of certain cultural products they would be deprived of authority and plaintive would sound their recommendation. With a brutal about-face the high bourgeoisie and the petit-bourgeois masses in a "new collective consciousness" make choices which at any rate become popular as symptoms of a pragmatic and indisputable change.' (HE: 38)

The two succeeding subsections of this chapter focus on Pasolini's understanding of the crisis of Marxism, revealing that Marxist theory was able to understand neither the changing nature of capitalism nor the political relevance of technology for neocapitalism (1.3.1). For Pasolini, the crisis for Marxist political language displays some basic conditions in the interplay between Marxism's renewal and the search for a renewed language about reality and politics – a technological language for Marxism capable of offering a wider perception of reality (1.3.2). These two foci will then allow the cinematic and political implications of Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre to be articulated.

1.3.1 The crisis of Marxist theory and its results

To start to provide elements of the crisis of Marxist theory according to Pasolini, I return to his definition of neocapitalism. For him, the term implies and suggests the changing nature of capitalism: capitalism is intrinsically revolutionary and neocapitalism is a 'technological revolution' (HE: 64).

This relationship between technology and revolution suggests to Pasolini a theoretical and practical crisis in two fundamentals at the core of Marxism: (a) the distinction between the economic structure of a society and its cultural superstructure; and (b) the social revolutionary role of the class struggle and especially that of the working class. Pasolini first remarks that neocapitalism's guiding language entails the end of the political mandate of intellectuals, directly producing a culture industry that bypasses political engagement with them; second, he notes that audio-visual technology disconnects the working class and its class-consciousness from the meanings and the values of revolution, bringing about a political non-commitment via consumerism and mass society. Pasolini argues that as a result, by denying the Marxist model of a base-

superstructure, the centrality of production as the crucial concept within Marxism must now be seen in the light of the technological production of audio-visual language and the cycle of production–consumption. For Pasolini, the production of images is directly linked to economic reality and the various social and individual dimensions that go along with it. The theoretical advance he wants to explore is that neocapitalism directly shapes society through linguistic transformation; that is, through the centrality of the production of an immense body of images on the screen which culturally articulate our perception of reality.

The technological revolution entails the failure of the philosophical framework of Marxism, which results in an illusory abstraction because of the reality of the 'internal revolution' of capitalism. Pasolini writes evocatively to the Communist Party and, of course, to Marxist intellectuals: 'what would the PCI have to do with such technological fruit?' (HE: 39). 'On the question of language, the PCI could attempt a criticism of itself and a verification of its own revolutionary relationship to an evolving reality' (HE: 48). The term 'technological fruit' is surely a harsh criticism with regard to the Communist Party, which 'has not the courage to look the reality of neocapitalism in the face' (HE: 47) and which realises neither the changing nature of capitalism nor the coming of neocapitalism's guiding language.

For the moment these questions remain unresolved. These critical sentences have been related to Marcuse's vision of technology as social domination (Sollazzo, 2016: 98-103). In his essay entitled 'Some Social Implications of Modern Technology' (Marcuse, 1941), Marcuse pessimistically asserts that technology was being organised by an administered technocratic society in which the only individual and collective values were industrial and technical productivity. Indeed, this pessimistic synthesis crosses into Pasolini as well. For instance, Pasolini claims that neocapitalism is a technocracy (HE: 43) in which the power of technology is everywhere. However, there is also a broad stream of ambivalence about technology in Pasolini's writing. Pasolini is an author who has a clear and critical focus on technology and his thinking may be in danger of being interpreted as anti-modern (Greene, 1990; Gordon, 1997; Patti, 2015). But, in my opinion, this danger is devoid of value when Pasolini's vision of technology is assessed through the lens of the problem of Marxism's renewal. Indeed, for Pasolini, while on the one hand technology is written into the process through which productive forces and audio-visual technology are intimately related (and through which each renders the

other possible and necessary), on the other hand technology is also the starting point for thinking and exploring the political opportunities implicit in Marxism's renewal. This is the sense of Pasolini's claim that now guides subsection 1.3.2: the crisis of the language of Marxism and the search for 'a technological language as a specialised and elliptical part of Marxism' (HE: 37). Here Pasolini looks at technology, and of course technological language, in order to start articulating the conditions for Marxism's renewal.

1.3.2 The crisis of Marxist language and its rationalism

In relating the crisis of Marxist theory to the rise of neocapitalism, the problematic question facing Pasolini is why things are thus. Pasolini shifts his analysis from a general study of the most important theoretical passages of the Marxist vision of history to a specific concentration on the question of communicating with the masses. He focuses – though always in an elusive and sometime contradictory way[36] – on how and where to search for a technological language for Marxism. Because, while neocapitalism further reinforces communication with the masses, integrating it through the new guiding language of audio-visual technology, Pasolini admits that 'Marxism doesn't know, or knows badly, how to insert itself in this scandalously dialectical relationship' (HE: 47) between the masses and capitalism. As a result, Pasolini develops an analysis of the crisis of the language of Marxism, his basic premise being that the theoretical error of Marxist communication was linked to a very clear, binary, and polarised dialectic: the rationalism of intellectuals versus the irrationalism of the masses. According to Marxist formulation, the term 'irrationalism' was basically a negative concept that was historically connected to sentimentalism and populism and was the mechanism through which fascist propaganda had fascinated and integrated the Italian rural masses. At the end of fascism, during and after the Second World War, these masses – 'innocent and deprived of critical tools' (HE: 92) – had to be re-orientated towards Marxism via the Italian Communist party. This was the aim of the political mandate of the intellectuals within the Togliatti version of Marxism.

[36] This analysis runs through some concepts or formulas that Pasolini occasionally presents in *Heretical Empiricism*, and there are plenty of affinities with his own analyses. These concepts and formulas are fragmented and scattered throughout the text, but a close reading of them has allowed me to create a conceptual framework to systematically formulate the basic conditions of Pasolini's theory, his field of research, and the philosophical development of his proposals for Marxism's renewal.

For Pasolini, the rise of neocapitalism's guiding language changes everything and shows that the Marxist dialectic was completely wrong. He observes that neocapitalism's guiding language – as much as fascist propaganda – is highly communicative but not rational (HE: 30) and that audio-visual technology is analogous to the basic condition of irrationalism among the masses. For this reason, he argues that the masses more easily respond to the rules, visions and perspective of neocapitalism.[37] For Pasolini, this results in the linguistic success of audio-visual language, as it perfectly teaches and communicates with the masses in an Italian language that is easier for them than the literary and elitist language taught in Italian schools. And this explains for him the quasi-religious mass fascination in cinema stars, the value of conformism in television and the power of advertising slogans. While neocapitalism further reinforces the irrationalism of the masses, integrating it through a new guiding language, the central core of Pasolini's treatment of the problem is the development of a 'technological language' as 'a specialised language' and an 'elliptical part' of Marxism (HE: 37).

This technological language is characterised by two assets: it is 'specialised' and it has an 'elliptical part'. While later sections describe clearly, step by step, how this specialised language is the language of cinema, for the moment it is fundamental to focus on the concept of the 'elliptical part', which is to be understood in its etymological sense, that is, as the part of Marxism that is lacking in relation to the changing nature of capitalism. The sense of this is programmatic: since Marxism lacks a technological language in the face of neocapitalism's guiding language, Marxism's renewal must search for a new technological language if it is to be part of the present day and still allow for communication with the masses. Starting with this, Pasolini questions: what is the distinction between the typical neocapitalist linguistic plane, and that typical of Marxism? (HE: 38). In response to his own question, Pasolini refers to a further idea, one he calls 'the expressiveness of reality', which, for the moment, is to be understood as an 'an enlargement of the lexical, creative, and social horizons of language' (HE: 102). This means that (a) a Marxist characterisation of technological language must be more oriented towards the aim of 'an enlargement of the horizons' than the selective reduction of neocapitalism's guiding language would otherwise allow; and that (b) Pasolini trusts the process by which the technological language of Marxism

[37] Pasolini argues that one of the characteristics of audio-visual imagery is that it can be a phantasmic reproduction of reality, like dreams and mnemonic processes. As a result, the perceptive apparatus on which neocapitalism's guiding language is predicated is an unconscious, oneiric, and irrational one (HE: 169) and hence homologous to irrationalism.

can distinguish itself from that of neocapitalism. The enlargement of horizons may be defined as aiming for a wider perception of reality, where the reality of what is theoretically and practically excluded by the selectivity of neocapitalism is to be considered as the main content of the technological language of Marxism.

This directly brings about the ontological and political questions of what is internal and what is external to the changing nature of capitalism, issues that are directly related to Pasolini's conception of reality and that start to be focused on here in chapter 1 but that will be explored in their entirety in chapters 2 and 3. For the moment, it is important to stress that the aim of a wider perception of reality characterises Pasolini's place within the debate in the 1960s among Italian and international intellectuals in searching for an adequate and alternative form of communication with the masses. Pasolini wants to verify two points: if and how what he calls 'the special languages' of literature and cinema (HE: 21) can successfully struggle for a wider perception of reality, 'cost what it may' (HE: 40); and if and how audio-visual language could bring about something like 'a second philosophy' (HE: 249) for Marxism. Both points are considered in the next section 1.4.

1.4 Pasolini's militant engagement and the intellectual context of the 1960s

What is the distinction between the typical neocapitalist linguistic plane and that of Marxism? (HE: 38). The answer is the distinction between the selection of reality and a wider perception of reality that can be communicated to the masses.

With this awareness, Pasolini characterises his intervention in two fundamental debates in the 1960s: the debate about the special language of the Italian intellectual context – which is treated in 'New Linguistic Questions' (HE: 3-22); and the international debate on the crisis of Marxism – which Pasolini develops in 'From the Laboratory. Notes *en poète* for a Marxist Linguistics' (HE: 50-78). Section 1.4.1 traces Pasolini's questions of if and how the express intention of some writers, poets and avant-gardists in Italy – those who were consciously opposing the communicative purposes of neocapitalist audio-visual language – can urgently offer a wider perception of reality 'cost what it may' (HE: 40). His emphasis on the political failures of what he calls 'the special languages' (HE: 21) allows the start of an articulation of his cinematic turn, recognising how and why the language of cinema is the leading candidate for the renewal of

Marxism.

Section 1.4.2 considers how Pasolini's awareness results in the urgency of something like 'a second philosophy' (HE: 249). He asks: if the 'excessive rationalism' of Marxism is the main cause of the incapacity of intellectuals to meet the irrationalism of the masses, then does the foundation of a technological language entail a new philosophical integration for Marxism? In this case, Pasolini questions if and how Structuralism and the Frankfurt School can be new philosophical integrations capable of renewing Marxism.[38] Here is one of the most fascinating, but highly problematic, peculiarities of Pasolini's oeuvre; what Gordon calls 'creative disorganization' (Gordon, 1997: 185).

Pasolini is so convinced that the problem of Marxism is its rationalism, he interprets texts, authors and philosophies in light of this criterion, providing a vision of Structuralism and the Frankfurt School that is more arbitrary and militant than balanced and objective.[39] However, the peculiar friction resulting from the relationship between academic rigour and Pasolini's creative disorganisation is not the only component in these essays. From Pasolini's militant perspective, Structuralism and the Frankfurt School achieve neither a wider perception of reality nor the replacement of rationalism. They do, in fact, justify his choice of the language of cinema as the means by which one may best cultivate a wider perception of reality. But in looking at Pasolini's harsh criticism of the philosophical frameworks of Structuralism and the Frankfurt School, one may recognise how such criticism necessarily entails the foundation of a new cinematically conceived political theory for Marxism. From this perspective, the language of cinema will be considered as the total unifier of Pasolini's militant engagement.

1.4.1 The debate on special languages in the Italian intellectual context

The heated intellectual debate on what Pasolini calls the special languages was about whether poetic, literary, and avant-garde attempts by some Italian authors were able to

[38] While Pasolini's references to Structuralism are directly derived from his texts, the reference to the Frankfurt School derives from the fact that Pasolini and the Frankfurt School share a common analysis of mass society.

[39] A significant reference for Pasolini is the French cultural and philosophical and academic debate. This is illustrated by his reading of Gide and Rimbaud in the late 1940s as well as by a variety of quotations from prominent French philosophers such as Barthes, Klossowski and Blanchot in his film '*Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom'* of 1975, via his fascination for Sartre and Fanon in the 1960s.

renew the political mandate of intellectuals.[40] Within this debate, Pasolini's essay 'New Linguistic Questions' (HE: 3-22) aims to assess if and how these works, along with their political implications, really face the coming of neocapitalism's new guiding language. Pasolini assesses these authors through the lens of what distinguishes the technological language of Marxism from the typical neocapitalist linguistic plane. This poses the question of whether these languages can actually secure a wider perception of reality and be capable of communicating with the masses. Pasolini's militant analysis in these attempts is highly critical and negative: not one of these works analysed achieves these aims.

Pasolini criticises as decadent and reactionary the political glances cast by three different groups of intellectuals at the rise of neocapitalism. He rejects the hermetic poetry of four of the most important Italian poets at that time – Ungaretti, Quasimodo, Montale, and Luzi.[41] Although hermeticism tries to grasp a wider perception of reality and develops a linguistic purism and deep analysis of the inner life, Pasolini believes it is actually incapable of communicating with the masses and being part of the poets' own present day. Pasolini uses the same summative view to assess the works of a second group of poets and writers of his generation (Roversi, Leonetti, Vittorini and Banti). They want to offer a wider perception of reality, re-poeticising reality to elevate and sublimate the present era through the forms of aestheticism and mannerism (HE: 5). For Pasolini, this group of intellectuals suffers from the same problem the hermetic poets have: they essentially see reality as pessimistic, something whose processes are not to be politically confronted but poetically transfigured, enriched, and embellished. A third group of intellectuals (Bassani, Cassola, Soldati, Delfini), for Pasolini, focus on the power of remembering. They associate the struggle in favour of a wider perception of reality with a nostalgic function that keeps alive the memory of the past. For Pasolini, this nostalgia is a fascination with a distant place, promised and lost, which reflects the end of the dreams and hopes of the first bourgeoisie, who now face a new dominant

[40] It is important to note that Pasolini analyses both Marxist and non-Marxist intellectuals. For example, Montale was never Marxist. However, Pasolini looks at non-Marxist studies in the light of their challenges to the selectivity of neocapitalism and their search for a wider perception of reality.

[41] Hermeticism is a tendency in modern Italian poetry to fully exploit the sublime connotations of a word in order to express what is unknown and obscure in human interiority. For Pasolini, these poets certainly wanted to distinguish their linguistic plane from that of neocapitalism's selective guiding language. However, Pasolini argues that these sublime attempts are forms of classicism and elitism which are clearly very far from the irrationalism of the masses. He describes this language as an Italian used within 'ivory towers', in which 'introversion equates reality with interiority' (HE: 5) and he states that the sublime style of linguistic purism is the seat of typical aesthetic mysticism (HE: 5).

neocapitalist class.

To best articulate this, Pasolini refers to two further groups of writers. The first group (Moravia, Morante, Calvino) has, for Pasolini, the virtue of satisfying the need to search for a universal ordinary language – what he calls 'a kind of neutral European language' (HE: 7-9) – in which to communicate with the masses. However, for Pasolini, this group does not understand that the drive towards universalism is always the effect of an enlightened and bourgeois rationalism, which itself has been the main cause of the incapacity of the intellectual classes to meet the irrationalism of the masses.[42] According to Pasolini, the second group of authors deserves more attention than the first, as it exalts the oral vivacity of dialect within literary content (Cardarelli, Cecchi, Baldini), adding the spoken language of the masses to the sublime language of literature through literary experimentation (Gadda). For Pasolini, these intellectuals, especially Gadda, seem capable of offering a wider perception of reality that includes communicating with the masses. However, Pasolini argues that their communication with the masses is compromised by their incapacity to transcend the bourgeois culture from which they come. As a result, Pasolini concludes that these experimental attempts are only an adaptation of the new taste among the bourgeois for a more pluralistic vision of society, and that they risk lyricising about, and moralising on, the conditions of the masses.

Among intellectuals, avant-gardism is the last focus of Pasolini's analysis. Pasolini gives avant-gardists as much extraordinary attention as he does harsh criticism. Their experimentalism looks at a wider perception of reality, even if they completely break communication with the audience. Pasolini polemically asks avant-gardism: 'Having finished reading an avant-garde text, what have I learned? What information have I obtained from the way of writing? I know only one thing: I know, that is, that he is a man of letters. And it is thus that the ancient, incurable classicism of literature perpetuates itself' (HE: 129). Pasolini rejects the aims of avant-gardism because he is convinced that every form of destruction of communication and intelligibility is essentially an auto-destruction of political impact and that the rupture of communication

[42] Although Pasolini highlights how this linguistic operation is very fascinating and seemingly in line with his political discourse on being part of the real processes active within society, he claims that this attempt hides a basic political contradiction: these writers want to replace the universal power of neocapitalism's guiding language with another form of universalism. Although these writers pay attention to the present time, their political attempts are analogous to the old political mandate of intellectuals and homologous to the power of neocapitalism over the masses. They are not able to distinguish their special language from neocapitalism's guiding language.

with the masses orients the masses towards neocapitalism, once again.[43] For him, the object of avant-gardism is the emphasis on changes of linguistic technique, never on the relationship between language and knowledge of reality (HE: 129).

Therefore, in assessing all these attempts, Pasolini provides some important implications for the language of Marxism. It should be part of the real and active processes of reality; it should communicate with the masses; it should avoid producing both further universalism and further bourgeois taste; and it should distinguish itself from bourgeois and classist moralism, but never through a shocking rupture of communication. This means, for Pasolini, explicitly outlining two other points that logically follow from his criticism of the special languages. First, those intellectuals who are still playing in the field of literary, poetic and general alphabetic language must not 'fear to learn the ABC of audio-visual language' and 'appropriate it' (HE: 20).

According to Pasolini, intellectuals must be fully aware that politics is no longer related to the power of words but to audio-visual images, and that there is a paradigm shift in the struggle against capitalism, an awareness from which Pasolini deduces his cinematic turn. Second, Pasolini asserts that this paradigm shift is aimed at proposing the language of cinema as the new language of Marxism. However, this language is no longer the literary language of the past (what Pasolini calls 'language A'), nor is it neocapitalism's guiding language at the present time (what he calls 'language B'). Rather, assuming there is a tension between these two poles and that Marxism wants to be part of the current real and active processes of the linguistic transformation of society, Pasolini states that Marxism has to cinematically give up rationalism and communicate beyond universalism and bourgeois taste, without ever breaking communication with the masses (what he calls the 'language X' – 'language A in the act of becoming language B') (HE: 98).

[43] Avant-gardism and experimentalism are as transgressive as they are unpolitical, or worse, reactionary and in favour of neocapitalism. Pasolini explains that rather than deriving its languages, values, and meanings from what is outside the system, every transgression of a form of communication is constrained by the same system. Hence, for Pasolini, what avant-gardists do not know or admit in their experimentalism is that it is imagined and conceived in a context in which it is already reduced and its intentions embodied. For these reasons, the rupture of communication through excessive nonsense or the exaltation of incommunicability can be simultaneously understood and rejected by both reader and viewer. About an Andy Warhol' film, *Sleep* (1963), in which the artist films an infinite sequence-shot of six hours of a man sleeping, Pasolini reiterates his distance from avant-gardism in confirming the political and aesthetic characteristic of his cinema: in its intensified cult of reality and in its interminable sequence shots, rather than having as its fundamental proposition 'that which is insignificant is', it has as its fundamental proposition 'that which is is insignificant' (HE: 241).

Numerous questions are now implied: What does it mean that the language of cinema is neither merely literary nor merely audio-visual any more? How does such a language understand real and active processes and intervene in them? Above all: in what sense can cinema really offer us a wider perception of reality – in content, for its viewers, and for its own aesthetics? These questions presuppose a more general question that can be deduced: how does the language of cinema assume and reveal the conditions of possibility for the renewal of Marxism and for anticapitalism? Before also focusing on what Pasolini's cinematic turn means for his militant engagement in favour of Marxism, a pause is needed to consider which philosophies can contribute to the rethinking of Marxism and a wider perception of reality. These must be presented in order to best understand, articulate and illustrate how Pasolini's trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics is revealed, in order to then outline how he sees the conditions of possibility for the renewal of Marxism.

1.4.2 Pasolini and the international contexts of the 1960s

Pasolini never considered himself a philosopher and his study of philosophy is amateur. It is his militant engagement that leads and forces him to explore Structuralist language theory, and in a way, also the ontology of Gurvitch – the French sociologist who Pasolini defines as empiricist – as well as the results of the Frankfurt School. These were the main theoretical approaches that were available to him in the intellectual context of the 1960s and they are considered in light of his search for providing philosophical integrations of Marxism. In an essay of 1965, entitled 'From the Laboratory: Notes *en poète* for a Marxist Linguistic', Pasolini looks at these philosophical theories with the following aim: to look for ideas to replace the excessive rationalism of official Marxism – the main cause of the incapacity of intellectuals to communicate with the masses – with a second philosophy. Pasolini's idea thus coincides with his cinematic turn and his militant engagement.

It is interesting to note that Pasolini seems to know little about these theoretical approaches.[44] This is why he starts his analysis with a self-deprecatory statement: that his essay is 'a discourse inter pocula' (among a few) and is 'at the level of the chattering

[44] In the footnotes of the essay, Pasolini ironically speaks of himself as a fanatical Marxist (HE: 46).

of a cocktail party' (HE: 75). The title of his essay 'From the Laboratory' clearly suggests that his analysis is the result of intuition and speculation rather than academic study. The subtitle 'Notes *en poète* for a Marxist Linguistics' (HE: 50) similarly uses the word 'notes', but it also reveals the aim of his essay. As a result, his essay is only a series of collected notes that serve to orient Pasolini towards a definition of a new language for Marxism. So, the essay's title and subtitle are interpreted as a way of introducing Pasolini's cinematic turn and as a way of extracting something of 'a second philosophy' for Marxism, and certainly not as a close interpretation of Structuralist language theory or the Frankfurt School.[45]

To introduce Structuralism, Pasolini quotes Barthes: 'every man is a prisoner of his language' (HE: 113). This entails that he bases his work on the most important thesis of Structuralism: that language is autonomous and dualistically separated from reality; that no subject is free because they are already embedded in a linguistic framework that 'structures' their enunciations, thoughts, and agency; and that what people call reality and what they consider the subject are linguistically structured. However, Pasolini interprets such an imprisonment as an immutable, geometrical, metaphysic structure, which ignores the dynamism of the emancipation of the people; in other words, this imprisonment is not a bearer of values, but ultimately another form of rationalism. This means that Pasolini believes – wrongly – that Structuralism is an abstract, pure, and closed model (as it were, a precise geometry, he says) instead of an open and provisional method that structures the empirical results of reality. With this perspective, the structuralist term 'arbitrariness' is misunderstood by Pasolini as a form of determinism and as an 'epistemological violence that reduces reality and society to an adoption of rational and logical schemas' (HE: 75), while Barthes and Levi-Strauss are defined as rationalist, metaphysic and even classist.

What it is interesting to stress is that Pasolini's hard (and mistaken) criticism of Structuralism, as if he were a 'fanatic Marxist' (HE: 58), is the impetus for developing his second philosophy for Marxism. This is metaphorically represented by the term 'magma'. Pasolini's theoretical approach is derived from geophilosophical reasons and

[45] It is important to take account of some scholars (Peloso, 2015; Desogus, 2018) who review Pasolini's essay showing the errors in his understanding of Structuralism and arguing that Pasolini ideologically assumes that Marxism cannot be superseded as a science. While embracing the first part of this interpretation – Pasolini clearly has a poor grasp of Structuralism – this study is instead critical of the second part of that interpretation.

he claims that it is the different linguistic, historical, and social traditions between France and Italy that compel him 'to not be a Structuralist, to not have a "head" for Structuralism' (HE: 71). Pasolini argues that this difference is grounded in and justified by different realities for the masses. While the French establishment has linguistically, historically, and socially organised the masses for centuries, the Italian masses have remained 'magma' for the same length of time. It seems to Pasolini that Structuralism offers 'a geometrical projection of the magma' in order to rationally understand the organisation of the masses, while he is looking for a philosophical framework to meet and to communicate with the irrationalism of the masses.[46]

As a result, the term 'magma' means that one of the conditions for Marxism's renewal is, for Pasolini, a philosophy that positively includes irrationalism. In addition, if the term 'magma' is probed a little more, it is evident that for Pasolini reality is never 'passive', as Structuralism claims. The term 'magma' starts to imply another condition for Marxism's renewal: an ontology in which reality is 'magma' that can erupt and flow. Pasolini's claims are clearly contrary to Marxist theory as well, and, in my view, they are to be understood through his militant engagement against neocapitalism. If neocapitalism's guiding language ideologically selects and produces a perception of reality in line with the irrationalism of the masses, then Marxism's renewal must be equally able to conceive irrationalism and to offer a wider perception of reality.

With this perspective, Pasolini's essay seems to endorse Gurvitch's criticism of Levi-Strauss's Structuralism.[47] In the eyes of Pasolini, Gurvitch articulates an ontology in which movement and contingency seem also to be keywords of the dynamic becoming of society. On the one hand, society is a multiplicity of social macro- and micro-elements which have a tendency to operate independently of each other. On the other hand, society tries to establish the provisional co-ordination of this multiplicity. The structure is everchanging and sits within a continuous and empirical interplay of irrationalism and pluralism which cannot be reduced to a logical schema. This philosophy is called hyper empiricism by Gurvitch (Gurvitch, 1953: 10); however, for Pasolini it is akin and prone to the changing nature of capitalism. Gurvitch's ontology is

[46] Pasolini concludes that: 'Structuralism is presented as a sort of geometry of magma' in which 'the magma can only be known in its geometric projection' (HE: 75).
[47] See the debate on the term 'structure' as recorded in the latter's *Sens et usage du terme structure dans les sciences humaines et sociales* (1962), which Pasolini has read in its Italian edition *Usi e significati del termine 'struttura'* (1966).

exclusively an exaltation of the dynamic becoming of society in which 'social structures are like clothes: underneath there is something else that makes them move and even explode' (HE: 75). It is capitalism that pragmatically and provisionally organises irrationalism and pluralism into an order, a fact that, according to Pasolini, is revealed by the current consumerism and conformism, which constantly changes fashions, meanings, and values.[48]

It is at this point that Pasolini openly argues for another condition for Marxism's renewal. He says that Marxism needs to integrate irrationalism and pluralism with order and progress (HE: 72), briefly referring to two American sociologists[49] whose vision of society is conceived as a process of continued variation of 'structuration, de-structuration, and re-structuration' (HE: 72). This means that if the changing nature of capitalism pragmatically and provisionally involves a new structuration of society, de-structuring the previous one and re-structuring a perception of reality prone to these changes (thanks to the power of audio-visual technology), then Marxism should accept such changes and fight back with the same weapons.

In this sense, Pasolini's cinematic turn is fully aware of itself. The aim of communicating with the masses is in turn involved in the problem of the perception of reality. The rise of neocapitalism poses the question of 'if, how and what extent' cinema can express reality. The only way to counteract capitalism is to enlarge the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language to offer another order, another progress, another structuration. This action is evident in Pasolini's choice of a paradigm shift from literary language to audio-visual language and justifies his trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics. As a result, for Pasolini, the conditions for Marxism's renewal coincide with his cinematic turn.

Before focusing on Pasolini's cinematic turn and what it entails in ontological, political, and militant terms, there is one further possible philosophical integration that this study

[48] It is interesting to highlight that, for Pasolini, Gurvitch articulates a coinciding of ontology and movement that probably originated in the work of Bergson.

[49] Here Pasolini refers to two anthropologists, Georges Peter Murdock and Karl Vogt (HE: 193-195). Murdock was an anthropologist who described evolutionary schemas as subjected continually and relentlessly to a process of differential reproduction of variants. The term process in Vogt describes the evolutionary process as a convergent change in which if the various populations could be traced back to their origins, no single human type could be found. It is very interesting to note that both look at the term 'process' as continuous variations. However, not one of their works is in Pasolini's library.

considers: the Frankfurt School. In their exploration of the society of the masses, the philosophers of the Frankfurt School argue that the culture industry has integrated the working class. They criticise consumerism and homologation among the masses. They appeal to those responding to the crisis of Marxism and its ideological decline. As seen in Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre, they look at a residual political space that favours an emancipatory role for art. There are clearly good reasons to find affinities: the starting point of Pasolini's analysis and the Frankfurt School's one appears the same. Despite these affinities, however, Pasolini never refers to Adorno in his essays of the 1960s; he quotes Marcuse in *Heretical Empiricism* polemically and only once; and he does not consider any Frankfurt School scholars as authorities in his political discourse. And it is remarkable that none of the Frankfurt School's books are found in Pasolini's library.[50]

In my view, the affinities can only derive from the fact that the Frankfurt School's analysis of mass society was highly renowned by Marxist intellectuals and that its essential concepts were known to those working on the crisis of Marxism after the Second World War. In fact, what distinguishes Pasolini from the main thinkers associated with the Frankfurt school is not their analysis of society but how to face the effects of neocapitalism on the masses. Here, I refer especially to the role of avant-gardism for Adorno in proposing two basic differences between the father of Critical Theory and Pasolini's militant engagement. It might be said that the starting point of their common analysis of society ultimately differs in their findings. Adorno considered that given the scandalous incommunicability of avant-gardism, its role in shocking society was the only way to confront standardised cultural forms in mass society. As already noted, this solution is too unpolitical for Pasolini, who argues in contrast that any negation or rupture of communication with the masses is a political error.

These different visions of the avant-garde held by Adorno and Pasolini are supported by their different definitions of reality and the different tools by which they perceive that neocapitalism may be faced. Through what he calls negative dialectics, Adorno explores and penetrates the contradictions of society, but refuses to attempt any kind of political reconciliation. From his perspective, the political role of intellectuals and artists and their works is merely critical and negative: breaking into and exploding ideology. But in terms of Pasolini's militant engagement, Adorno's view means that critical actions never

[50] As I will report in chapter 4, I have twice visited Pasolini's library in Pasolini's Archive in Florence.

meet political agency. Pasolini questions: does this critical attitude not lead to a rejection of the present? Does it not radically reduce the autonomy of politics and even art? Does it not imply and orient towards some utopian future?

Through the eyes of Pasolini, one may see how Adorno's critical attitude feeds on a widespread political pessimism whose line of research is simultaneously aimed at a critique of ideology as well as a rejection of the present. Such a way of reading reality on the one hand radicalises critical attitudes to the point that everything is put in doubt, and on the other hand excludes the possibility of living in the present as a place in which one may politically engage. This interpretation could irritate some experts in Critical Theory in that it sees Adorno's philosophy as the kind of abstract rationalism associated with anti-modern and right-wing intellectuals. However, this shows the difference between these philosophical frames. Pasolini's militant engagement may also be seen as an unusual way to live and be part of the present time: his cinematic turn does not reject but positively regards communication with the masses, the active processes of the restructuration of reality, and the fundamental roles of technologies and languages.

A case that explains the different positions of Adorno and Pasolini is Chaplin. In *Transparencies on Film* (Adorno, 1968), Adorno highlights the nature of the framing in Chaplin's film production. He says that it is reminiscent of old-fashioned photographs flowing on film. Adorno elaborates that this is caused by Chaplin's unawareness of cinematic technology. Hence Adorno, who despised all film production as bearing 'the mark of Cain' on its forehead (Fraser, 2018: 22), instead appreciates only Chaplin's cinema because it represents a harsh criticism of the cinema industry and of technological and commercial methodologies. From this conservative perspective, for Adorno, Chaplin's cinema is political insofar as it is anti-cinematic as well as elitist. Whereas Pasolini looks at Chaplin's cinema and focuses on its gags and the comicality through which Chaplin speaks to the masses.

As chapter 3 explains, Pasolini is interested in such highlights because they are aimed at positively producing a wider perception of reality among viewers. For Pasolini, gags and comicality are not anti-cinematic in any way but are instead the result of a political consciousness within Chaplin's cinematic style, technique, and language. From this perspective, Pasolini's strategy is finally clear: in his chosen means of struggle against

the changing nature of capitalism, the technological revolution is not exclusively considered as an enemy. Hence the language of words will be replaced by the language of audio-visual imagery.

1.5 Pasolini's cinematic turn

This section explores Pasolini's cinematic turn, describing not only a paradigm shift in the expression of his militant engagement, but also a breakthrough in his previous theoretical approach. Pasolini grasps the potential of cinema to promote a cinema theory which is also a political theory and an everchanging film production which constitutes anticapitalistic political action 'in the now'. To best justify these contentions, there are two developments: in 1.5.1 Pasolini's cinematic turn is considered through secondary bibliography and in light of his previous militant engagement through poetry and literature; and in 1.5.2 Pasolini's awareness of his cinematic turn is seen to create a breakthrough in his militant engagement and in his theoretical approach. This awareness entails, develops, and justifies Pasolini's cinema theory as the fundamental basis for his trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics, and ultimately as a political condition for Marxism's renewal.

1.5.1 Pasolini's cinematic turn in secondary bibliography: continuity or breakthrough?

Many prominent scholars agree that Gramsci had a fundamental role in Pasolini's understanding of the relationship between Marxism and linguistics (Ferretti, 1976; De Mauro, 1992; Scalia, 2020). The reference to Gramsci is surely central in understanding Pasolini's background. Likewise, these scholars identify how Pasolini's interpretation of Gramsci is personal, subjective, and also problematic (Sillanpoa, 1981: 120). On the one hand, Gramsci is for Pasolini the example of an intellectual who works for the people and who aims to produce a culture and a language for the people – albeit Pasolini operates in a different political and cultural time to that of Gramsci.[51] On the other hand,

[51] Several prominent scholars have recognised how Gramsci's reflection on language is an essential part of his political theory (Ives, Lacorte, 2010) and how it is an essential background when considering Pasolini. Linguistic issues are presented in Gramsci's Notebooks and Letters through his historical reconstruction of the linguistic relationships between orality and writing. Gramsci understands this relationship as a relationship between dominant and subaltern classes. He writes: 'Every time the question of language emerges, in one way or another, it means that a series of other problems is imposing itself: the formation and enlargement of the ruling class, the need to establish more intimate and secure relations between the ruling groups and the popular-national mass, i.e., to reorganise the cultural hegemony' (SPN:

a basic criticism is that Pasolini seems to consider the role of the intellectual basically as a vertical and pedagogical one, as if the culture of the people can be created from the outside in. It is on this basis that Pasolini's reference to Gramsci has now become consolidated. Through Gramsci's writings, Pasolini learns the fundamental relationship between the appropriation of a technical language in order to be 'organic' among people and the struggle for political consensus. This is ascertained when Pasolini's critical works look at the political role of literary language from the late 1940s, and as he develops his militant engagement through poetry and literature in the 1950s.[52]

Within Pasolini studies, some prominent scholars interpret his shift from literature to cinema as a continuity of his previous militant engagement. This interpretative horizon means that Pasolini's militant engagement is fully aligned with his previous background. Pasolini's cinema seems to carry forward two fundamental issues of the political mandate of intellectuals: 1) the idea of a 'popular cinema' that would emerge from Pasolini's early films and 2) the political role of the director as an 'organic intellectual' capable of empathising with a social or political subjectivity.

For example, Viano argues that 'a certain realism' in Pasolini's cinema in the 1960s and 1970s continues his literary and poetic realism of the 1950s. According to Viano, Gramsci inspired Pasolini's cinema 'to keep a realistic, that is, down to earth level of discourse and never to lose sight of popular culture' (Viano, 1993: 317). In this way, Viano thinks that Pasolini's cinema, in its method and content, is Gramscian as well as being highly pedagogical for people. This view develops the implicit pedagogy of

234). Gramsci takes as an example the development of 'volgare' in the cities of medieval Italy to show how the cultural hegemony of a new municipal bourgeoise implies the breaking out of the 'volgare illustre' as the form of written language used by the intellectual and cultural élite. In *Heretical Empiricism* Pasolini engages an analogy with Gramsci's example, arguing that 'the condition of necessity' of hegemony is changed (HE, 29). Pasolini asserts that one type of Italian society is finished, and another is begun. The new bourgeoisie of the cities of the North are the new dominant class whose real technocratic and economic power is 'the irradiator of hegemony on culture, and language' (HE: 29).

[52] Since the working class has a partial awareness of its own political condition, and at the same time, it shows the abyss-like distance between the low culture of 'the people' and the high culture of the dominant class, Gramsci presents a cultural strategy in which the political role of Marxist intellectuals is both to criticise the hegemony and to create a culture for the working class. With this perspective, Gramsci's political theory asks for the shaping of a new group of intellectuals – *l'intellettuale organico* – to work precisely on what intellectuals had never done: 'going to the people'. Pragmatism and imagination are the main elements of a new literature that, for Gramsci, has Machiavelli's *Prince* as model and aim. 'The basic thing about *The Prince* is that it is not a systematic treatment, but a "live" work, in which political ideology and political science are fused in the dramatic form of a "myth". Before Machiavelli, political science had taken the form either of Utopia or of the scholarly treatise. Machiavelli, combining the two, gave imaginative and artistic form to his conception by embodying the doctrinal, rational element in the person of a condottiere who represents plastically and "anthropomorphically" the symbol of the "collective will" ' (SPN: 316).

Pasolini's films. Likewise, Rumble uses the term 'civil' for politically identifying Pasolini both as a 'civil poet' and as a 'civil director'.[53] Rumble writes that Pasolini's choice, in the early 1960s, to shift from the novel to film was a function of 'his overriding desire to engage in the reality of the present, to make an impact upon an audience quickly abandoning the book for the more immediate gratification of cinema and television' (Rumble, 1996: 6). Rumble argues that this shift is guided by 'a Gramscian urge to renew the intellectual mandate' (Rumble, 1996: 4). Recently, Patti has reiterated that Pasolini's cinema is inseparable from his previous poetry and novels. Patti argues that Pasolini appropriates cinema as an impetus to deal with two political issues of Gramsci's legacy, via the model of Dante's multilingualism. For Patti, this model works on both Pasolini's literature and his cinema, which are aimed at rethinking 'the representation of subordinate classes' in relation to other cultural models and at dealing with the question of how 'to fill the gap between national culture and social reality' (Patti, 2016: 97).

In general, these scholars recognise that the shift from literature to cinema renews Pasolini's political mandate. This militant engagement is fully internal to Pasolini's film production: the 'if, how and to what extent' his plots, characters and contents correspond to being 'the condition of necessity' amidst the struggle for political consent.[54] This basically brings about two fields of research in Pasolini studies: first, in the relationship between his cinema and the representation of the people without representation (Vighi, 2002; Rodhes, 2007; Caminati, 2007; Antonello, 2012). Two examples can be useful: Caminati pays attention to Pasolini's relationship with the Global South and post-colonial peoples, arguing that Pasolini represents Africa as a mythical refuge from capitalism and a utopia of pre-industrial and mystical values. He considers the representation of decolonised people as 'one of Pasolini's political and existential alternatives' (Caminati, 2007: 19). Rhodes shows how Pasolini's early

[53] Here, Rumble uses the term 'civil' as Moravia defined Pasolini a 'poeta civile', a poet for the people.

[54] 'The condition of necessity' is the relationship between technology, language and common sense for Gramsci: 'Given all this, the question of language in general and of languages in the technical sense must be put in the forefront of our enquiry. What the pragmatists wrote about this question merits re-examination' (SPN: 663). 'If it is true that every language contains the elements of a conception of the world and of a culture, it could also be true that from anyone's language one can assess the greater or lesser complexity of his conception of the world' (SPN, 629). This 'condition of necessity' is also, for Gramsci, the name of the 'historical bloc' determining the macrocosm and microcosm of the political field: 'Structures and superstructures form an "historical bloc". That is to say the complex, contradictory and discordant ensemble of the superstructures is the reflection of the ensemble of the social relations of production' (SPN, 690). 'Man is to be conceived as an historical bloc [of] purely individual and subjective elements and of mass and objective or material elements with which the individual is in an active relationship' (SPN, 681).

cinema represents the peripheries of Rome, their environments, and their sub-proletarians to represent the poor condition of those who are embedded in the social and economic contradictions of capitalism (Rhodes, 2007: 22). In short, Pasolini seems to reconceptualise Gramsci's legacy by looking at the underclasses of the world, which are 'the highly productive and highly problematic political project' of his cinema (Casarino, 2010: 678).

The second field is the emergence of the specific contents of Pasolini's cinema through the lens of the everchanging relationship between culture and reality: for example, the role of feminism (De Lauretis, 1984); the relevance of sexuality (Ravetto, 2003); the exaltation of the body (Benini, 2016); the attention to adolescence (Bondavalli, 2014); and references to gender and to a queer condition (Humphrey, 2020). Pasolini's cinema becomes an encyclopaedia of a variety of forms of modern and postmodern subjectivities (Gordon, 1997). For example, Benini says that the body is at the centre of Pasolini's cinema, 'a world where bodies themselves speak' (Benini, 2016: 97) and where the subversive representation of the body unhinges social control. Likewise, Humphrey exalts Pasolini's cinema because it reveals the queer roots of Western civilizations. For Humphrey, this standpoint allows viewers to empathise and to understand the queer perspective because Pasolini's cinema 'creates a queer spectatorial experience' (Humphrey, 2020: 97). In addition, some scholars speak of Pasolini's militant impact on the present through a canonisation of his person (Pacchioni, 2008), as well as of the intimate, incarnated, and militant revolt of his life (Bazzocchi, 2006; Antonello, 2012; Felice, 2016). [55]

While embracing these interpretations, this study nevertheless follows another path. It argues that Pasolini's cinematic turn is due to a breakthrough in his militant engagement and his awareness of the potential of cinema to change his own theoretical approach. Through cinema, Pasolini breaks away from not only his relationship with official

[55] Gramsci's political theory teaches Pasolini how the dominant class produces dominant techniques and ideas in which individuals play and modify this language by reproducing it within a cultural framework, allowing them to recognise themselves as belonging to a certain culture. In this light, technical language becomes a battlefield in which individuals compete with and enrich the cultural framework as well. 'Language changes with the transformation of the entire civilisation, through the emergence of new classes in the culture, through the hegemony exercised by one national language on others etc., and takes up precisely metaphorical words of previous civilisations and cultures.' The new 'metaphorical' meaning is infused by the diffusion of the new culture, which in addition also creates brand-new words or borrows from other languages with precise meanings, that is, without the extensive meaning that they had in the original languages (SPN, 451).

Marxism, but also with the aims of Gramsci's legacy. If Pasolini's cinema follows Gramsci's legacy, it must be the result of the concept of the 'national-popular', Gramsci's term noting his interest in the inclusion of the masses in political and cultural discourse. However, although marginalised groups are the cinematic subjects of his first films, Pasolini's cinema does not look at the emancipation of these subjects, but rather at their exclusion. Although Pasolini himself calls his early films 'national-popular', it is evident that he never associates his film production with the struggle to inspire political consensus among the masses. On the contrary, his early films concern the end of any political role among the masses: Vittorio in *Accattone (*1961) and Stracci in *La ricotta* (1962) die, and *Mamma Roma* (1962) and *Comizi d'amore* (1964) reveal the ambiguity of the life of the masses caught between ignorance and conformist dreams. Hence, Pasolini's early films already reveal his cinematic way of commenting on political and social contingencies rather than of simply telling stories.

If the rise of neocapitalism spreads a low degree of the perception of reality, but also if it is neocapitalism's very guiding language that is both *national-popular* and *organic* in pedagogically educating and normalising people, then Pasolini's relationship with Gramsci's legacy can only become contradictory. Pasolini says: 'Presumably, in the future, there will be only a radicalization of the struggle between communication and expressiveness typical, for that matter, of every language' (HE: 20). 'The struggle now is for expressiveness, cost what it may' (HE: 40). The strategy must be changed: cinema must be able to express something else: the hegemonic functioning of neocapitalism's guiding language; those parts of reality which are excluded from and not integrated on the screen; a wider perception of reality.

As a result, this entails that Pasolini's political purpose is never aimed at the emergence of a political subjectivity, but always at what capitalism excludes. In this way, the originality of Pasolini's cinema always represents the political reality of a contingent social moment in which the successes of the changing nature of capitalism are eliminating parts of reality – for example, the rural and sub-proletarian masses, which are reduced to neocapitalism's values and meanings – and are imposing a renewal of the struggle for Marxism. From this perspective the early films, from *Accattone* (1961) to *The Gospel According to St Matthew* (1964), are already emblematic and paradigmatic of what this study will reveal as the core of Pasolini's political theory: to put at the centre of the screen the contingency of what is excluded, forgotten, and denied by the

changing nature of capitalism. That Pasolini continues to change profilmic content stresses the fact that he wants his cinema to face and counteract the mutable selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language as well as the changing nature of capitalism.

In a way, Pasolini's militant engagement may already be defined as anticapitalist, fully cinematic, and new. Significantly, Pasolini argues that audio-visual images can directly show both what is excluded by the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language and those 'real things' which imply new political theorising. Pasolini lists a series of 'excluded images' of his time: the disappointed young of East-European countries in which the revolutionary dream has sunk under Stalinism; the intensified social and political needs of the Global South and black Americans; the provocation of the body of a female, a homosexual or a poor person (HE: 159). As a result, the task of his militant engagement is to fight the process. He says: 'The "commitment", that is, the awareness of all this, is the mediation between (natural) confrontation and (conscious) revolution, between absolute ambiguity and relative ambiguity, between enigma and prophecy. The revolution, then, is made with action; and so, if anything, the semiotic possibilities of the semiological picture of human communication are to be enlarged to also include, piously, the example of life' (HE: 161).

However, it is, above all, the discovery of the potential of cinema that brings about Pasolini's cinematic turn and his engagement in producing a cinema theory that changes the relationship between him and Gramsci, ultimately freeing him from Gramsci's legacy. The problem is no longer the mandate of the intellectual, or communication with the masses, but the foundation of the potential for the language of cinema, which now 'seems to be founded on nothing at all' (HE: 167), having no 'immediate philosophical legitimacy as [a] political instrument' (HE: 167). As a result, Pasolini explains the task of his cinema theory in light of his political theory. If, on the one hand, he argues that cinema has to be compared to literary languages as a political language (HE: 167)[56], on the other cinema shows itself to offer a highly expressive language capable of imagining

[56] 'I believe that it is no longer possible to begin to discuss cinema as an expressive language without at least taking into consideration the terminology of semiotics. Quite simply the problem is this: while literary languages base their poetry on the institutionalized premise of usable instrumentalized languages, the common possession of all speakers, cinematographic languages seem to be founded on nothing at all: they do not have as a real premise any communicative language. Literary languages thus have an immediate legitimacy as instruments (pure and simple instruments), which do, in fact, serve to communicate. Cinematographic communication would instead seem to be arbitrary and aberrant, without the concrete instrumental precedents which are normally used by all' (HE: 167).

an infinite dictionary of images and of communicating the written language reality. Therefore, Pasolini's cinematic turn becomes the starting point for recognising his trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics. The framework of the struggle, but also its virtual conditions, are determined and located within the complexity of audio-visual language and its own different forms of imagery, communication, and expression. This is why Pasolini is creating a new cinema theory alongside his film production. It is necessary to produce not only a political cinema, but above all a theoretical apparatus able to support it.

1.5.2 Pasolini's cinematic turn as a breakthrough for his militant engagement and for his theoretical approach

To best articulate Pasolini's cinematic turn as a trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics and to develop his attention to the political problem of the conditions for the renewal of Marxism, one can refer to what Pasolini, in an often-cited interview with Stack, says:

> 'At first, I thought the shift from literature to cinema simply involved a change of technique, as I have often changed techniques. Then gradually, as I worked in the cinema and got more and more into it, I came to understand that cinema is not a literary technique, it is a language of its own.… So I came to the idea that the language of the cinema is not a national language; it is a language I like to define as 'transnational' and 'transclass'…. Then gradually I realised that [cinema] had taken the form of a great love for physical, sexual, objectual [*oggettuale*], existential reality around me…. By studying the cinema as a system of signs, I came to the conclusion that it is a non-conventional and non-symbolic language, unlike the written or spoken language, and expresses reality not through symbols but via reality itself…. So in practice the cinema was an explosion of my philosophical and reverential love for reality' (Stack, 1969: 28-29, 40).

In my view, this quotation explores the political meaning of Pasolini's cinema theory and justifies his cinematic turn. The filmmaker lets us know step by step why his choice of making films is to be assessed as a breakthrough for his militant engagement and for his theoretical approach. First, he admits having considered cinema only as a change of technique. He explicitly says: 'I have often changed techniques' and seems to imply 'though I never changed my theoretical framework'.

This claim might support and illustrate a continuity of his militant engagement. But second, Pasolini adds that he has gradually identified how cinema is not a technique, but a language. Clearly such a proposition helps reiterate a point of this study: that Pasolini

is aware that audio-visual technology produces not only a medium through which people are entertained, it is also a new catalytic instrument to enable perception and understanding, education and the manipulation of reality. With this awareness, Pasolini claims that an anthropological mutation is involved in the linguistic transformation of society. Pasolini's cinematic turn can be assumed to be both his acceptance of the power of neocapitalism's guiding language and his way to be part of this revolutionary event. Hence, he recognises 'cinema is a language' that does not simply replace literary with audio-visual language, but also develops Marxism's cinematographic capacity to change the struggle and itself. This stems from the following claims.

First, Pasolini realises that audio-visual language is a common system of signs 'for a worker or a bourgeois, a Ghanaian or an American' (Stack, 1969: 28). To give an example, in *Heretical Empiricism*, Pasolini vividly remarks that the proliferation of spies and cowboys in blockbusters on the screen marks the rise of 'the common dreams of managers and workers, technocrats and technicians' alike (HE: 124). Blockbusters, advertising, and television are already aimed at reducing the political potential of audio-visual language to an abstract interclassism and universalism that perfectly correspond with the gentrification of the masses and the proletarianisation of the old bourgeoisie. However, conceiving audio-visual language as transnational and trans-classist (there is an emphasis here on the different meanings of the prefixes 'trans' and 'inter') allows Pasolini to manifest breaking away from the previous aims of Marxism in Italy and from neocapitalism's guiding language. On the one hand, a filmmaker can be neither 'national-popular' (HE: 55) nor an organic intellectual for the national masses because of the disappearance of local and national traditions (HE: 124). On the other hand, while neocapitalism prefigures a world made linguistically unitary and socially levelled on the screen, Pasolini argues that it is necessary to go beyond (trans) in order to deal cinematically with the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language. In this way, the theoretical evolution of his militant engagement is to be related to the following aim: to offer a wider perception of reality beyond interclassism and universalism. This brings out the issue of the political role of Pasolini's ontology, semiology and semiotics of cinema, as discussed in succeeding chapters.

Second, Pasolini asserts that audio-visual language is not conventional, is not symbolic, is not arbitrary, and of course it is not national. Audio-visual language directly expresses reality through the figures, actions, and objects of reality. This anticipates Pasolini's

most famous, and long-despised, semiological conception of the language of cinema (audio-visual language) as the written language of reality. And this foresees that the aim of a wider perception of reality results in those realities which are beyond neocapitalism and the perception of reality spread by its guiding language. This study will deal very broadly with the complex and contradictory role of the relationship between cinema and reality in the next chapters. For the moment, it is important to note that audio-visual language as the common systems of signs as well as the direct expression of reality is for Pasolini surprisingly prone to trans-classist and transnational language. As a result, a twofold acceptance of learning and appropriating a new guiding language necessarily also entails a new commitment: to the struggle between the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language – sectarian, conformist and normative – and the search for showing what is excluded, forgotten and denied by the changing nature of capitalism.

This justifies the impetus of Pasolini's last statement. Cinema allows him to live and to apply his philosophy better than official Marxism. Pasolini can always remain at the level of reality, right inside reality, his cinema like an explosion of philosophical love for reality (Stack, 1969: 40). This impetus endures in Pasolini's thinking about cinema. He has several times asserted it in *Heretical Empiricism* – and has reiterated it in one of his book interviews in 1969, reprising it in 1975; it is also published posthumously (Duflot,1982). While not being a philosopher, Pasolini in his cinematic turn aims to live 'according to my philosophy' (HE: 132). This means living 'physically at the level of reality without the magico-symbolic interruption produced by the system of linguistic signs' (HE: 225). Therefore, the steps of this quotation enable the understanding that there is a philosophy implied in cinematic language. What Pasolini calls 'his philosophy', which this study intends to confirm, is the trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics. The emphasis on his love for reality and living at the level of reality is to be associated with the trans-classist and transnational language of his cinema, which shows realities outside capitalism in order to offer a wider perception of reality. This means that for Pasolini, Marxism's renewal is never the individuation of a political subjectivity, but the affirmation of a radical anticapitalism that always requires knowledge of the changing nature of capitalism and a vision of what remains of reality.

It is now clear that Pasolini's cinematic turn abandons official Marxism, even though Pasolini several times declares himself a Marxist. But what does it mean and entail, this

abandonment? And what does it mean that Pasolini remained Marxist? The answers may stand inside the relationship between his film production and his cinema theory. 'To remain Marxist' is not only an act of resistance, but also a creative and theoretical use of cinema as political theory. To reiterate, Pasolini argues (a) that Marxism was the only ideology that protects us from the loss of reality; and (b) that the language of cinema is the only language that allows us to live at the level of reality. Therefore, Marxism's renewal had to be argued and integrated with Pasolini's cinema in light of the aim of a wider perception of reality. This perception stems from living at the level of reality, i.e. at the level of the continued variation of society through which the changing nature of capitalism includes and simultaneously excludes parts of reality. The following question results: how, why and under which conditions is the language of cinema able to protect people from neocapitalism through a wider perception of reality? This is the beginning of a cinema theory in which cinema and Marxism are connected.

However, because of his creative disorganization (Gordon, 1997), Pasolini's theorising is dispersed in his essays and films and is a contamination of contradictory moments and inconsistencies; it is also a conceptually incomplete work, whose systematicity and consistency, according to Pasolini himself, is fully to be entrusted to the singular interpretation of reader. To resolve these shortcomings, some scholars have provided original perspectives on Pasolini's work through the lens of prominent twentieth-century philosophers.[57] With this perspective, the next chapter looks at Deleuze's interpretation of Pasolini. In my view, it is extremely intriguing and fascinating that Deleuze was one of the most influential defenders of Pasolini's cinema theory against a formidable coalition of opponents (Sitney, 2015: 16). Deleuze encounters Pasolini not only because they stand on the same philosophical side – they are critics of official Marxism, full of doubts on Structuralism, far from an academic and conventional theorisation and searching for the renewal of thought – but also because both understand the theoretical potential of cinema. There is no doubt that Deleuze was the first scholar to take seriously Pasolini's theorising and conceptualisation. Hence, Deleuze offers us a method. Deleuze conceptualises a trans-disciplinary encounter between philosophy and cinema in which 'he presumes the conditions of possibility for dissent and discord'

[57] These scholars have focused on some of Pasolini's theoretical aims through the lenses of Adorno and Lacan (Vighi, 2003, 2012; Chiesa, 2011), Althusser (Hamza, 2016), and Barthes and Foucault (Bondavalli, 2007, 2015; Righi, 2011; Brisolin, 2011). These studies, which look generally at Pasolini as novelist and poet, associate and emphasize Pasolini's obsessive need to fight against the totalising power of modern times and his search for the residual possibility of freedom for the individual subject.

(Shapiro, 2013: 2). Deleuze teaches us that one can extract philosophical problems from cinematic theory and images as well as from a philosophical text. By following Deleuze, this study now proposes the basis for a theoretical reconstruction of Pasolini's cinema theory (and his film production) as entailing the conditions for Marxism's renewal. As a result, chapter 2 considers Deleuze's books on cinema to best articulate Pasolini's theorising. Among the most notable filmmakers towards whom Deleuze points is Pasolini. Deleuze's interpretation will be extremely productive, but also highly problematic. While Deleuze seems to look at Pasolini as someone without clear political aims, he nevertheless allows us to understand Pasolini's urgency related to an ontology, a semiology and a semiotics of cinema in favour of Marxism's renewal.

1.6 An example of Pasolini's cinematic turn as breakthrough and theoretical evolution

The short film *La ricotta* (1962) can already be considered a good example of Pasolini's cinematic turn as breakthrough and theoretical evolution. It is among his early films, but it is clearly emblematic and paradigmatic of 'his philosophy'. Later, this study will come back to *La ricotta* in order to recognise how audio-visual language and techniques allow us to extract a political theory from Pasolini's cinema theory.[58] For the moment, it is enough to identify how Pasolini, already in 1962, brings out the two fundamental issues of the trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics in light of the rise of neocapitalism: first, the struggle against the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language; second, the search for a wider perception of reality.

La ricotta is a short black and white film about the filmset of a Hollywood blockbuster whose subject is the passion of Jesus Christ. Orson Welles, who plays himself, plays the role of the director of this blockbuster. The set and the scenes of the film of Jesus are always filmed by Pasolini in Technicolor and in the manner of many Hollywood biblical blockbusters of that time. Through the opposition of 'black and white' and 'Technicolor and then of the passion of Stracci and of Christ, Pasolini cinematically composes a political battlefield between two different degrees of perception of reality: the singularity of a social contingent and the ideological selectivity of neocapitalism's

[58] Fraser contributes to this study by showing a way to apply political concepts to selected films. He focuses on the theoretical concepts and assesses their efficacy in understanding a film. This further enhances 'the development of the approaches to political theory and cinema' (Fraser, 2018: 2).

guiding language. To denounce by analogy the selectivity of the cinematic language of Hollywood blockbusters, Pasolini reproduces in Technicolor on the screen two famous mannerist paintings: the Deposition of Christ by Rosso Fiorentino (1521) and the Transportation of Christ by Pontormo (1528). Through these paintings, Pasolini wants to identify how Hollywood language recreates the shapes of sacred iconography because these shapes were easily recognisable by audiences and were a sure source of commercial and popular success.

Instead, the philosophical (and ontological) centre of the film *La ricotta* is an interview with Orson Welles as director of the Hollywood blockbuster about the passion of Jesus Christ. Pasolini lets Orson Welles give his own aesthetic and political judgement about neocapitalism's guiding language through a poem written on 10 June 1962. Orson Welles says: 'monstrous the human being born from the bowels of a dead woman'. The ontological basis of this programmatic sentence will become clear in chapter 3. The reference is to the political use of the language of cinema. The selectivity of blockbusters is monstrous as well as the mannerism of Rosso Fiorentino and Pontormo because both are devoid of reality. So, while the dead woman is the reality killed by the selectivity of the blockbuster, a blockbuster's characters, issues and contents are politically monstrous insofar as they are only ideological.

The real political protagonist of *La ricotta* is the life, in black and white, of Stracci. Stracci is a marginal individual – a poor and hungry extra engaged for the blockbuster to play the role of the good thief in a film about the passion of Christ. Of course, Stracci plays himself through Pasolini's aesthetic choice of nonprofessional and sub-proletarian actors. And he is always filmed in black and white by Pasolini. Many extreme close-ups of his face present his condition of chronic hunger due to his marginalised condition. *La ricotta* films the set of the crucifixion, but Stracci really dies. His death is caused by his chronic hunger and then having eaten a complete wheel of ricotta cheese and a quantity of food left on set. It is at this point that eventually the two films become one. In the last scene of *La ricotta*, the director (Orson Welles) – now in black and white – remarks: 'Poor Stracci!! He had to die to remind us that he, too, was, alive.' Therefore, on the cross, who dies is Stracci in black and white, not Jesus in Technicolor. In this way, Pasolini politically reveals the end of the urban marginalised masses, implying a harsh criticism of Marxist intellectuals and the Italian Communist Party. Despite this, Pasolini cinematically demonstrates his political theory for Marxism concerning the struggle

against the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language. By elevating the inhuman condition of Stracci to the truth of the screen, to the beauty of cinema, and to the sympathy of viewers,[59] Pasolini produces an encounter with another reality and another politics.

[59] To define the relationship between cinema and politics, for Panagia, the concept of sympathy is fundamental. For him, political theory relates to cinema in that it reveals conditions for 'the uncommon sense' if and only if the sympathy of the viewer is an experience of discontinuity from the traditional paths of perception (Panagia, 2015: 18). As noted, this conception of sympathy is very close to Pasolini's argument about the political importance of the sympathy of the viewer.

CHAPTER 2

PASOLINI'S CINEMA THEORY THROUGH THE LENS OF DELEUZE'S PHILOSOPHY OF CINEMA

> 'The mute porter, as pure image, what is he? He is the aesthetic idea that a bourgeois has of a porter, who has nothing in common with that porter. Conversely, the porter who speaks of dialectics is apocryphal and a pretext; he, too, is at the service of a bourgeois who has little in common with him. That is, between a bourgeois and a porter there can only be a tie of human sympathy, that is to say, canine sympathy. We bourgeois are all racists. Now, I don't wish to be such. And I want the porter to be a porter; that is, I want him to be neither an image which pleases me nor the spokesman of my philosophy. The porter of cinema is the same porter of reality, then, and because cinema is an audio-visual technique, the porter of cinema appears and speaks as in reality. But the porter of a film? Cinema is an infinite sequence shot—I have already said dozens of times—it is the ideal and virtual reproduction made possible by an invisible camera which reproduces as such all the gestures, the actions, the words of a man from his birth to his death. The porter of a film—as opposed to the porter of cinema, who is a living porter—is a dead porter.' (HE: 245)

> 'In a title I have defined cinema [*not a film*] as the "written language of reality." And I meant that: reality is a cinema in nature (I act out myself for you, you act out yourself for me. I am a shot for Apra an Apra is a shot for me: two fixed shots, now that we are sitting, but which can become sequence shots or a pan when we get up and once again resume the round of our actions). This cinema in nature which reality is is in effect a language ... it means that it is neither arbitrary nor symbolic; and therefore, it represents reality through reality.' (HE: 225)

> 'It is understood that the fusion or confusion between that code of reality and the code of cinema is never total or totally achieved. Why? Because cinema in concrete terms does not exist: in concrete terms only the "film" that I am looking at exists, and therefore I never forget completely that I am in the presence of a fiction of reality since it is a "reproduction".' (HE: 288)

Chapter 2 examines Pasolini's cinema theory (and his film production) through the lens of Deleuze's philosophy of cinema.[60] Among the most notable cinema theories towards which Deleuze points is Pasolini's.[61] Deleuze is the only prominent philosopher who looks positively at Pasolini's cinema theory – as well as seriously and literally – even though he reinterprets it in light of his own philosophy, and depoliticises it.[62] The nature of the relationship between Deleuze and Pasolini remains unclear within both Deleuze studies and Pasolini studies. As regards the literature on Pasolini, no previous study has investigated his work through the lens of Deleuze's writing. Despite numerous quotations of Pasolini in Deleuze's philosophy of cinema, the two most important monographs on Pasolini's cinema do not explore these quotations. Greene (1990) and Viano (1993) just take a few words here and there from Deleuze's texts and refer to his interest in Pasolini's ideas on the 'free indirect subjective'. In a recent work, *Pasolini Oggi. Fortuna internazionale e ricezione critica,* edited by Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, the Table of Contents presents two papers: 'Pasolini selon la France' (Libasci, 2016) and 'Appunti (con molti punti) per una ricezione di Pasolini nella filosofia contemporanea' – 'Notes for a Review of Pasolini in Contemporary Philosophy' (Fraccaroli 2016). But both studies completely ignore the relationship between Deleuze's writing and Pasolini's work.

In addition, while some scholars note this relationship, they do not focus on it and do not develop it. For example, Lazzarato refers to Pasolini's semiotics as connected to Deleuze, but he develops his argument through Guattari's semiotics (Lazzarato, 1996; 2015). Casarino considers Pasolini's interest in the Global South problem in light of Deleuze's concept of minority, but he does not focus on Deleuze's philosophy of cinema (Casarino, 2010). Virno and Hardt (2010), as Sitney (2015), Schwartz (2017), Ravetto (2006) and Esposito (2009), recognise Deleuze's endorsement of Pasolini, but refer to it only as a famous and relevant quotation and nothing else. Lastly, Paolucci (2006) refers

[60] This study uses the term 'Deleuze's philosophy of cinema' to define the encounter between film and philosophy within his fundamental texts on cinema: *Cinema1* (1986) and *Cinema2* (1989).
[61] Pasolini's films and essays on cinema are directly quoted by Deleuze 12 times in *Cinema1* and 44 times in *Cinema2*.
[62] Sitney lists many specialists and opponents of Pasolini's cinema theory both during his life and after his death: Eco, Barthes, Metz, Heath, Baldelli, Garroni, Bettetini, Costa, and Rhodes.
With regard to one of the most relevant of Pasolini's theories of cinema (on 'the written language of reality'), Deleuze writes: 'Pasolini's highly complex thesis is in danger of being misunderstood. Umberto Eco reproached him for his semiological naivete' ... but 'Pasolini seems to want to go still further than the semiologists: he wants cinema to be a language system' ... 'a universal language system' ... 'a descriptive science of reality' (Deleuze, 1989: 28).

to Deleuze's interpretation as the most famous and debated on Pasolini's semiotic thesis – that the language of cinema is the written language of reality – but he is most interested in understanding this thesis in the light of Eco's semiotics rather than in developing the relationship between Deleuze and Pasolini. Hence the specific objective of this chapter is to explore this uncharted territory by focusing on how Deleuze helps us best articulate Pasolini's cinema theory as something aimed at formulating the conditions for the renewal of Marxism. In my view, a systematic study aimed at reading these two authors concurrently should illustrate several research directions. Drawing them together suggests there is a need (1) to analyse the cinematic influence of Pasolini on Deleuze and understand where it comes from and why Deleuze focuses so much on Pasolini among all the directors and theorists of his time; (2) to clarify how Deleuze directly quotes, re-interprets, or manipulates Pasolini's cinema theory in order to recognise possible similar aims and different directions in Deleuze's and Pasolini's cinematic theories; and lastly (3) to derive from these resonances the diverse implications in both Pasolini and Deleuze of composing a trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and philosophy. To resolve the shortcomings of Pasolini's theorising, this study basically restricts its own task to point (3), drawing from Deleuze's remarks and questions about Pasolini's 'highly complex' cinema theory (Deleuze, 1989: 28) in order to derive conditions for his trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics. It takes inspiration from Deleuze to find a method of composing a theoretical reconstruction to show that Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre has been shaped by the problem of Marxism's renewal.

Despite the difficulties that a researcher faces in dealing with Deleuze's unusual and obscure philosophical style of writing,[63] in section 2.1 this study defines the choice to understand Pasolini through the lens of Deleuze's philosophy of cinema. This allows the identification of some methodological notes by Deleuze, which pose two fundamental questions: what theoretical problem is implied in Pasolini's cinema theory? And what is

[63] While Deleuze is commenting on another author, he tends to speak directly in the first person, and his text results in an exchange in which it is hard to distinguish Deleuze's philosophy from that of the one who is quoted. Pasolini's thinking does not come through an analytical reading of Deleuze, but rather through a singular creative intensity within the folds of his text. In the light of such difficulty, what is most interesting for the reader is that although this study follows Deleuze as the person who best grasps the coherence of Pasolini's theorising, it will also show how Deleuze depoliticises Pasolini's cinema theory.

the theoretical problem on which Pasolini's film production converges? Succeeding sections will then respond to these questions, showing not only how Deleuze captures Pasolini's fundamental thesis on cinema in great depth, but also illustrating how he avoids revealing their political meaning. In section 2.2, Deleuze helps us understand the importance of the perception of reality on the screen as a theoretical problem in Pasolini's cinema theory. Section 2.3 recognises how Deleuze identifies the concept of 'the outside' as the theorical problem on which Pasolini's film production converges, albeit Deleuze connects Pasolini's work with ethical and religious issues rather than with the conditions for a renewal of Marxism. In contrast with Deleuze's reading, this study considers the perception of the 'reality of the outside' as the best definition of the political core of Pasolini's cinema.

2.1 Towards a theoretical reconstruction of Pasolini's cinema: why Deleuze?

Despite the glaring differences between them,[64] Pasolini and Deleuze share a number of philosophical questions which are easy to identify even on a superficial reading and which suggest some clear resonances. Both work on cinema theory by speaking in the first person; both start from a variety of diverse intercessors rather than from the methodological rigour of particular cinema specialists; and both ask for interlocutors rather than interpreters. Further comparison is interesting and no less necessary. First, both realise that there is something to ask audio-visual language because cinema is in relationship with philosophy. For Pasolini, cinema can convey his philosophy of living at the level of reality. He writes: 'expressing myself through the language of cinema, I constantly remain within the bounds of reality' (HE: 225). Deleuze seems to set up a dialogue with Pasolini's words, when he affirms in the preface of *Cinema1* that 'the great directors of the cinema can be compared with thinkers' (Deleuze, 1986: XIV), because 'cinema is the condition of the upsurge of a new thinking image' (Deleuze,

[64]As is well known, Deleuze borrows Bergson's concepts of movement-image and time-image (Alliez, 1998) and applies them to the history and theory of cinema in order to produce a new image of thought (Flaxman, 2000; Bogue, 2003; Marrati 2008; Colman, 2011). He wants to identify how cinema shows that the movement of consciousness as well as of matter is an infinite set of images (Deamer, 2016: 6). The flowing of the cinematic images on the screen, for Deleuze, precisely realises this new image of thought: the end of the dualism between the physical movement of the external world and the psychic movement of consciousness (Angelucci, 2014: 313). From this starting point several scholars identify how Deleuze realises that cinema may be a vehicle that can return to us to a new conception of philosophy (Thomas, 2018: 121) – as the philosophy of the event (Zourabichvili, 2012); the philosophy of creativity (Hallward, 2006); and the philosophy of experimentation (Massumi, 2002). These new conceptions of philosophy clearly contradict Pasolini's aims, which look at cinema in the light of Marxism's renewal.

1986: 251). Second, both look for a semiotics of cinema through their common references to the American pragmatists. Pasolini refers to Morris's pragmatism (HE: 265; 281-82), while Deleuze addresses Peirce's pragmatism (Deleuze, 1989: 29-35); Pasolini also looks to Morris's semiotics to replace the presumed universalism of oral–written language with the language of cinema, in order to show how the latter is a trans-classist and transnational system of signs – comprising another possible political theory (HE: 265). Furthermore, Deleuze seems to infer his general aims from Pasolini's remarks by arguing that 'cinema and its theory of signs demands a new standpoint and a new rationale for philosophy' (Deleuze, 1986: XIV). Third, both think of cinema not only as a popular medium through which to express and communicate content, but as a means capable of positively supporting a new configuration of reality; this is linked to an ethical purpose by Deleuze – what he calls a 'belief in the World' (Deleuze, 1989: 172) – and one which for Pasolini has a political purpose, which he calls Marxism's renewal.

These resonances are incapsulated in the following quotations from *Cinema1* and *Cinema2*. In *Cinema1*, Deleuze writes that 'Pasolini looks for a new status for the cinematic image in order to express the modern world' (Deleuze, 1986: 75) 'in front of the modern necessity to replace the contiguity of relations of images with the relations of thought' (Deleuze, 1989: 174). In *Cinema2*, Deleuze reiterates that 'the author who became most committed to this theorematic direction was undoubtedly Pasolini' (Deleuze, 1989: 174).

To best understand and articulate the 'modernity' of Pasolini's cinema theory and film production for Deleuze, a brief summary is needed of Deleuze's distinction between classical and modern forms of cinema.[65] He argues that, while classical cinema

[65] For some prominent scholars (Badiou, 2000; Žižek, 2008; Zourabichvili, 2012), Deleuze's books on cinema are to be read in the light of reiterating and broadening his philosophical project that was already evident in *Difference and Repetition* and in *The logic of Sense*: his will in grounding a new image of thought. In this sense, they consider Deleuze as a classical and systematic thinker, with Deleuze encountering cinema precisely because cinema is more able to introduce movement to thought and to match 'real' movement than his preceding intercessors Hume, Spinoza, Lucretius, and Nietzsche. Indeed, for Deleuze, cinema shows clearly what he calls the plane of immanence in his previous work: it is not a representation, a concept, a method, but movement itself as a process of continual differentiation, the struggle–creation of forces and enchantment. Moreover, for Deleuze, cinema allows him to realise how these processes are related to a conception of time as the co-existence of virtual levels of time and as a labyrinth of possible times that go beyond the purely empirical succession of mental time as past–present–future (time-image).

produces films governed by a coherent, chronological, and cause–effect conceived plot, modern cinema is directly tied to the exploration of memory in the viewer by forcing us to pause and to think about what we are seeing on the screen (Deleuze, 1989: XI). This dichotomy between classical and modern cinema derives, in turn, from two contrasting and different statuses of the image. The first is what Deleuze calls the image-movement. This strictly subordinates the time of the image on the screen to the deterministic movement of the narrative (Deleuze, 1986: 56-66). The second is what Deleuze calls the time-image. This pauses the movement of the narrative to take the time to really perceive and think about what is on the screen (Deleuze, 1989: 1-18).

As a result, for Deleuze, the dichotomy between classical and modern cinema reveals several differences for the viewer. While classical cinema develops a kind of textual relationship between images and plots, modern cinema is aimed at provoking the relationship between images and the virtual and intimate memory of the viewer. While the cinematic sequences of classical cinema work like the alphabetical words of a literary text, modern cinematic images work like theoretical concepts in a philosophy. While the classical flow of movement-images promotes the perception of a deterministic vision of reality, modern flow is usually slowed or even interrupted by time-images which break into consistent and logical narratives in order to create a new way of thinking (Deleuze, 1989: 156-173). Deleuze expresses this difference in philosophical terms as well: while classical cinema is Kant-inspired by the search for the conditions for the common sense, modern cinema is post-Kantian and oriented by the search for the conditions of dissent.

Deleuze's attention to shifts in philosophical approaches to experience, both in history and in the present, leads him to infer how cinema presumes new conditions of possibility for human experience, and, in turn, to understand how modern cinema positively creates the conditions for 'believing in the world' and elaborating on 'the new'. He writes:

> 'Which, then, is the subtle way out? To believe, not in a different world, but in a link between man and the world, in love or life, to believe in this as in the impossible, the unthinkable, which none the less cannot but be thought. Something possible, otherwise I will suffocate. It is this belief that makes the unthought the specific power of thought, through the absurd, by virtue of the absurd' (Deleuze, 1989: 170).
>
> 'The modern fact is that we no longer believe in this world. We do not even believe in the events which happen to us, love, death, as if they only half concerned us. It is not we

> who make cinema; it is the world which looks to us like a bad film' (Deleuze, 1989: 172).

In this interpretive frame, Pasolini is linked by Deleuze to the context of modern forms of cinema and he is even defined as a post-Kantian director.[66] Differently from other scholars – who understand Pasolini's cinema in continuity with his previous background or who exalt his being archaic and anti-modern – Deleuze focuses on 'the new' in Pasolini's cinema. Likewise, differently from a critical tradition in Pasolini studies – those who blame Pasolini for naive theorising or meticulously listing the shortcomings of his theoretical approach and his 'extravagantly interdisciplinarity' (Viano, 1993: 21) – Deleuze develops the idea of creative disorganization in Pasolini's theorising and absorbs his conceptually incomplete work, offering a systematicity and consistency in it. In Deleuze's philosophy of cinema, Pasolini as a director is already a philosopher. Deleuze does not interpret Pasolini's cinematic content, but renders it as something that forces us to think. That is, Deleuze seeks to extract a conceptual apparatus from Pasolini's cinema theory and film production to develop new perspectives for our experience.

Deleuze's sense of the new and his philosophy of cinema help to best articulate how Pasolini's cinema creates the condition for a new theoretical approach to politics. He therefore contributes to an endorsement of this thesis: that Pasolini's cinematic turn is a breakthrough in his militant engagement, which has always been aimed at finding the conditions for the renewal of Marxism. Deleuze also offers a first methodological note to this study. It is to shift the interpretive attention from Pasolini's plots, characters, and facts to his cinema theory in order to understand how his conception of the image is a condition for political dissent and is to be identified as a breaking from the classical form of cinema (and from the common sense). In understanding Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre, this means inquiring (a) how his cinema theory allows his films to offer a wider

[66] To offer a definition of 'post-Kantian' in Deleuze, I refer to *Nietzsche and Philosophy*: 'They (post-Kantian) also condemned the survival, in Kant, of miraculous harmonies between terms that remain external to one another. With regard to such a principle of internal difference or determination they demanded grounds not only for the synthesis but for the reproduction of diversity in the synthesis as such. If Nietzsche belongs to the history of Kantianism it is because of the original way in which he deals with these post-Kantian demands. He turned synthesis into a synthesis of forces – for, if we fail to see synthesis in this way, we fail to recognise its sense, nature and content. He understood the synthesis of forces as the eternal return and thus found the reproduction of diversity at the heart of synthesis. He established the principle of synthesis, the will to power and determined this as the differential and genetic element of forces which directly confront one another' (Deleuze, 1983: 52). As explored in 2.3.1, it is notable that Deleuze links Pasolini to Nietzsche.

perception of reality; and (b) how his aim of a wider perception of reality is a condition for counteracting neocapitalism. Deleuze suggests another fundamental methodological note. He states, too, that Pasolini's film production – just as much as that of other prominent modern filmmakers (e.g., Hitchcock, Welles, Renoir, and Godard) – is to be understood through a theoretical problem on which everything converges in his cinema and by which his cinema is haunted (Deleuze, 1989: 175). This means, for Deleuze, a requirement to treat the potential of cinema as an interference between philosophy and film production, and analogously for this study, to look at the trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics (Shapiro, 2013: 71).

Therefore, for this study, the strength of Deleuze's interpretation of Pasolini lies in how he proposes two fundamental research directions through his reading of Pasolini's cinema theory: (a) what theoretical problem is implied in Pasolini's cinema theory? – this will be addressed in 2.2; and (b) what is the theoretical problem on which his film production converges? – addressed in 2.3. Deleuze responds through two concepts. The theoretical problem of Pasolini's cinema theory is the search for a 'solid perception' of reality on the screen. The theoretical problem on which Pasolini's film production converges is 'the outside', which is understood by Deleuze as an encounter with something that disrupts the habitual conditions of the common sense. These two concepts will create a perspective on Pasolini that orients this study towards a theoretical reconstruction of the trans-disciplinary encounter between his cinema and his political theory, even though Deleuze's interpretation is prone to depoliticise Pasolini's cinema by directly grafting it onto his own philosophy. As a result, although the analysis throughout this study positively endorses Deleuze's method and what his remarks imply about Pasolini's cinematic turn, instead the results of this chapter will show how the theoretical questions posed by Deleuze of Pasolini may be oriented to Marxism's renewal, a fact that Deleuze leaves out and forgets.

2.2 Pasolini in light of *Cinema1*: Deleuze's concept of the solid-perception image and political implications in Pasolini's cinema theory

This section poses one fundamental question starting from Deleuze's interpretation of Pasolini's cinema in *Cinema1*: what theoretical problem is implied in Pasolini's cinema theory and film production? Deleuze offers us a convincing answer: Pasolini intends to

create the cinematic conditions for a 'solid perception' of reality. While embracing Deleuze's definition of 'the solid-perception image' (Deleuze, 1986: 72) as a starting point from which to consider Pasolini's film production as mirroring a certain theoretical framework, 2.2.1 will be critical of the lack of political implications in Deleuze's references to Pasolini's essays on cinema. Deleuze makes Pasolini's 'solid perception' a question of style, referring to the concept of intentionality. Section 2.2.2 follows Pasolini's criticisms of the intentionality of such prominent directors as Antonioni, Bertolucci and Godard to pinpoint the political meaning of Pasolini's essays on cinema.[67]

Such criticisms will reveal that the cinematic and theoretical problem on which his philosophy converges is undoubtedly the aim of a wider perception of reality in the face of the selectivity of neocapitalism. This connects to an awareness of Pasolini's cinematic turn: how the language of cinema can protect the viewer against the loss of reality and result in a political theory in favour of Marxism's renewal.

2.2.1 The concept of the solid-perception image: Deleuze interprets Pasolini's cinema style

In *Cinema1*, by questioning the art of framing in modern cinema, Deleuze defines the perception-image as the first conceptual form of the image in the history of cinema. It is aimed at subordinating an image to its time, and the narrative to the thinking behind it. Deleuze identifies three differentiations of the status of the perception-image: solid, liquid, and gaseous (Deleuze, 1986: 72). These three forms of the perception-image are basically the first form of 'time-image' in the dawn of modern cinema, for Deleuze. They cause the collapse of narrative time and result in the shift from classical to modern cinema. Deleuze writes that the perception-image 'implies that cinema has reached an evolved state, having learned to mistrust the movement-image' (Deleuze, 1986: 76). This collapse starts to determine the philosophical nature of modern cinema, which prompts viewers to think about what they are seeing on the screen. According to Deleuze, it is the result of three kinds of framing that break into narrative time: (1)

[67] To clarify Pasolini's view on these directors, not only Antonioni and Godard are considered, as in Deleuze's text of *Cinema2*, but also Bertolucci, as in Pasolini's text. Deleuze never refers to Bertolucci in his *Cinema1* and *2*.

paying attention notably to a centre (the solid-perception image); (2) a series of privileged images that run through the narrative as a refrain (the liquid-perception image); and (3) the interaction of a continuing variation of images, which disrupts the very sense of the narrative (the gaseous-perception image). Deleuze connects this variety in the production of the perception-image to some directors, defining Pasolini as the main director of the solid-perception image; German Expressionism and the French School of Cinema as the first producers of the liquid-perception image; and the film production of the Soviet director Vertov as a complete realisation of the gaseous-perception image (Deleuze, 1986: 71-80).

Deleuze's work represents a very important validation of the historical and theoretical importance of Pasolini's cinema theory.[68] In discussing the concept of 'the solid-perception image', Deleuze refers to what Pasolini calls the 'free indirect subjective' as the main characteristic of his cinematic style (Deleuze, 1989: 76).[69] For Deleuze's philosophy of cinema, Pasolini's style is as innovative as it is problematic. Deleuze stresses the fact that Pasolini would have understood the perceptive relevance of the screen. During a film, our perception of reality is continuously reflected on the screen, which proposes it and determines it and causes us to think and determine ourselves in relation to reality (Deleuze, 1986: 74). Nevertheless, Deleuze argues that Pasolini gave too much importance to the intentionality of the director and that he remains entangled in the philosophical question of the crisis of the modern subject. This means, for Deleuze, that Pasolini pedagogically forces the viewer to think about what the director wants (Deleuze, 1986: 74). But also, Deleuze adds that the solid-perception image necessitates Pasolini's cinematic awareness. This entails that Pasolini does not think the

[68] See: 'In two crucial pages of *L'experience heretique*, pp. 146-7, Pasolini moves, with plenty of precautions, from the idea of internal monologue to that of free indirect discourse. In the first volume, free indirect discourse is a constant theme of Pasolini's, in his literary but also cinematographic reflection: what he calls 'the free indirect subjective' (Deleuze, 1989: 313).

[69] For Deleuze, the solid-perception image coincides with the free indirect subjective. In technical terms, the free indirect subjective is an image taken within an utterance (a character's vision), which itself depends on another image (the author's vision). The first one is the image on film, the second is the image of the author's thought. Free indirect subjectivity thus realises the presence of a point of view which frees perception from its own natural narrative flow by passing through the interplay between the thought of the director and the life of his own characters. The free indirect subjective is neither an objective nor a subjective framing, but a time-image. It reflects an idea, a concept, a thought, i.e., a certain philosophical framework. Thus, for Deleuze, the use of the free indirect subjective is the first historical and theoretical case of a modern form of cinema aimed at subordinating images to thinking, by making a vivid centre in the frame perceived by the viewer that is to be carefully seen, felt, and thought about. Deleuze describes the free indirect subjective as the core style of Pasolini's time-images, a result of his trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and philosophy.

cinematic image is an illusory copy of reality (Deleuze, 1986: 72), but a real perceptive encounter with the viewer.

What is already at stake for Deleuze is Pasolini's most famous, and long-despised, semiological conception of the language of cinema as the written language of reality, as seen in the succeeding section. For the moment, I follow Deleuze's remarks on the concept of the solid-perception image. Deleuze is right: Pasolini intentionally wants to use the screen in order to perceptively provoke something in the viewer.[70] Deleuze converges on the following cinematic and theoretical problem: how does Pasolini's style call the viewer to 'be with' the reality of the characters on the screen? (Deleuze, 1986: 74). Although Deleuze is sure that this 'being with' is the fruit of Pasolini's intentionality, Deleuze is not interested in inferring why Pasolini's films should force the viewer to perceive, see and think. Deleuze completely ignores Pasolini's political theory. It is precisely this lack which emerges from Deleuze's text, even when he sums up how 'Pasolini's style is a pure poetic consciousness', displayed to the 'lowest level of vulgarity and bestiality of reality' and 'animated by the mythical and sacralising elements' (Deleuze, 1986: 74).

This lack is clear when Deleuze explains the development of Pasolini's cinema theory regarding the problem of intentionality. In mentioning a long Pasolini reference to Antonioni's and Godard's cinema in *Heretical Empiricism* (Deleuze, 1989: 149), Deleuze notes that Pasolini cites Antonioni and Godard as examples of the free indirect subjective and of modern forms of cinema. In Deleuze's reading, Antonioni and Godard are, for him as well as for Pasolini, the main filmmakers who offered circumstances and images to best articulate the free indirect subjective as the style of the director. Deleuze is consequently focused on the core of their films, which well articulate the solid-perception of a number of new anthropological types: the neurotic man and the obsessive woman (Antonioni) and individuals who are ill as well as full of life (Godard).

In relation to Pasolini's reference to Antonioni and Godard, however, Deleuze leaves

[70] According to Peirce's classification, Deleuze defines Pasolini's free indirect subjective as a *dicent*, i.e., a sign whose aim is to focus our understanding on the existential features it employs in signifying an object and which is aimed at producing an effect in the interpreter.

out any reference to the reasons that Pasolini looks at the results of these two directors. While Deleuze exalts the free indirect subjective that gives rise to the cinematic self-consciousness of the director as the beginning of modern cinema, Pasolini in fact questions Antonioni's and Godard's style to harshly criticise their contributions to modern cinema. Of course, the task of this study is not to clarify the reasons for this discrepancy in Deleuze's texts. In contrast to Deleuze, however, this study does suggest an explanation of why Pasolini criticised Antonioni and Godard, an explanation that will contribute to a key political reading of Pasolini's cinema theory and orient us towards a deep sense of his cinematic turn and the core of his film production. Coming directly to Pasolini's text, this study will aim to show that Pasolini affirms that the free indirect subjective of Antonioni's and Godard's cinema is surely the mark of an aesthetic evolution of bourgeois taste, but within the internal revolution of capitalism: a new channel of cinematic distribution for the elite, which corresponds neither to Marxism's renewal nor to any other form of resistance to the changing nature of capitalism.

2.2.2 The political implication of the solid-perception image: Pasolini beyond Deleuze's interpretation

Pasolini's references to Antonioni, Godard, and also Bertolucci, come in two of his essays on cinema: 'The Cinema of Poetry' and 'The Fear of Naturalism'. In the essay, 'The Cinema of Poetry' (HE: 167-185), Pasolini analyses three films, one after another, to discuss the relationship between the free indirect subjective and the intentionality of the director: *Red Desert* by Antonioni, *Before the Revolution* by Bertolucci, and *Bande à part* by Godard. Pasolini suggests to us that the relationship between the free indirect subjective and the intentionality of the director may be politically significant. Here, it is clear that his interpretation is fully influenced by his militant engagement in favour of Marxism's renewal, particularly when related to the loss of reality within neocapitalism.[71]

Red Desert by Antonioni produces what Pasolini calls 'the cinema of substitution'. Pasolini's fundamental thesis is that Antonioni's free indirect subjective was only a pretext to show the reality seen with his own eyes. The perception of the characters gets

[71] It is clear that Pasolini's interpretation of these directors may be original as well as fully embodied within his militant engagement.

completely replaced by the neurotic perception of the director. As a result, for Pasolini, Antonioni's cinema is basically a metaphor for his bourgeois neurosis as well as a sublime form of cinematic aestheticism. As a result, while *Red Desert* is unmeaningful for the masses, it is surely significant for the problems of the bourgeoisie as portrayed on the screen. *Before the Revolution* by Bertolucci outlines what Pasolini calls 'the cinema of contamination'. Pasolini claims that Bertolucci's free indirect subjective merges the perception of reality of the film's characters with Bertolucci's mid-bourgeois, intimate and idealist life. For Pasolini, Bertolucci's cinema is thus a form of symbolic and formalistic cinema in which the images reflect the failure of revolutionary dreams, as well as an elegant form of cinematic romanticism. For this reason, it is politically insignificant, and appreciated by bourgeois audiences. *Bande à part* by Godard represents what Pasolini calls 'the cinema of the restoration of reality'. Pasolini asserts positively that Godard wants to return critically to the disintegration of the reality in which we live, but through characters who are sick, obsessive, and discordant as much as they are homologous to the changing nature of capitalism. For Pasolini, Godard's cinema is basically an ontological cinema capable of understanding the effects of the internal revolution of capitalism, but incapable of intervening against it.[72] This means that while Godard responds to the problem of the loss of reality, his sick characters present their bourgeois annihilation rather than develop positive forms of resistance to capitalism. As a result, *Bande à part* may certainly be shocking for bourgeois audiences, but it is politically weak and unsatisfactory for Marxism's renewal.

Therefore for Pasolini, replacing, contaminating, and restoring are three aesthetic functions of new cinematic and modern tastes. The most relevant issue, for this study, is that not one of these three operations solves the problem of the loss of reality as well as being a form of resistance to the changing nature of capitalism. According to Pasolini, Antonioni, Bertolucci and Godard are the best products of the internal revolution of capitalism and the new cinematic taste of the dominant classes of neocapitalism. The reasoning of Pasolini is clear: the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language finds its own high form of communication through the evolved state of modern cinema.

[72] This term is reprised in 2.3.2. The term 'ontology' will be understood as the descriptive science of reality. This science needs, for Pasolini, an adequate language, which is transnational and trans-classist and which was not, for Pasolini, produced by Godard.

Consistent with this, Pasolini affirms that on the one hand, Antonioni, Godard and Bertolucci surely give rise to a need for the renewal of a cinematic code, and a replacement of previous rules, 'a need for an irregular and provocative freedom'; but he claims that on the other hand they do not realise that their need responds to the tastes and values of a new audience homologous to the changing nature of capitalism.

Hence, returning to Deleuze's interpretation, Deleuze is right to argue that for Pasolini, the style of these directors, their intentionality, and their own use of the free indirect subjective are all signs of an aesthetic evolution of taste. However, Deleuze leaves out the idea that for Pasolini these are the upshot of neocapitalism's guiding language and its 'channel' of distribution for speaking with and of the elite, making cinema homologous to the new dominant classes.

In Pasolini's essay, 'The Fear of Naturalism' (HE: 244-246), this study finds further support to this argument. Pasolini still refers to Antonioni, Bertolucci and Godard. He polemically writes that if during the making of their films they reproduce a porter, they should use a non-professional actor in light of a certain sociological consciousness. They frame a real porter, a fact which surely illustrates their political interests in social issues. Yet Pasolini adds immediately and ironically that this porter would behave and speak as a neurotic man in a film of Antonioni, or that this porter would propose a debate about the political theory of Marx in a film of Bertolucci, or that this porter might even become a philosopher in a Godard production. This means not only that the image of the porter is in the hands of the intentionality of an author, but also that the clarification of any eventual political problem posed by a film would not strictly pertain to the porter himself, but to the director, because the director uses the porter to share an individual point of view with the audience.

Hence, Pasolini still stresses the fact that if the bourgeois audience is the new dominant cinema-going class, the political problems are those posed by and to this new dominant class. At the same time it means that interest in the conditions of the lower classes (in this case the condition of porter) necessitates the director always taking account of the bourgeois fear of dealing with the shocking and scandalous reality of the political problems of the lower classes. Therefore, Pasolini cites Antonioni, Bertolucci and Godard as examples of a form of modern cinema that is completely absorbed in

changing technological language and taste. In contrast to Deleuze's interpretation, this study reiterates that Pasolini reads the cultural emphasis of intellectuals and critics on the innovative and oppositive use of the free indirect subjective not as a form of political resistance, but as a mark of 'the internal revolution of capitalism', which develops its own new tastes within neocapitalism's guiding language.

From this perspective, returning to the choice of a nonprofessional actor, Pasolini adds significantly that it is a pretext at the service of 'the aesthetic idea that a bourgeois has of a porter, who has nothing in common with that porter', adding, 'I don't wish to be such. And I want the porter to be a porter' (HE: 245). In the light of his cinematic turn, for this study, it is worth highlighting this programmatic claim. Pasolini writes: 'I want the porter to be a porter' and in my view, this encapsulates the style of Pasolini's solid-perception image. Having illustrated Pasolini's criticism against Antonioni, Bertolucci and Godard, but still looking at Pasolini through the lens of Deleuze's philosophy of cinema, it is clear what is to be perceived and thought by the viewer. In saying 'I want the porter to be a porter', Pasolini reveals a cinema theory that reflects on screen a reality that is alternative to the tastes of the internal revolution of capitalism and filmed as the subject of a trans-classist and transnational language of cinema. For the moment, this study points out that Deleuze does not grasp Pasolini's intentionality just as he does not fully understand his militant engagement. This suggests broadening the cinematic and theoretical problem on which Pasolini's philosophy converges. It is not only about calling viewers to 'be with' the reality of characters on the screen, as Deleuze says. Pasolini is looking for a 'being with' which may be non-homologous to the internal revolution of capitalism, in order for us to think about and determine reality in a manner non-consonant with – and beyond – the changing nature of capitalism.

This results in a direct relationship between Pasolini's solid-perception image and his political theory, as seen in chapter 3. For now, the following thesis is proposed: Pasolini rejects a view of modern cinema that ends up in being homologous to capitalism. If directors are to be understood politically, and if they are to be socially motivated to work against capitalism in light of Marxism, then their intentionality has to be differently oriented from the bourgeois and mainstream tastes of the audiences. This will undoubtedly bring a cinematic awareness connected to a wider perception of reality and to what is outside capitalism. So, in 2.3, through the concept of 'the outside', it is

still Deleuze that orients this study. However, the concept of the outside will be redefined in light of Pasolini's political theory. While for Deleuze Pasolini's cinema addresses the universal and poetic sacralising of any bestiality and vulgarity of reality – reality is thus sacred, mystical, religious – this study argues that Pasolini's cinema must politically reveal what elements of reality are outside capitalism in order to resist the changing nature of capitalism. It must portray the reality of what is excluded, denied, or forgotten by capitalism.

2.3 Pasolini in light of *Cinema2*: Deleuze's concept of the outside and the ontological horizon of Pasolini's cinema

This section looks at Deleuze's *Cinema2* to develop the theoretical problem on which Pasolini's film production converges. The argument is that Deleuze's interpretation of Pasolini's semiological thesis – that the language of cinema is the written language of reality – allows the identification of the political core of Pasolini's cinema theory and outlines the ontological horizons of it. And while again noting that Deleuze's interpretation leaves the political meaning out of Pasolini's cinema theory, yet by endorsing his deep reading of Pasolini and the category of 'the outside' as the main impetus of his cinematic oeuvre, 2.3.1 describes how such a concept affords a definition of the subject of a trans-classist and transnational language.

Pasolini's cinema theory aims to organise a solid-perception image capable of showing the reality of what is external to the selectivity of neocapitalism through a form of cinema capable of rigorously deducing a wider perception of reality beyond the new tastes and language of the dominant classes. Furthermore, as is increasingly evident, Pasolini's cinematic turn is aimed at protecting viewers from the loss of reality and at counteracting neocapitalism. Thus 2.3.2 looks at how the category of the outside poses a fundamental question for Pasolini's film production: what vision of reality can be deduced from his cinematic oeuvre? An awareness of this ontology will be the starting point of chapter 3 and inform the foundation of what is defined as 'the cinema of the outside' and its direct relationship to Marxism's renewal.

2.3.1 Deleuze's concept of the outside as the definition of the political core of Pasolini's cinema theory

In *Cinema2*, Deleuze explores and identifies how the concept of the time-image enables a modern cinema fully committed 'to think in images' (Deleuze, 1989: 174). According to Deleuze, by pausing the flow of the filmic plot, the time-image forces the viewer to accept the co-existence of film images – including present and past and even virtual mental images – so that the viewer can explore, develop and create new synapses, connections, and thoughts. This function of the time-image, for Deleuze, occurs as the result of two different experiences in the viewer. The first experience is when the viewer discovers something perceptively intolerable on the screen; the second is when the viewer imagines something new on the screen. The time-image is 'a shock for the gaze' (Deleuze, 1989: 169-170) to the point where it transforms the viewer into a seer in the arms of their dreams and fantasies as well as their worries and nightmares. As a result, for Deleuze, the main effect of modern cinema is to enable the imagining of the unperceived and the unthought. Deleuze conceptualises this cinematic role through the notion of 'the outside' (Deleuze, 1989: 174), where the central core of the film is not understood through the narrative flow of images, but through the individual and collective effects and connections that are explored, developed, and even created 'by [the] viewer's gaze and brain' (Deleuze, 1989: 175).

Thus, the outside is the place of the relationship between cinema and its audiences, as well as between the images and their meaning. Many modern films compel viewers to give up the logic of narrative flow; however, this requires to them to work out what problems might be represented on the screen. Deleuze adds that the more these effects and questions occur automatically, that is, without the clear intentionality of the director, the more philosophical matching between viewer and screen, and brain and images, is achieved. This means that the best modern cinema inspires viewers to explore not only the limits of intimate memory, but even of pure memory, which for Deleuze 'is not a psychological state or a consciousness: it exists outside of consciousness, in time' (Deleuze, 1989: 80).[73]

[73] The complexity of these claims has been widely discussed in recent years by several scholars of Deleuze (Bogue, 2003; Angelucci, 2014; Deamer, 2016; and Thomas, 2018). It is not the task of this thesis either to develop these intriguing debates on Deleuze's philosophy of cinema or to discuss those directors who are loved by Deleuze for their modern cinema.

What is important to stress for this study is that Deleuze refers to the concept of the outside in order to identify the theoretical problem on which Pasolini's film production converges and to make sense of his style and insert it into the Gotha of great modern cinema.[74] According to Deleuze, Pasolini's relevance in the history of cinema is related to the extent to which he can bring about both responses in the viewer. For Deleuze, Pasolini's intentionality is caught, even haunted, by the relationship between cinema and reality (Deleuze, 1989: 174), a fact that is also stressed by Pasolini's semiological thesis that the language of cinema is the written language of reality. Deleuze links this thesis with the concept of the outside, in the section 'Thought and Cinema' (Deleuze, 1989: 156-173).[75] From this perspective, for Deleuze, Pasolini's intentions are essentially pedagogical. His films force viewers to deduce problems and perceive new realities. Deleuze associates Pasolini's style with what he defines as the mathematical outside. The outside is mathematical in two ways: (a) it forces the viewer to rigorously deduce an issue; (b) it forces the viewer to pay attention to a particular subject. With this perspective, for Deleuze, Pasolini's style rigorously forces viewers to deduce the problematic relationship between cinema and reality.

In following and endorsing Deleuze's reading of Pasolini's cinema, it seems that Deleuze is right to argue that Pasolini sees a problematic relationship between image and reality and uses cinema to reveal it. In addition, Deleuze is right that Pasolini's cinema is pedagogical and in favour of the viewer; that Pasolini wants to push the viewer to perceive reality; and that this aim runs through his whole film production. However, it is crucial to highlight that Deleuze ignores Pasolini's political theory. This discrepancy clearly emerges in Deleuze's text. When Deleuze finally poses the question of why Pasolini wants to make the viewer think about what is on the screen, his response is highly problematic. Deleuze understands Pasolini's style from his

[74] Of course, for Deleuze, Pasolini's cinema is an early form of modern cinema. Pasolini's 'thinking in images' does not occur automatically, but always through the intentionality of the director. And consequently, the notion of the outside is always subject to the style of director and what they want the viewer to perceive of reality.

[75] Deleuze explains the notion of the outside through three differentiations: what he calls the mathematical outside, in which the relationship between cinema and thought is achieved through a truly mathematical and deductive rigour on the part of the viewer (Deleuze, 1989: 174); what he calls the existential outside, in which the relationship between cinema and thought gives rise to the viewer's reflection on the modes of existence (Deleuze, 1989: 177); and what he calls the automatic outside, in which the relationship between cinema and thought expresses the intuition of something which is inexplicable and incommensurable (Deleuze, 1989: 182).

idiosyncratic lifestyle. There is no reference to Marxism nor to political engagement. Deleuze speaks of Pasolini's intimate revolt against Italian Catholicism and his cinema as developing rigorous deduction through its use of images that enable the perception of a reality beyond the traditions of Catholicism. He argues that Pasolini gives up religious moralism in order to replace it with radical atheist ethics (Deleuze, 1989: 176). From this perspective, Deleuze understands Pasolini in ethical terms: Pasolini's cinema is a universal and poetic sacralising of any bestiality and vulgarity within reality, which in turn fights religious moralism.

Deleuze's reading is really intriguing not only in what it says, but also in what it doesn't say. On the one hand, Deleuze surprisingly suggests some analogies between Pasolini and Artaud and Nietzsche. He says that Pasolini's intentions – like Artaud's projects – were oriented towards the creation of 'events' external to the common sense, a fact that constitutes the main conditions of his work. Moreover, he believes that Pasolini's work – like Nietzsche's philosophy – was rigorously looking for a new devotion, a new faith, a new thinking. On the other hand, Deleuze neither considers nor even suspects that Pasolini's link between cinema and thought, and between image and reality, might be aimed at Marxism's renewal. This study embraces Deleuze's concept of the outside, nevertheless. In my view, Deleuze's notion affords a definition of the political core of Pasolini's cinema theory. In summing up chapter 1 of this study, it was stated that what Pasolini called reality was, for him, completely at the mercy of the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language, which in turn includes and excludes parts of reality. The key political question for Pasolini is how Marxism can still protect people from the loss of their perception of reality.

Although Deleuze leaves political meaning out of Pasolini's cinema theory, the category of the outside perfectly describes what Pasolini wants. Pasolini's cinema wants to make the viewer perceive and think about problems and subjects politically unperceived and unconsidered insofar as they are excluded, forgotten, and denied by the selectivity of neocapitalism. This fact is to be understood in light of Pasolini's political aim: he wants to push viewer intentionally and pedagogically beyond the selectivity and aesthetic tastes of neocapitalism's guiding language. Marxism's renewal thus runs both through a form of cinema capable of showing what is external to the selectivity of neocapitalism and through a form of cinema capable of rigorously deducing a wider perception of

reality beyond the new tastes of the dominant classes. The perception of the reality of the outside illustrates this political core.

As a result, it is surely intriguing that Deleuze points to Pasolini's intimate revolt against the moralism of Italian Catholic traditions, even though, as described in 2.2.2, his cinematic turn is clearly addressed to Italian Marxist intellectuals and to the Italian Communist Party, both of whom are unable to produce new forms of resistance to neocapitalism. What is at stake for Pasolini's cinema and political theory is the complex relationship between language and reality in light of the rise of neocapitalism and the coming of the new guiding language.

Deleuze's concepts of 'the solid-perception image' and 'the outside' are essential references for chapter 3, which will go on to show how Pasolini sees an ontology, a semiology and a semiotics of cinema promoting Marxism's renewal; these in turn are supported by Deleuze's conceptual framework. Thus, in light of Pasolini's political theory, Deleuze's notion of the solid-perception image can be redefined as following: solid-perception images are images in which the parts of reality that have been excluded by neocapitalism now become images themselves – making visible a reality that asks the viewer to think in an anticapitalistic manner. This will be the fundamental concept in understanding the core of Pasolini's semiotics: the concept of 'the iconic sign of itself' in section 3.2. Likewise, the notion of 'the outside' can be redefined as a condition of Marxism's renewal: a wider perception of reality beyond the selectivity and tastes of neocapitalism's guiding language. This essential concept will show how Pasolini's cinema converges on the political problem of contending with the changing nature of capitalism, in sections 3.3–3.5. This attention to the concept of the outside is also referred to by Hardt in 'Pasolini discovers love outside' (Hardt, 2009). However, I disagree with Hardt, because he elaborates on this concept in the existential light of Pasolini's idiosyncratic lifestyle, his homosexuality and his deep desire for community.[76]

[76] Hardt says: 'Pasolini's desire for fraternity and all the erotic energies associated with it have found a real social articulation in the camaraderie of the peasant political struggles. In this newfound context, sexual politics and class politics are articulated in parallel like two attributes of a common substance, a political form of love. Although Pasolini first discovers love outside—in the innocence of the boys in the countryside and in the peasant world external to dominant society—through his political awakening he finds access to a new form of love in the joys of political struggle, a love engaged in making our history, which disrupts all the divisions between inside and outside' (Hardt, 2009: 129).

The redefinition of Deleuze's 'solid-perception image' and 'outside' are persuasive for this study. First, Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre is aimed at returning to the viewer a perception of what is excluded by neocapitalism, which is politically anticapitalistic because it is beyond ideology, class, and nationality. Second, the search for a wider perception of reality is related to the direct relationship between the aesthetic and political dimensions of the author, aiming to make an encounter between the film and the sympathy of the viewer. Pasolini's criticism of a certain intentionality on the part of the director is not fully grasped by Deleuze, but both aims are supported through Pasolini's understanding that that the language of cinema is the written language of reality. As a result, there is one last step to perform: if Deleuze's reading of Pasolini is to be followed fully, his interpretation of such a thesis must be understood. As seen in the next section, Deleuze fully endorses Pasolini's theorising and grasps some deep aspects of Pasolini's cinema theory, but he has not fully grasped the political meaning of them. However, Deleuze's interpretation does allow for the identification of the problem that will be the starting point of chapter 3: the ontology of Pasolini's cinema.

2.3.2 Deleuze's interpretation of Pasolini's semiological thesis on the language of cinema as its ontological horizon

When Deleuze speaks of Pasolini, he says 'it is as if Pasolini wants to return to the theme of a universal language system. Except that he adds: 'it is the language system of reality' (Deleuze, 1989: 28). As a result, Deleuze argues that Pasolini is trying to produce a descriptive science of reality, cinematically. In doing so, Deleuze clearly knows that in the eyes of prominent semiologists like Eco and cinema theorists like Metz, Pasolini's thesis perfectly embodies his naive philosophy of reality and sums up all the contradictions of his cinema theory (Paolucci, 2006; Desogus, 2018). For them, the main problem is that Pasolini seems to assert a direct relationship between cinema and reality, ignoring the fact that cinematic images are basically fiction, and that this fiction is artificially produced by the cinematic elements of film production: the choice of framing, the rhythm of editing, the extradiegetic music and so on. In contrast to Eco and Metz, what is interesting to note is that Deleuze surprisingly states he is the only

scholar who has adequately understood Pasolini's thesis, which instead 'is in danger of being misunderstood' by his several opponents.[77]

Once more Deleuze does not look at Pasolini's political aims.[78] However, although he is far from grasping the political meaning of Pasolini's cinema theory, this study argues that he grasps the ontological horizon of Pasolini's thesis. He understands that it is not to be understood as the exaltation of a strict relationship between image and reality, but as the search for those conditions that constitute or ground this relationship. It is at this point that Deleuze counteracts Eco and Metz. For Deleuze, they have misunderstood Pasolini's thesis (Deleuze, 1989: 313). According to Deleuze, where Pasolini's thesis exclusively concerns the issue of analogy, Eco is right to say that the images of reality on the screen are only signs of and references to reality; and Metz is right to say that the image only reflects an impression of reality. However, for Deleuze, Pasolini's thesis concerns 'the conditions of legitimacy' that constitute the analogic relationship between image and reality. It is from this perspective that Deleuze claims that, for Pasolini, these conditions of legitimacy of cinema are conditions of reality itself. This means that for this study, Pasolini's thesis on the language of cinema as the written language of reality implies an ontology of cinema in accordance with the aim of a wider perception of reality and as a condition for Marxism's renewal.

To best develop this claim, I refer to Deleuze's quotation of Pasolini's fundamental distinction between films and cinema (Deleuze, 1989: 313). Whereas films are made up from a certain language of reality which is framed and edited by the intentionality of the director, it is clear, for Pasolini, that the language of cinema *tout court* does not exist outside them. But if the actual language of cinema does not exist, what is the main

[77] Deleuze reprises his endorsemt toward Pasolini's semiotics in his work with Guattari, in which Pasolini's cinema theory is an exemplary model for re-thinking the political meaning of language in favour of minorities. They write: 'We should distinguish between minor languages, the major language, and the becoming-minor of the major language. Minorities, of course, are objectively definable states, states of language, ethnicity, or sex with their own ghetto territorialities, but they must also be thought of as seeds, crystals of becoming whose value is to trigger uncontrollable movements and deterritorializations of the mean or majority. That is why Pasolini demonstrated that the essential thing, precisely in free indirect discourse, is to be found neither in language A, nor in language B, but "in language X, which is none other than language A in the actual process of becoming language B". There is a universal figure of minoritarian consciousness as the becoming of everybody, and that becoming is creation' (Deleuze, Guattari, 1987: 127).

[78] This study does not consider the reasons why Deleuze endorsed Pasolini's thesis and stressed his semiology and semiotics – such reasons are clearly related to his own philosophy of cinema and his search to illustrate a theoretical evolution of the relationship between modern cinema and philosophy.

language through which the intentionality of director works via the screenplay, framings, and uses of montage? According to Deleuze, Pasolini's distinctions explain why directors are forced to directly look at reality in order to formulate and manage their own particular filmic language. This result entails that a director perceives and thinks of reality as being movement-images and time-images, and for Deleuze's philosophy of cinema this stresses how cinema and philosophy have analogous tasks and aims.[79] Pasolini's thesis basically says the same, but in light of his political theory. This study therefore claims that for Pasolini, a certain vision of reality can be deduced by a film, in a strict sense grounding the political meaning of the film. In a broader sense, cinema can ultimately represent reality itself, thus proving its own legitimacy. As a result, for Pasolini, reality can potentially be always politically cinematic for a director. If, for Pasolini, any realities can be filmed, then one can always show, perceive, and think cinematically about what is excluded by capitalism – and so one can achieve the aim of a wider perception of reality beyond the selectivity and aesthetic tastes of neocapitalism's guiding language. Put simply: what is outside capitalism can be revealed by cinema to make cinema both political and Marxist.

Therefore, Deleuze's claims help us to recognise that the perception of the reality of the outside is the main condition of Pasolini's trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics. Deleuze is right that the primacy of perception is the deep sense of Pasolini's cinema theory, that this primacy grounds and perfectly embodies the finality of his cinema, and that Pasolini's images break through to the common sense. However, Deleuze ignores the fact that Pasolini looks at cinema in order to perform a typically Marxist task: to protect the masses from the loss of reality. The outside is thus a wider perception of reality in the face of neocapitalism's guiding language. Furthermore, Deleuze has surely realised that the harsh criticism against Pasolini's semiotics is linked to a misunderstanding of what Pasolini wants philosophically: that the condition of the legitimacy of this perception is the implicit ontology of a director. However, if, as Deleuze highlights and endorses, Pasolini wants to semiologically create a descriptive science of reality through cinema, Deleuze is not interested in developing what it means ontologically for Pasolini. Although Deleuze clearly asserts that for Pasolini the

[79] For Deleuze, cinema and philosophy are practices of perception and thinking, and their trans-disciplinary encounter can show how great directors become philosophers (Deleuze, 1989: 240).

language of cinema (a) wants 'simply reality', (b) 'represents reality through reality', and (c) is always 'within the framework of reality, without interrupting it because of a symbolic or linguistic system' (HE: 232), Deleuze's interpretation does not grasp the problem that will be the starting point of chapter 3 of this study: the vision of reality that can be deduced from Pasolini's cinema theory. Here Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre accurately reveals his political theory as a form of resistance to the loss of reality that in turn is aimed at a wider perception of reality. This ontology will allow for a definition of Pasolini's ideas on universality, and how such ideas are related to the transnational and trans-classist language of cinema.

2.4 The outside and reality in *Che cosa sono le nuvole?*

Che cosa sono le nuvole? (What are the clouds?) is a short film, one of the most complex and interesting of Pasolini's works and also an intriguing form of the meta-cinema in which Pasolini seeks to explain the meaning of his cinema theory. Indeed, Pasolini significantly states that this film, together with another short film entitled *La terra vista dalla luna* (1967), had to be part of his project 'What is cinema?' The cast is composed of very famous comic Italian actors of that time: Totò (Jago), Ninetto Davoli (Otello), Franco Franchi (Cassio) and Ciccio Ingrassia (Roderigo),[80] along with actresses and close friends of Pasolini Laura Betti (Desdemona) and Adriana Asti (Bianca). They play in a small provincial theatre as living puppets in *Othello* by Shakespeare and are directed by a puppeteer (Francesco Leonetti) in front of a proletarian and peasant audience.

The plot of the film is as follows:

In a small, very rough and poor provincial theatre, where the audience stands in a room with grey, rough walls and with neither windows nor furniture, the production of Shakespeare's *Othello* is being staged by a puppet master. With his puppets he shows

[80] *Che cosa sono le nuvole?* was released in 1968. Totò was then one of the most important actors of the Italian cinematic tradition and Ninetto Davoli was one of Pasolini's favourite cinema actor. Totò and Davoli had worked together in the previous Pasolini films *Uccellacci uccellini* and *La terra vista dalla luna.* By contrast, Franco Franchi and Ciccio Ingrassia were two popular and comic actors in so-called B-movies. According to some scholars, these latter indicated how Pasolini was still producing a national and popular cinema (Ferrero, 1994). However, other scholars claim that in *Che cosa sono le nuvole?* Pasolini was not interested in success with audiences, but in his meta-cinema (Viano, 1993).

the public the plots of Jago against Otello and the subsequent murder of Desdemona. The audience is not only oblivious to the fiction of the story, it is as if they do not realize that there are strings that bind the puppets to their actions. The line of vision of the audience is frontal and superficial. The puppets, on the other hand, are perfectly aware of the detachment between their actions and their feelings both on the stage and backstage, especially Otello and Jago. We see that Otello is not yet prepared for, much less accepting of, the role that is written for him and that instead he would like to change history, while Jago, resigned and pragmatic, tells him: 'we are in a dream inside a dream'. Therefore, while the condition of the living puppet is complex and dualistic (stage/backstage), the audience are seeing on the stage only the conditions by which they may understand the story. It is a story that is unfair to the extent that it becomes unbearable for them, at which point they burst onto the stage to prevent the murder of Desdemona and kill the evil puppets Jago and Otello. As a result, the audience change the story on the stage and determine the success of Desdemona over Otello, bringing about Desdemona's triumph and the killing of Jago and Otello. Jago and Otello, rejected by the audience and defeated on the stage, are no longer useful to the puppeteer, and are replaced by other puppets. Lastly, they are thrown out onto the rubbish heap. For Jago and Otello, there is a new and final space outside the theatre. Here, amidst the rubbish, but amazed by a new world they have never seen, the two puppets wonder what clouds are.

Pasolini himself presents this final scene as follows: 'the puppets are thrown into a horrible filth. But there, they discover the world that is their paradise' (Betti, 1991: 147). The script (scene XXII) is as follows:

Otello: what are those?
Jago: they are ...are... the clouds.
Otello: And what are clouds?
Jago: Who knows?
Otello: How beautiful they are! How beautiful they are!
Jago: O, torturous, incredibly wonderful beauty of creation!

In the meantime, the diegetic music of the final scene is an unpublished song by

Domenico Modugno,[81] with lyrics by Pasolini, freely inspired by the words of Shakespeare's Othello. Modugno is the dustman who throws the two puppets onto the rubbish and while he performs his job, he sings these words: 'I will be damned if I don't love you, and if I didn't, I would not understand anything any more. All my crazy love, heaven blows it, heaven blows it, thus'.[82] This song directly connects the final scene with the first scene of the film. Indeed the same song, as extradiegetic music, accompanies the viewer on entering inside the Puppet Theatre. The images linger on the poster of the puppet show of the day. Here, the opening title of the film, 'What are clouds?', is superimposed over and related to the image of Velazquez's *Las Meninas*.

It is important to note that although *Che cosa sono le nuvole?* is interpreted differently by several scholars, none of their cinematic, philosophical and linguistic analyses relate the film to the problem of Marxism's renewal. What follows is a report of the interpretations of two cinema theorists, two linguistics and two critical theorists. For Ferrero (1994: 36-37) the film is oneiric, surrealist, hallucinatory and completely pessimistic. It is only death that shows the way to escape from the consumerist society in which we are embedded. Viano (1993: 170) identified how the images of the film are to be connected with the theoretical remarks of Pasolini's cinema theory. Returning to the question 'What is cinema?' Viano argues that the film responds to the question by showing how cinema is different from literature (Othello) and theatre (Shakespeare). According to Viano, the protagonists, Otello and Jago, are not able to decipher the world through the words of theatre. Only when they are outside the theatre can they see reality. The clouds are thus the symbol of the language of cinema: the clouds are cinema ('how beautiful they are … how beautiful they are'), which utilises words but harnesses them to images, and by doing so produces images that look at reality (Viano, 1993: 169).

Bazzocchi points to the quotation from *Las Meninas* in the first scene of the film and puts it in relationship with Foucault's book 'The Order of Things'.[83] The fundamental

[81] Domenico Modugno was one of most popular singers in Italy in the 1960s. His song 'Volare' was and has continued to be one of the international successes of Italian pop music.
[82] The lyrics are a rephrasing of Otello's words in act 3, scene 3: 'All my fond love thus do I blow to heaven'.
[83] Bazzocchi writes that Pasolini's film accurately knows Foucault's analysis of *Las Meninas*. This claim had already been made by Viano. Viano writes that the continuity between Foucault's and Pasolini's interest at this point in time is nowhere clearer than in this remark made by the French philosopher in *Le*

theme of the film is therefore, for Bazzocchi, the philosophical problem of representation, and the distance from words and things. As a result, Bazzocchi argues that Pasolini's aim is to make viewers aware that we are immersed in a fiction that constitutes an interplay between what we hold true and the Truth, and that this is the first condition for experiencing reality (Bazzocchi, 2006: 88). Patti (2022) argues that the meaning of the film focuses on Pasolini's warning against the selectivity of the language of the society of the spectacle, and in favour of his multilingualism and expressive pluralism. By highlighting how the film is a contamination of different forms of modern art – painting (*Las Meninas*), theatre (Othello), music (Modugno's song), literature (Calderon de la Barca's quote about life being a dream), and of course cinema – Patti claims that Pasolini's film intends to show how one may deconstruct the identifying and reductive forms of modern representation, which eventually result in socially illusory and politically dangerous outcomes for the pluralistic and liberal values of post-modern society.[84]

Vighi explains the film in light of Lacan's legacy. The murders of Jago and Otello, and even more their being thrown out of the theatre, are to be considered as what Lacan calls 'separation' and something he defines as the ecstatic instant of renewal. In this, separation implies the death of old habits and the vision of the real: the rubbish, the clouds. Hence, Vighi reports the meaning of Pasolini's film (and of Pasolini's entire film production) as the traumatic event of the breaking in of the light of the Hegelian negative role played by art. Only in this, Vighi says, cinema can be an instant of consciousness for the viewer (Vighi, 2006: 24-28). Sangalli (2017) interprets the film in the light of the relationship between reality and dreams, exalting Jago's words at Otello: 'We are in a dream inside a dream'. This attention to the dream is interpreted by Sangalli anthropologically. According to him, Pasolini's film reflects the 'dormant'

mots et le choses: 'The relation of language to painting is an infinite relation. It is not that words are imperfect, or that, when confronted by the visible, they prove the insuperably inadequate' (Foucault, 1990: 9). Pasolini accepted and appropriated Foucault's argument of an incommensurability between word and image. Indeed, Pasolini writes in *Heretical Empiricism*: 'Would whoever can do it tell me if this reasoning can be considered, perhaps through Sartrian existentialism, within the context of phenomenological research. If, that is, reality can also be considered in "flesh and blood" as the I of such research. And if by chance the "phenomena" can be the large "syntagmatic" forms with which the language of reality expresses itself in concrete terms (or "The Prose of the World," to paraphrase the title of a new book by Foucault which I have not yet read)' (HE: 115).

[84] Patti emphasises the relationship between the film and the six plays they had written in the same years. Moreover, in 1968 he had written his 'Manifesto per un nuovo teatro' ('Manifesto for a new theatre', SLA, 2001).

nature of human beings and the distance between our sensual perceptions and the real essence of things. This seems to him consistent with Velasquez's painting being placed behind the opening titles and in the final scene in which 'reality' is outside the theatre and beyond the puppet show, which are both symbols of the human condition. With this perspective, Sangalli argues that Pasolini's film shows how the limits of human perception work (Sangalli, 2017: 34).

While embracing these interpretations, this study argues that *Che cosa sono le nuvole*? is without doubt one of the most significant examples of the relationship between the concept of the outside and reality in Pasolini's cinema, and that in this it clearly shows Pasolini's political theory. If Pasolini significantly states that the film could have been entitled 'What is Cinema?', my argument would be that the result of the film is in fact a question: 'what is reality?', or better, 'where is reality?' – according to his desire for the renewal of Marxism. The answer is clearly that reality is outside in the rubbish and in the clouds, in those things that are excluded, forgotten and denied by capitalism. To arrive at this conclusion, it is necessary to briefly list some relevant clues in the film.

The first clue is that the film is set in a puppet theatre. The puppets can't change the story of the tragedy, even though they can dialectically see both the stage and behind the stage. It is the audience that changes the story, to the point that the protagonists of the story go out of favour with the puppeteer and are thrown outside the theatre and onto the rubbish. The vicissitudes of these two puppets can be seen to mirror the failure of the Italian Communist Party and official Marxism. Their dialectic is not seen and understood by the people, nor are they capable of revolutionising society, and as a result they have 'gone out of style'. However, this position of being out of style can equally be a starting point for the restyling of Marxism. It is outside and amidst the rubbish that Jago and Otello see the clouds for the first time. Although people give up Marxism, Pasolini invites Marxists to look elsewhere. The clouds represent the dialectics of inclusion-exclusion, and it is outside, where the reality of what is excluded by capitalism is now visible, that a solution for the renewal of Marxism can be found. These remarks entail a second clue. The extradiegetic music of the first scene and the diegetic music of the final scene create a circularity for the film. The film is thus a theorem to demonstrate Pasolini's crazy love. For what? Pasolini wrote the lyrics and his words declare that amidst the rubbish is where his hallucinated, foolish and crazy

love exists – for what is excluded by capitalism, that is, what he considers to be reality.

At this point a third clue emerges. If it is true that Pasolini chooses to use Velazquez's painting to question the problem of representation, he uses *Las Meninas* to show the relationship between the functioning of his cinema and his intentionality. By analogy, as in *Las Meninas*, what is not seen by the viewer is the intentionality of the author in showing the different levels of staging, so in *Che cosa sono le nuvole?* the viewer does not look where the author looks. However, the meaning of Velazquez's and Pasolini's works may be the same: to ask and to learn the point of view of the author. In this sense, it is very significant that in the second scene of the film, just after the images bring the viewer in front of the stage, the puppeteer explains the pedagogical sense of Pasolini's operation. Out of the scene, the puppeteer says: 'This is not only the comedy you see and hear; but also, the comedy you do not see and do not hear. This is not only the comedy of what you know, but also of what you don't know. This is not only the comedy of the lies that are told, but also of the truth that is not said.' What is understood in the finale scene, as well as in the circularity of the film, is that what the viewers do not see or hear is the outside, i.e., what is excluded by their perception of reality, what is outside the theatre. It is here that a fourth clue becomes clear. The theatre is a box with rough, grey walls, no windows and no furniture; it is very crude and poor, and looks incredibly like a television.

In my view, these clues are sufficient to explain how the is film in line with Pasolini's political theory, as this study outlines it. Fundamental for Pasolini's political theory is the search for reality, that which is external to the reductionism and selectivity of capitalism. As in Velazquez's painting, the hidden side of the situation – that which nobody sees or wants to see – is Pasolini's militant engagement related to the renewal of Marxism and his crazy love for reality (HE: 220), here represented by the clouds. However, to see the clouds, to approach renewal and to change Marxism, it is necessary for Pasolini to stay in touch with the 'rubbish', i.e., with what lies outside capitalism. Outside the theatre and beyond the barely visible strings there are no more puppets nor confined spaces, but instead the torturous (rubbish) and incredibly wonderful beauty (clouds) of reality. Thus, his political theory invites the film's audience to reverse its common interpretations. The life–death dialectic must be turned upside-down into death–life: only by looking at the exclusions, the outside, and the external allows

Marxism to restyle itself. With these perspectives, *Che cosa sono le nuvole?* depicts mass society as being in a tragi-comic scenario in which people confuse fiction with reality and forget Marxism. To rediscover Marxism, however, the viewer needs a further fiction, that of Pasolini's cinema, which leads them to look outside, to look at what is excluded and thrown away by capitalism, and to understand that those uncomfortable realities exist. What are clouds, indeed? They are the political perspectives that arise from what remains of reality, that is, when one is outside capitalism. Thus, Pasolini's film is both a manifesto of the political meaning of his cinema and an affirmation of his political theory, which ultimately aims to renew Marxist purposes but which can only take place through a new dialectics.

CHAPTER 3

PASOLINI'S POLITICAL THEORY OF CINEMA AS THE REALITY OF THE OUTSIDE (1960s)

> 'In a certain sense, therefore, the spectator codifies the uncodifiable act performed by the author who invents, inflicting on himself more or less serious wounds, and in this way asserting his right to choose the contrary of his prescriptive life and to lose what life orders him to save and preserve. The spectator, as such, enjoys the example of this freedom, and as such objectifies it; reinserts it into the speakable. But this happens outside all "integration"; in a certain sense outside of society (which integrates not only the scandal of the author but also the scandalous comprehension of the spectator). It is a relationship between individuals which happens under the ambiguous sign of the instincts and under the religious (not confessional) sign of charity. The negative and creative freedom of the author is brought back to the feeling which it would like to lose of the freedom of the spectator, inasmuch as, I repeat, it consists in enjoying the freedom of others; an indefinable act in reality, because it is saintly, but which could be reduced to current terms by observing that it objectifies and recognizes the unobjectifiable and the unrecognizable by means of sympathy.' (HE: 269-270)

Chapter 3 looks at Pasolini's cinema theory to provide the philosophical bases of his cinematic awareness. It then explains how these are connected to the political problem of the perception of reality of what is outside capitalism and to the aim for a wider perception of reality. A fundamental starting question is: what vision of reality can be deduced from Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre? This ontology then informs the foundation of his semiology and semiotics of cinema. Deleuze's concepts of 'the solid-perception' and 'the outside' have been redefined, and essential conceptual references now reveal how Pasolini's cinema theory promotes a transnational and trans-classist language of cinema, by means of the perception of the reality of what is excluded, forgotten, and denied by capitalism.

This theoretical reconstruction is original in its understanding of Pasolini and demonstrates the hypothesis of this study. Pasolini's cinema will be defined as 'the cinema of the outside' and illustrated through its convergence on the cinematic problem

of showing what remains of reality, which in turn contends with the political problem of the changing nature of capitalism over time. The results will confirm that the key political element in Pasolini's cinema is the relationship between his cinematic turn and Marxism's renewal, and that its purpose is to protect people from the loss of reality. The study considers that this is the philosophical and political legacy of Pasolini's militant engagement. Indeed, as Pasolini said at the time of his cinematic turn, talking about his shift from literature to film production in 1961: 'There is no absolute Realism that is valid for all epochs. Every epoch has its own realism. And this is because every epoch has its own ideology'.[85]

The chapter is split into two parts. The first part provides the philosophical basis of Pasolini's cinema of the outside. Pasolini's ontology and semiology of cinema are defined in 3.1 through a fully justified and significant reference to Spinoza's ontology, drawn not only from Pasolini's essays on cinema but also from his film production. This will ground the basis of the relationship between Pasolini's vision of reality and his semiotics of cinema. Section 3.2 will identify how Pasolini's semiology is linked to his ontology through uncharted territory by focusing on Pasolini's references to Morris's semiotics. These references enable the realisation of how the singularity is the ontological basis of Pasolini's semiotics both (a) through his concept of the iconic sign itself as the expression of the physical and violent and singular presence of reality; and (b) through the classification of different degrees of perception of reality on the screen. Next, in 3.3, Pasolini's political awareness of the workings of the cinematic camera will show how his cinema theory results in a vision of reality beyond neocapitalism, protecting viewers from the loss of reality produced by the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language, through what Pasolini defines as the trans-classist and transnational language of cinema.

This theoretical reconstruction leads to the second part of the chapter. What is termed Pasolini's 'cinema of the outside' – the trans-disciplinary encounter between his cinema and his politics – is described in 3.4. It entails an analysis of the political role of 'his profilmic content, which is associated with different elements excluded by capitalism over time, in 3.4.1; his awareness of the aesthetic dimension of audio-visual techniques that serve to elevate these elements to a place of love and beauty for the viewer, in 3.4.2; and lastly in 3.4.3 his film *Theorem* (1968) is analysed as a paradigmatic example

[85] Pasolini, P.P. (1961), 'Intellectualism and … the Teds', in *Films and Filming Magazine*, January 1961.

of his cinema of the outside in favour of a renewal of Marxism. In following the development of and in illustrating his cinema, this study thus shows how Pasolini wants to express the physical and violent and singular presence of what is excluded by neocapitalism in order create a relationship between his engagement with Marxism's renewal and the sympathy of viewers.[86] So, in explaining how his filmmaking is oriented towards what is outside neocapitalism and in illustrating how his cinema is aimed at affording a wider perception of reality for viewers, 3.5 identifies how Pasolini's cinema of the outside offers a form of renewal for Marxism, revealing the ultimate realism of the outside and its aim of educating people about the changing nature of capitalism.

3.1 Towards an ontology of cinema: realism and the outside

This section identifies the key elements of Pasolini's ontological and semiological vision of reality. Among Pasolini scholars there is no agreed definition of his vision of reality, though various interpretations have been suggested. Sitney isolated two prevailing interpretative horizons (Sitney, 2015: 15-33). The first is supported by the prominent semiologists Eco, Metz, Garroni and Bettetini in the 1960s and 1970s; they argue that Pasolini uses the word 'reality' in a highly questionable manner as he implies a metaphysical vision of reality. Eco was undoubtedly the most influential scholar within this interpretative horizon. He suggests that Pasolini's vision of reality is flattened by a naive naturalism in which action is natural and things are things in themselves. For Eco, Pasolini forgets that reality is always convention and culture (Eco, 1968: 149-160). Heath, a cinema theorist influenced by Eco, even considers that Pasolini's vision of reality ends up as a mere documentary duplication of reality, which can never be an artistic process (Heath, 1973: 109).

A second interpretative horizon is supported in the 1990s by cinema theorists De Lauretis, Bruno and Viano, who argue that Pasolini understands the word 'reality' in light of the postmodern crisis of signification and his critical review of the notion of rationality. According to Bruno, for example, Pasolini conceives reality as the cultural relationship between signs and things, in which what we call reality is seen as a participant in the cinematic process and through which we live in and deal with 'a

[86] Pasolini positively shows how the development of his cinematic oeuvre is increasingly oriented to a pedagogical role of cinema, in favour of the viewer.

society of spectacle' (Bruno, 1991: 32). For Bruno, Pasolini's vision of reality anticipates a largely explored thesis in postmodernism. Here, reality is not an ontological entity, but 'a site that inhabits the dynamics of social negotiation, contradiction, and communication' (Bruno, 1991: 33). Pasolini's cinema is understood through the everchanging relationship between culture and reality, as explored in 1.5.1, and 'the strength of his work resides in its being a theory of praxis ... when he discusses reality as a pragmatic dialogue between us and the objects, including our body' (Bruno, 1991: 38).

More recently, one can identify a third interpretative horizon supported by the Italian scholars Patti, Oster and Dunghe, who argue that Pasolini's conception of reality borders on mysticism. Patti emphasises Pasolini's aim of re-sacralising reality through a reading of his militant engagement in light of St Paul, that is, as a literary and cinematic attempt to reconcile his intimate impetus towards the mystical experience of the sacred with the militant organisation of this transcendence (Patti, 2007: 1). For Dunghe, Pasolini's vision of reality replaces Marxism with an irrational and mystic humanitarianism. Here, the faith and spirituality of the poor, the connection of human reality to Nature and even the relationship between 'the now' and the prehistoric and the pre-intellectual origins of humankind are valuable powers in counteracting capitalism (Dunghe, 2012: 584).

This study does not doubt the validity of these different interpretations but seeks another way to define and explain the term 'reality' for Pasolini. Inspired by his references to Spinoza's ontology, both in *Heretical Empiricism* and films *Pigsty* and *Medea*, Pasolini's vision of reality is defined as pure immanence. It has recently been demonstrated (Gragnolati, Holzhey, 2015) that in the 1960s Pasolini recants his opinion on Spinoza's philosophy, which he had developed over the 1950s. Rather than considering Spinoza as an idealist and a rationalist, Pasolini becomes aware of a new interpretation of Spinoza's ontology as anti-essentialist and a-moralist as well as non-teleological and non-determinist: an interpretation that defines Spinoza as materialist.[87]

[87] In identifying Pasolini's opinion on Spinoza, here is a reminder that it is undeniable that Pasolini looked at French culture as his fundamental point of reference. In the 1960s several French thinkers were providing new interpretations of Spinoza's philosophy, seeking to detach Spinoza from the rationalism of Descartes and Hegel. If Pasolini read Spinoza and understood him to be an a-moralist heretic and a materialist, this has affinity with contemporary French works on Spinoza, such as those of Gueroult, Althusser, Matheron, and Deleuze in the 1960s. I have researched these references at Pasolini's Archives in Florence where Pasolini's personal library has been rebuilt. In this library, one may find a French work,

From this perspective, Pasolini's references to Spinoza will be very useful for this study, by linking them to (1) what is called the philosophy of his cinematic turn in chapter 1: his love for 'reality' and his 'will to live at the level of reality'; and (2) what is understood about his semiological thesis in chapter 2: for Pasolini, any realities can be filmed precisely because reality can always be cinematic. This will result in a materialist ontology that develops and is maintained through Pasolini's semiology and semiotics and that shows how Pasolini's political and cinematic perspectives connect to and work with what is outside the changing nature of capitalism.

Eventually, it is necessary to distinguish and put in order three levels of understanding in Pasolini's theorising: his ontology, i.e. his vision of reality as pure immanence; his semiology (*sema*: sign; *logos*: discourse), that considers the language through which we perceive, act on and know reality, i.e. his thesis on the language of cinema as the written language of reality; and his semiotics (*sema*: sign; *tikos*: to make, technique), which specifically reveal how a system of signs (in this case, the language of cinema) can create perception and knowledge of a more or less adequate degree of reality. [88]

3.1.1 Pasolini's elusive and incomplete work on the definition of his vision of reality

To best articulate Pasolini's vision of reality, the evidence provides a variety of fragmented definitions of reality that can be drawn from Pasolini's essays on cinema. These definitions are scattered among his work, making it difficult to connect them to each other and to understand them according to a common ontological horizon.

Pasolini states that reality is an 'irreversible and unstable and non-sense infinite development' (HE: 237); that this development is a becoming 'which does not cease to be self-revealing tautology'(HE: 279); that this becoming is a continuous monologue in which 'reality speaks with itself'(HE: 251); and that this monologue is the 'infinite body of reality without any break in continuity' (HE: 293). However, in seeking for a

Spinoza, Philosophie and Politics (1967), selected and collected political texts from Spinoza's works; and an Italian work, *Marx, Quaderni Spinoza* (Spinoza's notebooks) (1972). In addition, there are other foundational French works of the 1960s such as Deleuze's *'Proust and the Signs'* (1964) in an Italian edition (1967) and books by Levi-Strauss, Barthes, Blanchot, Klossowsky, and Foucault.

[88] Pasolini refers to Eco's distinction between semiotics and semiology (Eco, 1968) (HE: 237). Semiology is a part of semiotics. While semiology looks at intentional communication acts (such as speaking and writing), semiotics includes all signs created in view of communication. In this chapter, semiology and semiotics form separate but contiguous fields in Pasolini's cinema theory.

definition of his vision of reality, Pasolini also creates several poetic expressions to grasp 'what is in itself' and how 'reality speaks with itself'. He connects the word 'reality' with metaphors such as the abyss, mystery, wild prehistory, poetry, and even spectacle (HE: 239). Finally, in one of his last essays on cinema, Pasolini uses the term 'rheme' to conceptualise the relationship between cinema and reality. The 'rheme' is the simultaneous and layered flowing of physio-psychological elements, audio-visual images, and spatial–temporal successions on the screen in which everything coexists and is juxtaposed, says Pasolini, in becoming reality (HE: 288).

To this variety of definitions, a further fact makes his vision of reality unclear for the reader. Pasolini never clarifies the three levels on which his argument relies – ontological, semiological and semiotic. It makes his vision of reality unclear for the reader. For example, speaking of reality, Pasolini uses the concept of 'expression' both ontologically – 'reality is expressiveness'; and semiologically – the expressiveness of the language of cinema is 'the written language of reality'. Eventually, and semiotically, Pasolini searches for a '*tecknè*' to 'express' signs capable of a wider perception of reality than the one culturally perceived (HE: 265).

This confusion of levels is also made clear in Pasolini's interview with the Catholic newspaper *Avvenire* in 1970. Whereas on the one hand Pasolini declares his vision of reality as an 'immanent ontology' and more importantly 'the typical component of all his film production', he still uses the term 'reality' in an equivocal way. He asserts that there is an ontological plane ('reality expresses itself'), a semiological plane ('reality is a complexity of signs'), and a semiotic plane (this component is typical of all his filmmaking). He writes:

> 'Reality is all a sign that I can semiotically analyse, a sign that tells me something. For you Catholics, there is a transcendental god here, speaking through reality. In other words, reality is nothing but God's sign system. For me, who am not a believer, I must rely on a kind of ontology. Reality is a complexity of signs through which reality expresses itself. So, my vision is sacred and religious, but immanent. Therefore, if you want to harmonize this transcendence with my sacred and immanent ontology, this component is typical in all my films, from *Accattone* to *Pigsty*'.[89]

What is fundamental in this interview is that Pasolini defines his vision of reality as immanence. This is consistent with what this study will show through Pasolini's references to Spinoza. However, as anticipated, he merges different levels of argument

[89] See: https://www.cittapasolini.com/post/pasolini-il-mio-sacro-testo-1970-avvenire.

through often elusive theorising. In the quotation above, Pasolini states that reality is immanence (ontology), but he also says that reality is a system of signs for humankind (semiology), and then lastly that his cinema is aimed at showing reality (semiotics).

The confusion of levels between ontological, semiological and semiotic is increased because of the comparison between Pasolini's ontology and that of Catholicism. The core issue is his thesis that 'reality is the language'. Pasolini says that for Catholicism, reality is the language through which God's transcendence speaks. This means that God is ontologically separated from reality and that reality is semiologically an image of God for humankind. It also means that events can semiotically be signs of this language, which in fact is separate from God. In contrast with Catholicism, for Pasolini's immanent ontology, reality expresses itself and speaks with itself. This means that, for Pasolini, events are expressions of immanence as much as they are equivalent to each other.

This results in what follows: for Pasolini, audio-visual language (semiology) is the written language of immanence (ontology), whose signs can communicate different degrees of perception of reality on the screen (semiotics).

3.1.2 Pasolini's references to Spinoza's ontology in *Heretical Empiricism* and in his films *Pigsty* and *Medea*

It is at this point that this study looks at Pasolini's references to Spinoza's ontology to understand his vision of reality. In 'The Code of Codes' (HE: 279-283) Pasolini refers to Spinoza twice. When Pasolini asserts that reality speaks to itself, he adds that this means 'in Spinozian fashion', and when he says that reality is its own language, he adds that 'reality is the language of Spinoza's God' (HE: 279). This reference produces a vision of reality as pure immanence: that 'things are expressions of reality' (HE: 239); that every expression of reality 'is the equivalent of another thing and every hierarchy among them is unjust, unjustifiable' (HE: 257); and that on an ontological level 'things speak to other things in a single context in which revelation and comprehension, question and answer, transmitter and receiver are the same thing' (HE: 279).

Thus, Pasolini reveals his endorsement of a materialist interpretation of Spinoza's ontology – which is to be understood as the ontology of his cinema. This will be the

ontological plane in which Pasolini grounds his semiology (audio-visual language as the written language of reality) and his semiotics (the concept of the iconic sign of itself) in favour of a trans-disciplinary encounter between his cinema and his politics. To express these three planes, there is a long quotation from the end of 'The Code of Codes' (HE: 297) which is now split into three parts, to appreciate and recognise how Pasolini uses these three distinctions to produce further specification. First, ontology as pure immanence:

> 'The Code of Codes has a quality which belongs to it and which cannot be transmitted; that is, for every other derived code, Reality presents itself as a succession, and furthermore, as completeness, while for the Code of Codes Reality is circularity and boundlessness'- (HE: 297)

Second, semiology as the language of reality. For Pasolini it is action, observation, imagination, evocation and it is also oral language:

> The savage-substantive im-sign-who, through action verbal im-sign-kills the animal-substantive im-sign-in the absolute identification of pragmatism and enigma, lives Reality as Truth: not only philosophical-religious Truth (the one of all the great interpretations of Reality), but also scientific Truth (the circularity of space and the relativity of time). The savage does not need illusions to live. (HE: 297)

Third, semiotics as the system of signs. For Pasolini this is the birth of the representation that is portrayed, written, photographed, transmitted and reproduced.

> But from the moment in which the savage begins to live reality as contemplation (from the first glimmer of this), and therefore begins to invent its succession and spatiotemporally, he discovers history, that is, illusion. From that moment on he will always need it, and will therefore base on this, and only on this, the absence of authenticity: the alienation, first of the peasant, and later of the petit bourgeois.' (HE: 297)

The relationship between Pasolini's vision of reality and Spinoza's ontology is clearly documented in two films, *Pigsty* and *Medea*, both released in 1969. These films allow a confirmation of both the importance of Spinoza's ontology for Pasolini's vision of reality, and his endorsement of a materialist interpretation of Spinoza. Both in the screenplay of the film *Pigsty* (1969) and in Pasolini's tragedy from which the film is drawn,[90] Pasolini uses Spinoza as a cinematic and conceptual persona through which he discusses and articulates his vision of reality. This is when Julian – the main character in

[90] The tragedy was published posthumously in 1979. It was written around 1967, while the screenplay of the film, based on the drama, was probably written in the autumn of 1968 (TE: 1183-1186).

Pigsty, who has a mysterious and transgressive erotic love for pigs – encounters Spinoza, within a kind of sudden and mystic vision. Spinoza does not condemn Julian's passion for pigs as they are the source of his happiness and his free expression of himself. Spinoza claims the right of living at the level of reality and of loving reality, whatever it is.

This reference to Spinoza is clearly explained by Pasolini in an interview about *Pigsty*. Pasolini says that Spinoza's vision of Julian helps Julian to understand and love his singular passion for pigs. Surprisingly Pasolini adds an intriguing claim, as stated in the previous section: he says that the love of Julian's singular passion is equivalent to affirming the existence of God (Stack, 1969: 142). As a result, the name of God stands for the definition of an ontology in which free expressiveness, equivalence and comprehension reveal Pasolini's vision of reality as pure immanence.

This vision is also identifiable in Pasolini's film adaptation of Euripides's tragedy *Medea* (1969). Here, there is a clear distinction between an ontological level and a semiological one. To quote the famous dialogue on reality between Jason and the Centaur Chiron:

> 'Everything's sacred in nature. Remember, my boy: there's nothing natural in nature. When it seems natural to you, it'll be the end. Something else will start. Good-bye sky, Good-bye Sea. But now the sky is beautiful! To look at it makes us happy. Don't you think that even a little piece of nature could be possessed by a god? What you see is an apparition. Look at that black streak on the sea, shining and pink like oil. The shadows of the trees. A god is hidden everywhere you look. If he is not, he's left traces of his sacred presence: the silence, smell of the grass, the chill of fresh water. Yes, everything's sacred. But sanctity is also a curse. Whilst the gods love, they also hate.' (*Medea*, 1970: 18)

To best understand the argument, this study invites the reader to replace Chiron's word 'nature' with the word 'reality', at which point a distinction between ontological and semiological levels becomes clear. Indeed, through the cinematic and conceptual persona of Chiron, Pasolini explores both the ontological level of reality and the semiological level of the language of reality. On the one hand, this study will connect Chiron's sentences: 'a god is hidden everywhere you look', 'everything is possessed by a god' and 'everything is sacred' to what has been said previously about *Pigsty* concerning reality as the free and equivalent expression of pure immanence. With this perspective, Chiron poetically reiterates that everything is sacred: 'the black streak on the sea, shining and pink like oil' and 'the silence, smell of the grass, the chill of fresh

water'; even if he also asserts that; 'whilst the gods love, they also hate' and that 'the sacred can also be a curse'.

On the other hand, these sentences are to be connected to the succeeding scenes in which the dialogue between Jason and Chiron reprises anew.[91] In this case, however, Jason sees two Chirons. Frightened by his twofold vision, Jason asks Chiron for an explanation. Chiron's words show the difference between the ontological and semiological levels. Chiron explains that Jason is seeing two images of Chiron because he effectively knows two centaurs. Recalling the previous dialogue, Chiron says that the first Chiron is the pure expressiveness of Chiron and that the second one is the Chiron caught and perceived by language. At this point, however, Chiron enigmatically says that both visions are reality. One is the ontological expression of reality and the other is the semiological deciphering of reality. Chiron adds that there is no separation between them because the semiological level can be inspired by the expressiveness of reality to show a wider perception of reality.

These last sentences are finally paradigmatic and fundamental for Pasolini's cinema and his political theory. Pasolini clarifies the ontological and semiological levels of his vision of reality, but also describes how they are culturally and historically linked to each other. In ontological terms, for Pasolini, reality is and exists absolutely and is body, expression, and equivalence in Spinozian fashion. In semiological terms, for Pasolini, every technological revolution brings about its own guiding language, whose signs decipher and select bodies and expressions by allowing for perceiving and knowing within a given culture and historical era.

With this perspective, it is also important to stress that Pasolini returns to this distinction between ontological and semiological levels in his essay titled 'Table' (HE: 293-298). Here, Pasolini reiterates his ontology, arguing that reality is an entire body that is 'physically without a break in continuity' (HE: 293), and that is 'circularity and boundlessness' (HE: 297). Significantly he adds that it is a sort of ethological space in which the ferocious animal that kills and the savage who runs away scared by the ferocious animal are equivalent expressions of reality (HE: 293). Likewise, Pasolini argues that the different kinds and levels of expressions of the language – represented reality, verbal reality, portrayed reality, photographed reality, and audio-visual reality

[91] Pasolini, P.P. (1970), *Medea – Screenplay*, Mondadori Milano, p.26.

transmitted or reproduced – are semiologically the way through which humankind continuously 'deciphers' reality (HE: 293). The theoretical framework of Pasolini's cinematic turn and his film production is thus outlined and reiterated. Starting from a definition of reality as pure immanence, Pasolini accepts the technological revolution of neocapitalism, considering audio-visual language as the new guiding language through which reality has been culturally perceived and known since the rise of neocapitalism.

An important note for this study now arises: to point out that, for Pasolini, since every audio-visual technology (television, blockbusters, classical and modern cinema, as well as his own cinema) uses the written language of reality, it all communicates a certain realism. Again for Pasolini, such realism depends on an image being semiotically produced by audio-visual technology, explaining the implicit semiology and ontology of any audio-visual production. Based on his ontology and semiology, Pasolini grounds the legitimacy of his semiotics of cinema, which is aimed at critiquing the ontology and semiology of audio-visual technologies in order to produce a wider perception of reality. So, heeding these three levels – ontological, semiological and semiotic – but focusing on the semiotic, section 3.2 will recognise how Pasolini's theorising produces images which are beyond the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language and which constitute 'the solid-perception' of what is outside neocapitalism.

3.2 Towards a semiotics of cinema: realism and the solid perception of reality

This section looks at Pasolini's semiotics of cinema and its pivotal role in identifying the relationship between the written language of reality and the different degrees of perception of reality produced by audio-visual technologies. These different degrees of perception will explain the relationship between ideology and knowledge in the field of audio-visual technologies in Pasolini's cinema theory. The relationship between ideology and knowledge on the screen is not between truth and error, but between greater and lesser perceptions of reality within television, blockbusters, modern cinema and Pasolini's own film production.

This will result in a recognition of the different degrees of perception of reality produced by each audio-visual technology. These levels of perception include in 3.2.1 a solid and materialist degree of perception, in which the perception of reality is afforded by an image that is its own iconic sign of a singularity; in 3.2.2 there is the idealistic

level of perception borne of the conventionalism of the images of the blockbuster, in which a singularity is sublimated and idealised by symbols and models; and in 3.2.3 a highly ideological degree of perception is described, which Pasolini calls naturalism and which is broadcast via televisual images in which the perception of reality comes without any forms of singularity.

As a result, the task of section 3.2 is to show how Pasolini's semiotics not only aims to critically oppose audio-visual technology as ideological, but also to cinematically construct a language that aims for a wider perception of reality. What is at stake for Pasolini's theorising is not only an analytical matter – of how neocapitalism's guiding language reduces or encourages the perception of reality; it is also a practical matter – of how a transnational and trans-classist language can make the knowledge of reality perceivably closer.

This study is aware of some important scholars in Pasolini's semiotics whose contributions can be essentially divided into two groups: (a) those who identify how Pasolini's semiotics reveals his attempt to expand the range of the discipline (De Lauretis, 1984; Bruno, 1991; Fabbri, 1991; Paolucci, 2006); and (b) those who highlight directly the importance of Pasolini's semiotics in cinematic terms (Costa, 1977; Welle, 1991; Scalia, 2012; Sitney, 2015; Rohdie, 2019; Humphrey, 2020). For the first group of scholars De Lauretis's reflection has been fundamental. She claimed that it is interesting to read Pasolini's semiotics to understand how his ideas are prophetic in developing the current semiotic scientific field. She adds that they help a series of questions and issues in the domain of critical theory that anticipate the direction of cultural studies (De Lauretis, 1984: 49). With this perspective, a number of scholars have recently remarked that the role played by Pasolini's semiotics is not exclusively polemical or even naive, but on the contrary constructive and in favour of the improvement of the methodological field of the subject. They stress that Pasolini's semiotics needs to be inserted in the pragmatic and scientific dimension of academic debate (Peloso, 2015; Desogus, 2018). Likewise, for the second group of scholars, Pasolini's semiotics enriches the awareness of cinema theory and the classification of its tasks and aims. For example, Scalia argues that Pasolini's semiotics helps to establish whether a film is poetic or prosaic, and how and why it is aesthetically related to literature, poetry and narrative (Scalia, 2012: 48). Sitney is sure that Pasolini's semiotics aims 'to attribute to cinema an oneiric dimension' that recalls 'the primitive nature of cinema language' as

the primal language of humankind' (Sitney, 2015: 19). Lastly, Rohdie argues that Pasolini's semiotics meets the audio-visual techniques of montage to articulate 'how to make reality significant, to make it conscious, to articulate it' (Rohdie, 2019: 22).

Differently from these scholars, this study intends to show how Pasolini's semiotics is aligned with his ontology. The connection between semiotics and ontology is revealed by Pasolini's endorsement of Morris's semiotics and allows for the isolation of a direct relationship between his cinema theory and a notion of singularity as the expression of the violent, singular and physical presence of reality, which is basically in line with his vision of reality as pure immanence and with his conditions for Marxism's renewal. In addition, Morris's semiotics shows how Pasolini considers audio-visual technologies as semiotic systems that can be measured by their effectual and pragmatic force on the viewer's perception. With this perspective, while singularity will be expressed by Pasolini's concept of the iconic sign of itself, it is also the ontological basis (and methodological criterion) for distinguishing the different degrees of perception of reality through which audio-visual technology is spread and by which a certain realism on the screen is organised. As a result, understanding the link between Pasolini and Morris will contribute to a materialist understanding of the degree of ideology and knowledge presented by the various audio-visual technologies in Pasolini's political theory and in his cinema.

Before proceeding to examine Pasolini's relationships with Morris's semiotics, one further note is important: while a considerable amount of literature has been published on Pasolini's semiotics, the use of Morris's semiotics and his terminology by Pasolini has not been investigated. However, an interpretation of this relationship supports the hypothesis that Pasolini's semiotics is to be understood according to a materialist ontology. Surprisingly, the pages dedicated by Pasolini to Morris coincide with those dedicated to Spinoza's ontology.[92]

3.2.1 The iconic sign of itself

This section aims to define singularity as the ontological basis (and methodological

[92] To understand Pasolini's interest in Morris's semiotics, it is notable that Pasolini met a scholar of Morris's in New York in 1966. https://www.tempi.it/un-marxista-a-new-york-fallaci-racconta-pier-paolo-pasolini/.

criterion) of Pasolini's semiotics. Pasolini's references to Morris's semiotics reveal the direct relationship between the violent, physical, and singular presence of reality and Pasolini's concept of the 'iconic sign of itself'. These theoretical distinctions arrive via terminological definitions from Morris's semiotics. In *Heretical Empiricism*, Pasolini borrows the concept of the iconic sign from Morris (HE: 278-282). It is always important to keep in mind that Pasolini's political engagement makes his theorising neither entirely clear nor precise. Therefore, this study approaches with some caution what he means by 'iconic sign', and with provisional definitions gets to a clear exposition of this fundamental concept in his cinema.

For Pasolini, the value of an iconic sign is that it 'gives testimony to the expressiveness of reality', that 'through conventional and arbitrary codes escapes us' (HE: 228). The formula 'the expressiveness of reality', as already described, entails that for Pasolini the iconic sign discloses someone or something beyond the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language. This formula results in a provisional definition of the concept of the iconic sign, which is modelled on Morris's semiotics and which, in broad terms, involves a strict degree of realism. For Morris, a sign is iconic insofar as it has the same properties as a real object – for example, in terms of proportions, relationships, and similarities. Conversely, a sign is a symbol insofar as the relationship between sign and object is arbitrary or conventional.

Pasolini links these definitions to his own definition of the iconic sign by giving the reader an example: while the official images of Queen Elizabeth could only be symbols and forms of conventionalism because what was represented was the monarch of the United Kingdom and not Elizabeth in the flesh, the sudden shot of an older and smiling Elizabeth was surely an iconic sign and could also be a form of strict realism. So, Pasolini adds that while the symbolic sign can be defined as the sign of another sign (Elizabeth was not Elizabeth, Elizabeth was the queen), the iconic sign is a sign of itself (Elizabeth was Elizabeth, nothing more). As a result, Pasolini reformulates Morris's concept of the iconic sign as the cinematic concept of 'the iconic sign of itself': a cinematic image which is strictly realistic, insofar as it has the same expressiveness as the real object. This first provisional definition is clearly consistent with what is said about Pasolini's cinematic intentionality in 2.2.2: 'I want the porter to be a porter' (HE: 245).

Therefore, viewers can perceive an iconic sign of itself if, and only if, they directly perceive what is documented. The relevance of perception is essential in understanding why Pasolini refers to Morris. For Morris, the relevance of the sign is pragmatically linked to its own capacity to produce effects and consequences on perception. For Pasolini, the iconic sign of itself entails that the expressiveness of reality shows itself in a violent, physical and singular presence of 'people, animals, things and events', detailed through their 'psychological, physical, moral, personal, sexual, carnal concreteness' (HE: 282). From this perspective, Pasolini understands the iconic sign of itself as political because it results in a higher degree of perception of reality.

A second provisional definition of the iconic sign of itself is now implied in line with Pasolini's ontology. The iconic sign of itself is a singularity violently and physically detailed.[93] Two elements characterise this definition. First, for Pasolini, an iconic sign is produced through a detailed singular and physical expression, 'without leaving any room for the viewer's imagination' (HE: 258). In my view, this expresses Deleuze's definition of the 'solid-perception'. Second, for Pasolini, this detailed singularity is associated with the adverb 'violently' insofar as the main characteristic of his cinema is 'to bring to the screen something real that viewers are no longer used to seeing' (De Carolis, 2008: 26). As a result, an iconic sign of itself shows a singularity that is never homologous with cultural hegemony (HE: 132).

This means that the iconic sign of itself is the main sign of a trans-classist and transnational language (HE: 131) and that it can question the accustomed perception of audiences beyond their ideological, cultural, and national superstructures (HE: 132). It also implies a violent effect, produced not only by the sudden and detailed expressiveness of reality, but from the fact that this expressiveness is outside the viewer's perception. As illustrated in 3.4.1, this is the political meaning of Pasolini's choices of profilmic content – what is defined as 'the outside'. The iconic sign of itself produces a degree of perception of reality insofar as it shows someone or something on the screen that is excluded, forgotten, and denied by the viewer's accustomed

[93] Wayne argues that 'attention to detail' is the method and the intention of cinematic politics in Marxism. This is a realistic strategy, i.e., it is an efficacious way of raising issues and speaking to audiences. (Wayne, 2020: 166). Wayne refers to Williams's reading of realism in 'Lecture on Realism' (1976) and as a cinematic example for his perspective on the relationship between realism, Marxism and film, Wayne identifies Ken Loach's film production. It is important to stress the point that for Pasolini this attention to detail is a necessary but not sufficient condition for a trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics. As seen shortly, the iconic sign of itself becomes political if and only if it is also capable of communicating with audiences.

perception. Thus, the iconic sign of itself brings a wider perception of reality because it violently produces the perception of something outside capitalism.

However, in line with his ontology and semiology, Pasolini hastens to say that while an iconic sign can bring a wider perception of reality, it will never provide a complete knowledge of reality, because it is created by the intentionality and the awareness of the director. As a result, if the language of cinema is, semiologically, the written language of reality, ontologically showing a director's vision of reality, then Pasolini's semiotics shows his transnational and trans-classist language. The aim is for a cinematic language and expression capable of portraying someone or something that is not integrated within the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language.

A clear definition of the iconic sign of itself is now possible: it is a cinematic image of a singularity that is excluded, forgotten, and denied by neocapitalism, and that forces viewers to see on the screen a reality that is homologous neither to capitalism nor to bourgeois taste and its universalism. In this way the language of cinema is, for Pasolini, transnational and trans-classist. This definition and these pragmatic effects are politically consistent with Pasolini's desire for Marxism's renewal. For Pasolini, the most urgent problem of his time is the loss of knowledge of reality due to the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language, and so the political task of his cinema is to enable the perception of reality through what is not integrated by capitalism. This entails the political strategy of his cinematic turn, and the political sense of his most famous and debated semiotic thesis: that cinema can show what capitalism does not show. Thus, Pasolini further distinguishes his cinema from that of other directors of modern cinema. In latter, viewers identify themselves with the author and they experience the director's vision; while Pasolini's cinema aims to invite viewers to be exactly there where the camera is. They must decipher what happens in front of their eyes. Here is his intriguing example:

> The camera in this case is extremely close to the woman (it is an extreme close-up); well, we are there, under the nose of this character, looking at her; and looking at her, we decipher her, asking ourselves some questions: what is this woman doing here? Why is she so unhappy (or happy)? What is she looking for, looking far off (or near)? etc., etc. The woman answers us "as an iconic sign of herself," in the same manner in reality and in cinema. (HE: 288)

As long as directors do not express the detailed singularity of reality, they remain within the internal revolution of capitalism; trans-disciplinary encounters between cinema and

Marxism occur outside capitalism and beyond its internal revolution.

3.2.2 The symbolic sign in *La ricotta*

The short film *La ricotta* is again exemplary in helping to define Pasolini's designs for his semiotics of cinema, because it is possible to extract from it a definition of the symbolic sign and its own degree of perception of reality. As already seen in 1.6, Stracci's suffering is seen as cinematically opposed to Christ's. To make this opposition semiologically explicit, Pasolini uses two opposing cinematic 'languages': black and white film for Stracci, and Technicolor film for Christ. Semiotically clarifying this different language, Pasolini deploys a further contrast. While the iconic sign of itself – of Stracci's suffering – is the detailed, starved face of a non-professional actor, a sub-proletarian extra from Rome's poor peripheries and who plays himself, the images of Christ's passion are instead reproduced through two famous paintings showing formalistic and mannerist representations of the passion of Christ: The Deposition of Christ by Rosso Fiorentino (1521) and The Transportation of Christ by Pontormo (1528). Here, Christ's face is seen in two conventional and easily recognisable images, a fact that sublimates and idealises any violent, physical, and singular presence of real pain and the cruel death of an individual.

Therefore, defining what is meant by the iconic sign in 3.2.1, Christ's face in these two famous paintings provides a definition of the symbolic sign. This study argues that, for Pasolini, the symbolic sign is an abstraction from the physical and singular presence of reality. Ontologically the symbolic sign is a form of idealism, producing semiologically a conventional language of reality made up from models and styles historically and culturally known and recognised. As a result, Pasolini significantly defines the degree of perception of reality that is possible when the symbolic sign is an image that loses 'every intimate and unrepeatable concreteness' (HE: 282). Likewise, he highlights the use of symbolic signs being kept cinematically under control versus any violent perception of reality. What happens when viewers see this conventional language? Two things happen: first, audiences see something they understand. Politically speaking, they have no wider perception of reality. For example, in a film about the passion of Christ, viewers see the usual iconography of Jesus, Maria and the Apostles, the usual Palestine that they recognise, and nothing in the plot breaks or disturbs their ideological perception of that event. Second, they learn that their ideological perception of reality is

confirmed on the screen, that is, they do not meet any singularity on the screen. Significantly, Pasolini adds that these symbolic signs belong 'to our visual memory and to our dreams' (HE: 171), meaning that for him, in semiological terms, the language of the blockbuster teaches and justifies an apparent universal language of cinema 'that is always internal to historical and cultural perception' (HE: 171).

However, the opposition of the iconic sign and the symbolic sign is not to be understood as the opposition of reality and illusion. Pasolini's concepts of the iconic sign and the symbolic sign identify how he looks at the relationship between ideology and knowledge. This relationship is produced semiologically and semiotically by the contrast between gradual and different perceptions of the violent, physical, and singular presence of reality. These gradual perceptions ultimately show two opposing ontologies, which ground the relationship between a materialist and an idealist, by means of the written language of reality. On the one hand, there is physical singularity and ever-changing concreteness; on the other, there is abstraction, models, and conventions.

3.2.3 Naturalism

Having defined the iconic and symbolic signs, there is next a need to understand why the written language of television is, for Pasolini, the most ideological form of cinematic imagery, entailing the lowest degree of perception of reality on the screen. In an apparently contradictory way, Pasolini defines as 'naturalism' that which constitutes the status of televisual images that directly document reality and that broadcast an objective perception of reality. The concept of naturalism[94] is another key concept in developing Pasolini's semiotics and in recognising the relationship between ideology and knowledge in audio-visual technology. Naturalism results in the least possible degree of perception of reality, as well as offering the most ideological vision of reality.

Pasolini defines naturalism according to two criteria. First: naturalism is expressed via a purely informative audio-visual language (HE: 266). Second: naturalism is a language that documents reality in its spatial and temporal linearity (HE: 227). Pasolini writes that live television broadcasting as well as cinematic sequencing filmed in real time are

[94] A differentiation between naturalism and realism is fundamental to avoid a loss of reality. Naturalism normalises the ordinary and sees capitalism as unchangeable. The most important critique of naturalism in the Marxist tradition was produced by Lukacs, whose essays were focused on Zola's naturalism (Lukacs, 1978). In Pasolini's library, however, there is no reference to Lukacs.

forms of naturalism. Another relevant form of naturalism is, for Pasolini, the so-called cinema-verité in which reality is seen as objective, but in which reality is also displayed 'in all its miserable and fearsome horror' (HE: 228) and 'dependent on chance and on the accidental passage of time'(HE: 228).

For Pasolini, these criteria show how naturalism is highly ideological. Naturalism aims to directly reproduce reality to the point that viewers are likely to perceive those images as objective (a clear example is a football match live on TV). Nevertheless, naturalism makes viewers unable to realise that any information on the screen is always determined by an intentionality. In this way, viewers believe what they see on the screen as reality, albeit it could be from a single visual angle and 'insanely subjective and ideological' (HE: 241). Naturalism thus offers, for Pasolini, the most ideological perception of reality precisely because it entails a complete fusion of ontology, semiology and semiotics. Reality is objective; the written language of cinema is the language of reality; and cinematic signs are reality.[95]

In contrast with naturalism, and in line with his own ontology and semiology, Pasolini claims that first, reality can never be entirely reproduced on the screen; and second, in line with his semiotics and pragmatism, he states that every image produces effects and consequences for the viewer's perception of reality. Hence, naturalism involves a cognitive misunderstanding in which the singularity is replaced by objectivity, becoming insignificant on the screen.

Once naturalism is considered as bringing a lower level of knowledge of reality, a summary becomes possible for Pasolini's identification of the relationship between ideology and knowledge in terms of gradual levels of perception of reality. Pasolini defines and distinguishes three kinds of written language of reality: signs, pragmatic effects on the audience, and consequent levels of knowledge. The first – naturalism – documents and accepts reality as a mere and insignificant flowing of space and time. The pragmatic effect is for Pasolini the negation of any violent, physical and singular presence of reality (HE: 227). Indeed, it is exactly the antithesis of his ontology; it is a deterministic correspondence between image and reality. Pasolini argues that this naturalism is aimed at promoting a vision of reality that completely accepts capitalism

[95] This is far from a Marxist understanding of reality, which does not emerge through an objective observation of reality, but through intentionality, choices, and decisions.

and its internal revolution; and that the language of live broadcasting is the most ideological form of neocapitalism's guiding language. The second – conventionalism – reduces the violent, physical and singular presence of reality to a symbolic sign. It is another product of the selectivity of neocapitalism's guiding language, and through it the language of cinema shows its ontological idealism in which the viewer's perception of reality is populated by models, standards and stereotypes. Pasolini connects conventionalism to an ideology in which the blockbuster constructs imagined capitalism as desirable and politically correct, obscuring the singularity of reality as dangerous and scandalous. The third kind of language is the transnational and trans-classist language of his cinema. Here, the iconic sign of itself reproduces a singularity that is beyond the ontological insignificance produced by television and the idealistic modelling of the blockbuster, and is therefore homologous to neither capitalism nor idealism.

In light of his aim for a wider perception of reality, Pasolini connects these languages and their signs to another element in his cinema theory: political awareness as revealed through the workings of the cinematic camera. This will be used in outlining how Pasolini sees the relevance of authorship in modern cinema and its relationship to neocapitalism.

3.3 Towards a political awareness of the cinematic camera within naturalism, conventionalism, and authorship

Section 3.3 recognises and connects the concepts of naturalism, conventionalism and the iconic sign of itself to Pasolini's analysis of a cinema-going audience's awareness of the workings of the cinematic camera. It reiterates Pasolini's harsh criticism of television's naturalism and its ideological use of the cinematic camera in live broadcasting (3.3.1); of conventionalism, in its idealistic use of the cinematic camera in the blockbuster (3.3.2); and, eventually, of modern cinema's 'taste for making the cinematic camera felt' (HE: 70) in its unawareness of belonging to the internal revolution of capitalism (3.3.3). These harsh criticisms are an additional development in Pasolini's trans-disciplinary encounter between his cinema and his politics, providing further elements for what is termed in this study 'the cinema of the outside'.

3.3.1 The cinematic camera and naturalism

What relationship does the cinematic camera have with reality? In responding to this question, Pasolini reiterates his semiological thesis: the cinematic camera is the first technical means that uses reality as a language, that is, the language of the cinematic camera is the written language of reality, which directly reproduces reality 'without the magico-symbolic interruption caused by a system of linguistic signs' (HE: 232). This also constitutes Pasolini's cinematic turn: his increasingly developed understanding that the language of cinema semiologically replaces spoken–written language as the main means by which people perceive, consider, and understand reality. However, Pasolini also reiterates that immanence cannot be directly reproduced by cinematic film as the naturalism in live broadcasting pretends to do.

To clearly demonstrate his position, he proposes three paradoxical claims about the relationship between the cinematic camera and reality, allowing a clear articulation of the relationship between reality and the language of cinema (HE: 225-232). First, Pasolini states that we should consider the hypothesis of the existence of 'an invisible and endless cine-eye' that is entirely capable of documenting reality through an infinite and uninterrupted 'sequence shot' (HE: 225). For Pasolini, such a technical tool does not exist; this total documentation of reality is clearly an illusion. As a result, the limited capacities of the cinematic camera demonstrate that naturalism is highly ideological, and that a total perception of reality is far from knowledge of reality.

However, continuing his paradoxical argument, Pasolini adds a second claim: we could consider the hypothesis of an infinite series of cinematic cameras that contemporaneously reproduce reality from an infinite variety of visual angles. In this way, the viewer would obtain the multiplication of 'points of view' that would be more capable of fully and clearly documenting the totality of an event. Pasolini asserts that (a) this pluralistic vision reveals 'the unreliability, the lack of precision, and the ambiguity of reality' (HE: 230) in front of the cinematic camera and that (b) this pluralism illustrates a phenomenological vision of reality. Third, Pasolini ends his argument by proposing the hypothesis of a clever, analytic cinematic mind that can co-ordinate every visual angle in order to eventually produce a total documentation of reality. For Pasolini, this seemingly objective and total documentation of reality would need to be

produced by divine editing, transforming immanence into transcendence and reality into a kind of super-subjective vision of reality that is ontologically theological (HE: 232).

These three paradoxical claims are entirely aimed at showing the limited nature of the cinematic camera in order to undermine the perception of reality spread by live broadcasting through naturalism. Naturalism exploits 'the strict bond of necessity' (HE: 70) between the language of cinematic film and reality, playing on the perception of reality in the viewer, who is accustomed to perceiving reality visually. Pasolini argues that naturalism – and even its variants, pluralism and objectivism – dramatically hides the intentionality that produces it. In this way, those 'written words' of naturalism perfectly present themselves as the main means of the cultural hegemony of the moment.

To develop this concealment, Pasolini reports a famous event on Japanese television: the live broadcasting of the hara-kiri of the writer Mishima (HE: 289). Pasolini asserts that 'viewers must forcedly identify their own point of view with live broadcasting' (HE: 289), in a complete and compulsory 'fusion' of their perception of reality with the ontology of naturalism. This is why this fusion is pedagogically dangerous for Pasolini: in the long run, naturalism and live broadcasting will teach viewers not only to consider that images are reality but also that reality has become an image (HE: 296). Pasolini's claim results in a twofold political consequence within his reading of neocapitalism, both linked to what he defines as 'the loss of reality' caused by neocapitalism's guiding language. On the one hand, the perception of live broadcasting ends with a resigned acceptance of reality as the natural flowing of events (HE: 227); on the other hand, viewers will become accustomed to look at events on the screen with absolute indifference (HE: 213).

For this study it is interesting to stress the fact that naturalism and live broadcasting progressively teach a fully ideological perception of reality in which something exists because it can be seen and that something does not exist because it cannot be seen. As a result, this relationship between visibility and invisibility produces a hegemonic level of culture, which legitimises what is included by the changing nature of capitalism and seen through neocapitalism's guiding language at the expense of what is excluded by capitalism and has consequently become invisible. Therefore, the relationship between the inclusive/visible and exclusive/invisible returns the viewer's perception of reality to

a pre-scientific and pre-Marxist ignorance – in which the sun is moving because we can see the sun rising – a fact that ultimately indicates why 'the loss of reality' is directly connected to 'the obscene health of capitalism'. How can we transform reality if it is hidden from us?

3.3.2 The cinematic camera and conventionalism

Although cinema-verité promises the truth, naturalism is never totally supported and spread by film production. Pasolini observes that when viewers see any film, they never completely forget that what they are seeing is a fiction (HE: 289). Fiction on the screen is the starting point of Pasolini's analysis of the relationship between the cinematic camera and the conventionalism of the language of the blockbuster. The analysis sits within the wider debate between Pasolini and Metz on the status of the image (HE: 157), which is quoted by Deleuze in *Cinema2* (Deleuze, 1989: 313-314) and referred to in 2.3.2. According to Metz (Metz, 1973), since the images of films are pure fiction, they can only provide impressions of reality, never reality itself. For Metz, cinema and reality are completely separate. Pasolini theoretically agrees with Metz's claims but disagrees with Metz in light of the pragmatic implications of his semiotics. What is at stake for Pasolini is the consequence of 'these impressions' on the viewer's perception of reality, that is, the implicit ontology of these impressions.

To develop his argument, Pasolini looks at the workings of the cinematic camera in the production of, for example, the blockbuster. Since the blockbuster deals 'with an unimaginable number of consumers' (HE: 172) and shows the need for highly communicative, universalist and interclassist images, Pasolini argues that here, such a film reveals its own conventionalism through a limited and defined common patrimony of sequences as well as images (HE: 171). For Pasolini, this conventionalism is not only the result of a fiction as Metz says. According to Pasolini, the production of the blockbuster necessitates an apparently universal but unavoidable historical and conventional language, resulting in fictions that are 'generalizations, classifications, genera, species' (HE: 282). Such 'impressions of reality' develop thus an interclassism of characters and plots (HE: 172) to achieve a 'hypnotic identification between viewers and conformism' (HE: 172).

In short, for Pasolini, Metz has underrated the relationship between semiotics and

ontology. Pasolini is more interested in identifying how the blockbuster influences the viewer's perception of reality, which becomes more accustomed to evoking, dreaming, and imagining an idealistic interclassism and false universalism rather than really perceiving and thinking about reality. As a result, whereas for Metz films are fictions that can only produce impressions of reality, for Pasolini such fictions reveal how cinematic equipment keeps the viewer's 'impressions of reality' under control. The result is, for Pasolini, another form of loss of reality in which a viewer's perception of reality is unproblematic and brings about the predetermined dream of 'a sempiternal happy end' (HE: 126). Therefore: how can we transform reality if the viewer's perception of reality is populated by capitalist dreams and fables?

3.3.3 The political awareness of the cinematic camera and the issue of authorial sovereignty

In response to the ideological aims of naturalism and conventionalism, Pasolini claims that the aim of a modern director in 'making the cinematic camera felt' is ideologically different from that in live broadcasting and the blockbuster, insofar as the audience is encouraged to be much more cautious of what flows onto the screen. This is also, for Pasolini, the first characteristic and task of authorship within modern cinema: 'the taste for making the cinematic camera felt' (HE: 221) – the taste that Pasolini speaks of in his main cinematic references to Antonioni, Bertolucci, and Godard, and indeed in reference to his own film productions.

Making viewers more aware of the cinematic camera, modern cinema makes it clear that a film is not only a fiction, but the result of an intentionality. It creates sequences that undermine the complete and compulsory fusion produced by naturalism and that diverge from the unproblematic perception of conventionalism. As Deleuze grasps perfectly, Pasolini believes that one of the aims of the awareness of the nature of the cinematic camera is to make viewers aware of their ideological and predetermined relationship with images. However, it is interesting to stress that, once more, Pasolini asserts that his aims are dissimilar to those of Antonioni, Bertolucci and Godard, explaining this difference through a metaphor. Pasolini argues that the director should 'die inside their films', even though this does not happen (HE: 242). This seems to move in the opposite direction to 'the taste for making the cinematic camera felt'. But Pasolini means that this taste is not to be confused with a form of sovereignty or

intellectualism in which authors become more important than the reality revealed in their films.

Hence, the political problem is how to dispense with naturalism and conventionalism without creating a new ideology linked to the filmmaker. Indeed, Pasolini asks: how can we grasp reality if the perception of reality is embedded within an authorial sovereignty? According to Pasolini, if modern cinema offers the possibility of a viewer's increased awareness, it must also explore the ideological implications of the intentionality of the director. In an interview in 1969 Pasolini clearly defines his intentionality in light of his ontology, semiology and semiotics. He says that his cinema aims to 'reconsecrate things as much as possible' (Stack, 1969: 83) because this use of the cinematic camera, for Pasolini, may also be the salvation of the viewer's perception of reality (HE: 205). Knowing that Pasolini uses the term 'sacred' semiologically to refer to language that reveals immanence as a singularity, his intention can be seen to work scientifically on the endless expressions of reality and their singular and physical presence – just as the telescope sees the stars and the microscope viruses and matter in movement.

From his perspective, his aims are dissimilar to those of other modern directors. For Pasolini, 'the taste for making the cinematic camera felt' is linked to his clear intentionality of showing in detail a singularity that is excluded, forgotten, and denied by neocapitalism, and that encourages viewers to see on the screen a reality and to develop an ontology that are homologous neither to capitalism nor to bourgeois taste and its universalism. And 'to die inside a film' means that his authorship makes possible a degree of perception in which viewers can encounter the violent, physical, and singular presence of reality, never the authorial sovereignty. So, the workings of the cinematic camera are aimed at offering a wider perception of reality that (a) transcends naturalism through what is external to neocapitalism; that (b) replaces fascist interclassism and bourgeois universalism with the transnational and trans-classist singular presence of reality; and that (c) undermines intellectualism and authorial sovereignty through detailed attention to reality.

These aims will now be linked to Pasolini's political choice of profilmic content (3.4.1) and the strategic role of audio-visual techniques (3.4.2), allowing further definition of the trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics in Pasolini's work.

3.4 The cinema of the outside

Section 3.4 develops Pasolini's cinema of the outside in light of the philosophical bases of his cinematic awareness. Subsection 3.4.1 shows how Pasolini's choice of profilmic content reflects the core of his materialist ontology, and his purpose in presenting singularities that are excluded, forgotten and denied by the changing nature of capitalism over time, what is defined as the outside. Subsection 3.4.2 shows how the aesthetic dimension of audio-visual techniques serves to elevate the singularity, previously invisible, to a place of love and beauty, enhancing the possibilities of an encounter between cinema and a wider perception of reality. In this way, this study will demonstrate that Pasolini's cinema of the outside leads viewers beyond capitalism to embolden them to have the same courage and freedom to perceive and live outside the capitalistic system. Lastly, subsection 3.4.3 shows how Pasolini's film *Theorem* (1968) is a paradigmatic and exemplary film within Pasolini's cinema of the outside.

3.4.1 The political role of profilmic content

Pasolini's choice of profilmic content reflects the core of his materialist ontology. Pasolini defines his profilmic content as those elements of reality that are placed before the cinematic camera: objects, faces, bodies, internal spaces, and external landscapes. These are associated with different elements excluded by capitalism over time, what is termed the outside. Furthermore, this profilmic content will change in relation to the changing nature of capitalism, thus emphasising the relationship between Pasolini's cinema theory and Marxism's renewal.

It is intriguing that Pasolini wanted to demonstrate the relevance of his choice of profilmic content by releasing some supplementary films related to his main feature films; for example, *Sopraluoghi in Palestina per il Vangelo secondo Matteo* (Location hunting in Palestine for the Gospel, 1965); *Appunti per un film sull'India* (Notes for a film on India, 1968); and *Appunti per una Orestiade Africana* (Notes for an African Orestes, 1970). These films, rightly called 'laboratory-films' (Desogus, 2018: 17-21) show Pasolini at work, seeking a reality to which viewers are unaccustomed. The profilmic content shown in these films appear, at first glance, to be well defined by the marginal conditions of the subproletariat and of poor people in developing countries,

according to the political representation of the 'outsiders' – in Fanon's and Marcuse's terms (HE: 157). As a result, a number of scholars understand Pasolini's cinema as a form of revolutionary humanism. They argue that Pasolini picks out alternative revolutionary subjects in order to replace the political parts played by the working class in the official Marxist tradition (Bachmann, 1974: 27; Casarino, 2010: 677-678, Bondavalli, 2010: 49-83). Other scholars look at Pasolini's cinema as portraits of conservative political beliefs that exalt poor people, mythic archaism and rural tradition; they state that in this way Pasolini displays resistance to modernity and to progress (Caminati, 2007: 23-33; Oster, 2009: 2; Esposito, 2010: 193-194).

However, this study argues that it is both revealing and deceptive to link profilmic content only with marginalised people and with a form of resistance to progress. Pasolini's film production looks for any elements excluded by capitalism. This can be shown throughout his film production. There are the forgotten peripheries of society in his early films – from *Accattone* to *Hawks and Sparrows* (1961-1965); there is the violent and scandalous appearance of sexual perversion and sadism – from *Pigsty* (1969) to *Salò and 120 Days of Sodom* (1975); and there are the alternative lifestyles in Pasolini's 'trilogy of life' – *Decameron, Canterbury Tales* and *Arabian Nights* (1971-1974). Even when using mythological subjects such as those in African or Asian underdeveloped contexts – as in *Oedipus, Medea* and *Oreste* (1967-1970) – Pasolini focuses on elements excluded by capitalism: the unusual coincidences between the most important mythological themes of Western tradition and the violent, physical, and singular presence of faces, bodies and landscapes from the Global South, for instance. As seen later in 3.4.3, *Theorem* (1968) is an eventually paradigmatic as well as exemplary film whose profilmic content clearly reveals the scope of Pasolini's cinema of the outside.

For the moment it is important to note that Pasolini defines his filmmaking as writing 'on a paper that is burning' (HE: 240) – a metaphor for his cinema of the outside and its concern for the loss of reality. His profilmic content represents contingencies that are generally considered as outside the perception of reality. These contingencies are disappearing from the viewer's perception of reality (HE: 245) and include peripheries, violent and scandalous appearances, alternative lifestyles and unusual cultural coincidences that are outside capitalism at that time. This means that Pasolini's cinema does not represent a political subjectivity, but instead makes visible the process through

which the changing nature of capitalism makes that singularity perceptively invisible, transforming it into an outside.

A significant witness to 'paper that is burning' lies in a comparison between Pasolini's choices of profilmic content in his cinematic version of *Arabian Nights* (1974) and his succeeding choices of profilmic content in his last film *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* (1975). This comparison reveals how the changing nature of capitalism has forced Pasolini to change his profilmic content over time. In an interview in 1973, Pasolini declares that *Arabian Nights* (1974) aims to denounce the repressive power of capitalism on individual sexuality in Western society. The subject of his film is, by contrast, the sexual freedom of an archaic Arabic culture, in which, Pasolini says, both poor and rich enjoy homosexuality as a natural and joyful part of life. In line with the concept of the outside, homosexual scenes and instances run through the film from beginning to end in order to make visible a distant culture in which social and physical freedoms are possible and in which sexuality is positively experienced. The profilmic content is semiotically rendered via a repeated iconic sign: the uncommon, innocent, and ubiquitous smiling faces of the non-professional Arabic actors. These smiles – which some scholars have defined as 'irritating, preposterous, unnatural' (Viano, 1993) – are, for Pasolini, contingencies that violently make clear that freely expressed sexuality was outside or beyond capitalism.

However, in an essay two years later entitled 'The Repudiation of the Trilogy of Life' (1975), Pasolini chooses to abandon the theme of sexual freedom, owing to the changing nature of capitalism. He says that the trilogy – *Decameron* (1971), *Canterbury Tales* (1972) and *Arabian Nights* (1974) – was intended to offer a wider perception of reality by focusing on the living, archaic and instinctual innocence of Eros, genitals organs and sexual self-expression; but that now, in 1975, with the rise of pornography, the violent effect of such profilmic content on the viewer's perception has been increasingly undermined by a new sexual conformism. Neocapitalism's guiding language has now included and manipulated sexuality to its own benefit. As a result, Pasolini admits political failure. This next brings about a new awareness of further changes in the nature of capitalism and a search for new profilmic content. Prefiguring and announcing his succeeding film *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* (1975), he writes:

> 'I am manoeuvring to rearrange my life. I am forgetting how things were before. The beloved faces of yesterday are beginning to yellow. Before me – little by little, slowly,

> without further alternatives looms the present. I readjust my commitment to a greater legibility. (*Salò?*)' (HE: XXII)

This brief text shows clearly how the concept of the outside is enriched by Pasolini's thinking: he is constantly and consistently readjusting his commitment to a greater legibility of reality, reiterating that his cinema is aimed at offering a wider perception of reality on the screen and showing how deep the including and excluding processes of neocapitalism are. In my view, it is this relationship between the outside and the changing nature of capitalism over time that ought to be reconsidered by Pasolini scholars. Many emphasise that, both as thinker and director, Pasolini was prophetic (Bruno, 1991; Ferrero, 1994; Ravetto, 2003); some scholars even associate him with Socrates, who lived (and died) as 'a master whose message went unheeded' (Bazzocchi, 2017; Desogus, 2018).[96] Contrary to this scholarship, Pasolini was not interested in prophetic or parrhesiastic messages, but rather in a clear desire to engage with the relationship between capitalism and reality, between ideology and knowledge, and between semiotics and ontology.

Therefore, when Pasolini says that his cinema 'is an explosion of his philosophical love of reality' and that 'the language of cinema forces him to remain at the level of reality' (Stack, 1969: 29), I believe we should recognise that he is looking outside capitalism according to his own ontology, semiology and semiotics. If neocapitalism works directly on the viewer's perception of reality through the alliance of productive forces and audio-visual technologies, Pasolini's cinema shows that a wider perception of reality can take place only by continually attacking this alliance, on the grounds that it is so selective in what it includes and excludes. This results in the concept of the outside, an anticapitalistic means by which Pasolini's cinema illustrates and marks the changing nature of capitalism, its power over reality and its own effects on the perception of reality. It is this ideological exclusion of parts of reality or the inclusion of as many elements of reality as capitalism will allow that keeps, for Pasolini, a Marxist focus on the internal tensions of capitalism. While neocapitalism's guiding language constantly and ideologically reorganises the viewer's perception of reality, Pasolini's political awareness and cinematic intentionality breaks into this ideology, making visible and giving value to what is excluded by capitalism. In this way, Pasolini shows how cinema

[96] It has been noted (Pacchioni, 2008), that a sort of canonisation of Pasolini followed the impact of two of the most important Pasolini biographies published in international academic contexts by Siciliano (1982) and Schwartz (1992).

meets politics.

3.4.2 The aesthetic dimension of audio-visual techniques

This section focuses on the aesthetic dimension of cinema through Pasolini's attention to those audio-visual techniques used in shooting and post-production by which the filmed becomes a film; these include the choice of sequences, the connection and rhythm of sequences, sounds, diegetic and extradiegetic music, montage and editing, and so on (HE: 221–222). The main reference to these is in the first part of a paper given at a conference in Assisi in 1970: 'The Unpopular Cinema' (HE: 267–275), in which Pasolini questions the role played by audio-visual techniques in his cinema.[97]

At the beginning of the conference, Pasolini argues that the awareness of the role of audio-visual techniques entails an 'infraction of code' (HE: 267). That is, Pasolini shows how the role of audio-visual techniques is cinematically relevant in breaking into the ideology normally shown on the screen (HE: 235). Pasolini lists several audio-visual techniques that aim to break into the accustomed perception of viewers and transform a film's images into a calling of their attention to what they are seeing on the screen. For example, there is 'the taste for making the cinematic machine felt' (HE: 183); there can be 'irregular and asymmetric editing' (HE: 221); and there is also 'the extradiegetic music in a sequence' (HE: 258). This means that audio-visual techniques not only affect and modify the rhythm, atmosphere and developing narrative of a film, but they also have pragmatic effects on the perception of audiences.

Nevertheless, Pasolini is also aware of a danger, which is that an excessive 'infraction of code' can orient his cinema towards a form of intellectualism and run the risk of succumbing to another ideology: avant-gardism, experimentalism, non-communication. Pasolini talks about the mixed role of audio-visual techniques in some examples. His references are to the work of a group of European directors – Fellini, Visconti, Godard,

[97] In this section, in the vein of Pasolini (HE: 235), I will use the term audio-visual techniques in the broadest sense both to refer to the actions of the film production phase and to refer to the activities of film post-production. In cinema theory the term 'film production phase' is generally understood to mean the movements of the cinematic camera – angles, planes, inclination – and the framings of the cinematic camera – sequence-shots, full shots, close-ups. Likewise, the term 'film post-production phase' is, in broad terms, the editing phase, which can be referred to as a series of actions transforming images in a film: the connection and co-crdination of images and sequences, the rhythm of a succession of images, the insertion of sounds, and diegetic and extradiegetic music. Usually these audio-visual techniques are used to arrange all profilmic content within a consistent spatial and temporal flow and include an appropriate narrative relationship of contiguity and similarity between scenes.

Rocha, Straub – and also to American Underground Cinema. For Pasolini, the European directors are recognisable for their peculiar and original awareness of audio-visual techniques. They aim to break into the accustomed perception of viewers in order to upset the narrative flow on the screen and to 'frustrate the viewer's expectations' (HE: 273). Another role of the infraction of code is to make cinematic authorship clear. According to Pasolini, these directors and their films force viewers 'to become aware of cinematic authorship and to realise that cinematic images are not innocent and natural, neutral, and non-ideological' (HE: 222). In this way, modern cinema has become a form of cinema that reflects on itself. Here, Pasolini emphasises a danger: 'an overly intellectual cinema ideologically oriented only to authorship' (HE: 253). New critical and aesthetic definitions – such as 'Fellini's cinema', 'Godard's cinema', 'Visconti's cinema' and so on – are not oriented to an encounter between cinema and politics, but to the ideology of authorship. For Pasolini, as seen in 2.1.2 and 2.2.2, this is the result of new bourgeois tastes for cinema and a cinematic elitism that is directly produced by the internal revolution of capitalism.

Pasolini also refers to American Underground Cinema. Here, he says, the infraction of code is so excessive that 'everything has become transgression' (HE: 274). Pasolini reiterates what he said about literary avant-gardism: too much infraction of code brings about a form of non-communication with audiences. According to Pasolini, the use of audio-visual techniques in American Underground Cinema reveals a total subversion of the usual communicative codes to the point where the infraction becomes politically counterproductive, because it rejects audiences and creates a nostalgic regression to neocapitalism's guiding language. For Pasolini, some films are even a declaration of radical opposition, war, or hatred against the viewer's perception of reality – a moralist sadism towards viewers, who are guilty of being manipulated by television and the blockbuster. The directors of these films, Pasolini argues, do not understand that the enemy is not the viewer – an individual democratically equal to them (HE: 270) – but the loss of reality produced by neocapitalism's guiding language. Significantly Pasolini says that this form of non-communication reveals that 'the enemy has disappeared and is fighting elsewhere' (HE: 274).

In short, Pasolini establishes that the disruptive role of audio-visual techniques is tempered by the aim for a wider perception of reality and the need to communicate it to audiences. To best articulate the meaning of Pasolini's claims, it can be useful to deal

with the issues of 'the infraction of code' not only in the first part of the conference in Assisi, but also in his later essays on cinema theory (1971–1972). Here, his fundamental cinematic reference is to Chaplin, as seen in 1.4.2. When Pasolini explains the use of Chaplin's gags on the screen, he also speaks of the meaning of 'the infraction of code'. His essay in 1971, 'The Gag in Chaplin', defines gags as audio-visual techniques that suddenly break into the spatial and temporal film narrative (HE: 254–255). On the one hand, gags capture the viewer's attention since they are conveyed in silent, accelerated, almost automatic frames. On the other hand, being funny and unnatural, gags upset the accustomed naturalism and conventionalism of viewers without an excessive transgression of code and indeed with lightness and sympathy. *Modern Times* by Chaplin is a model for Pasolini's cinema (HE: 100). Its profilmic content allows audiences to see the workforce in a real factory and to pay attention to the shocking reality of 'Fordism' (HE: 101). But in fact, it is the funny and unnatural gags that make the viewer perceive the worker's condition and sympathise with the problem of the alienating and automatic prohibition of expressiveness when working in a factory. Pasolini argues that gags are such a good example of which audio-visual techniques can convey a wider perception of reality, that here he significantly defines them as 'reality at its apex' (HE: 254). [98]

Thanks to the references to Chaplin, Pasolini starts to positively define the aesthetic dimensions of audio-visual techniques in light of the ontology implied by his choices of profilmic content. The connection between audio-visual techniques and profilmic content can help audiences see, perceive, and think about a singular reality through a shocking, but poetically tempered, breaking of film narrative. On the one hand, audio-visual techniques draw the viewer's attention to an iconic sign of itself as a shocking reality; on the other hand, since this is shocking for viewers, audio-visual techniques can poetically transform this shock into a form of sympathy and love for what they are seeing on the screen. This connection has been developed by Pasolini from his early films, with several significant and famous examples: Pasolini's choices of associating a beggar with an extra and the diegetic music being the sublime music of Bach (*Accattone,* 1961); the use of gags to present the starved life of Stracci (*La ricotta*, 1962); the choice of long-duration sequences of close-ups of the faces of poor people from Matera (*The Gospel According to St Matthew,* 1964); the abrupt stopping of filmic

[98] Pasolini has used gags since his early films, e.g. in *La ricotta* (1962), *Hawks and Sparrow* (1965), and *Che cosa sono le nuvole (*1966).

fiction by the insertion of archive documentary (*Hawks and Sparrows*, 1966; *Theorem*, 1968); the connection between an archaic landscape of the Global South and modern urban life (*Oedipus*, 1970), and so on.

Starting with these examples, many scholars define Pasolini's cinema as a contamination of aesthetics and reality (Viano, 1990; Mariniello, 1994; Rumble, 1996); as a phenomenological experience of reality (Fabbri, 1994; Ward, 1995; Desogus, 2018); or as a paradoxical moment between the perception of reality and its dissolution (Sitney, 2015; Vanin, 2017). This also seems to endorse a form of humanism in his cinema in which the political representation of the subalterns is linked to the reality of their human and excluded conditions, a thesis argued by several scholars (Rhodes, 2007; Patti, 2016: 161; Carmosino, 2016: 115–127). Here, this study continues to follow Pasolini's aim for a wider perception of reality in order to protect people from the loss of reality. Next, the encounter between Pasolini's audio-visual techniques and his profilmic content is considered as eliciting sympathy and love for 'the outside' in order that the viewer is enjoined to accept the political act of a shocking reality on the screen.

3.4.3 The relationship between audio-visual techniques and profilmic content to elicit sympathy and love for the outside

This section articulates how for Pasolini's cinema theory the aim for the wider perception of reality on the screen is achieved only if accompanied by the sympathy of the viewer for what they are seeing. The main references are two interviews which, significantly, are dedicated to his early films and to his last film, along with the second part of 'The Unpopular Cinema', the paper given at the conference in Assisi in 1970 (HE: 267–275) in which Pasolini argues that the sympathy of the viewer 'consists in enjoying the freedom of the director' (HE: 270). In other words, the sympathy of the viewer is invited and engaged by encountering his cinema, his ontology and his political theory. According to Pasolini, this sympathy can be achieved by the relationship between the political role of profilmic content and the aesthetic dimension of audio-visual techniques.

In an important interview about his second film, *Mamma Roma* (1962), Pasolini explains that the reasons for the political failure of this film are precisely because of his choices about the relationship between audio-visual techniques and profilmic content

(Stack, 1969: 49–58). Talking about 'his mistakes' in *Mamma Roma*, he asserts that he was wrong both in his choice of the main actress – Anna Magnani, the first star of Italian neorealism – and in his selection of Vivaldi's *Concertos in D minor and in C major* as the extradiegetic music of the film (Stack, 1969: 49–53). Pasolini links the first mistake to the wrong relationship between the profilmic content and the iconic sign of itself. Pasolini says that the profilmic content of *Mamma Roma* should show the ambivalent political conditions of the sub-proletariat at the time of the rise of neocapitalism: on the one hand, the sub-proletariat needs to be freed and, on the other hand, it desires to live out its petit-bourgeois aspirations and moralistic dreams as provided by neocapitalism's guiding language. In fact, Pasolini admits that this ambivalence between need and desire was not revealed by his film. This was caused by the singular and physical presence of Anna Magnani, who was neither violent nor unaccustomed to audiences; although she was a great actress, her face, body and behaviour reveal a woman who was born and has lived as a bourgeois woman for her whole life. Hence, her persona does not represent an iconic sign of the profilmic content chosen by Pasolini.

In talking of his second mistake, Pasolini admits that his choice of extradiegetic music should have aimed to draw the viewer's attention to this ambivalence. But the music of Vivaldi's *Concertos* was too light and joyful to achieve the aim. Pasolini asserts that his musical choices had created neither shocking effects on audiences nor intense and affective feeling for his profilmic content, as for example in *Accattone* (Stack, 1969: 46). As a result, he concludes that the viewer can digest *Mamma Roma* without much trouble and without too many questions, because there was little of the real and the sacred in that film.

The second interview, on Pasolini's last film, *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* (1975), is relevant in showing the connection between the political role of his profilmic content and the aesthetic dimensions of audio-visual techniques throughout his films. I found this interview unedited in Pasolini's archive in Florence. It is not a completed interview, but the preparatory manuscript that Pasolini composed for an interview with Gian Luigi Rondi (Archive II, 1, 172, 22) explains how he works on his profilmic content as the iconic sign of itself and how he cinematically transforms it through audio-visual techniques to assist the viewer's perception of reality. Speaking of a famous scene reprised in 4.4, Pasolini writes that the iconic sign of human excrement is the

fundamental profilmic content of this film. Later the political reference to that scene will be explored. However, for the moment what is interesting to note is that Pasolini combines this shocking reality with extradiegetic music by Morricone that is reminiscent of the soundtrack of Fellini's *La dolce di vita*. It is music that is light, mundane, dancing. There is no sweetness or beauty in human excrement, but the music helps viewers pause on the images and supports them to ask themselves what they are seeing.

These two interviews about *Mamma Roma* and *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* lead to an interpretation of the second part of Pasolini's contribution at the conference in Assisi in 1970, when he elaborated on how audio-visual techniques can elicit sympathy and love for his profilmic content. In line with the ever-changing outside of his profilmic content, Pasolini's aim has always been to continuously associate the viewer's sympathy with the different elements excluded by capitalism over time. As a result, Pasolini's cinema aims to invite viewers beyond capitalism pedagogically, and towards a wider perception of reality in which, he says, cinema has become a form of liberation that: (a) makes viewers perceive 'the contrary of the ideological perception of reality of capitalism'; and (b) makes them lose 'what capitalism orders [us] to save and preserve' (HE: 269).

This means and entails that the concept of sympathy is to be understood not only as a sentiment for sharing the ontology and semiotics of Pasolini's cinema (HE: 271), but also as a force of discontinuity that reveals another reality and another politics.[99] With this perspective, Pasolini adds that he considers sympathy as the main means to bring together viewer and director and to transform the viewer into another author, who, in turn, can instigate infractions of code. Pasolini argues that when the viewer transforms the shocking experience of the outside into sympathy with the outside, two intimate experiences occur: the first is that the viewer experiences 'the same freedom and courage to die' as the author, in the name of a wider perception of reality (HE: 269); the second is that the viewer objectifies this wider perception of reality, reinserting it into what is included and political (HE: 269).

[99] This idea is presented and supported by the academic context researching the relationship between cinema and politics. For Shapiro, it is the sympathy for what is on the screen that helps cinema-going audiences to develop a critical political thinking about the world (Shapiro, 2020: 16). For Panagia, sympathy is a kind of contagion, or even infection, that viewers catch from the director, as a kind of resonance or projection that feeds social conformism or political discontinuity (Panagia, 2013: 64).

Pasolini adds two further interesting claims that help to define this sympathy politically. First, focusing on the relationship between author and viewer, he says that while neocapitalism's guiding language forces 'a child to be educated within the masses' (HE: 269), for him, the relationship with the viewer is 'a dramatic relationship between democratically equal individuals' (HE: 268). As a result, the encounter between the viewer and the director is indefinable and contingent, but possible. This claim surely supports interpretations of Pasolini's cinema as humanistic, prophetic or even religious in its scope.

Nevertheless, the encounter between viewer and director is considered in light of the changing nature of capitalism (HE: 270). This means that Pasolini is aware that the viewer's sympathy remains a politically rare event because it is the result of a militant engagement that changes over time and because it is a form of anticapitalism and antagonism that searches for reality beyond capitalism – again over time. Pasolini's cinema of the outside results in his cinema being a form of anticapitalism that realises his political theory, that is grounded in his ontology, and that is organised by his entire cinema theory. His cinema of the outside conveys a transnational and trans-classist language made up from iconic signs that express profilmic content, which in turn reveals a contingency excluded by the changing nature of capitalism. This offers a wider perception of reality to all viewers ready to accept it. Such a cinema of the outside also invites the viewer to love that reality, and to live at the level of that reality outside capitalism (HE: 269; 278).

Sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 have sought to show that Pasolini's choices of profilmic content and his consequent audio-visual techniques have these twin purposes. Next, section 3.4.4 shows how these purposes can be illustrated through an analysis of Pasolini's film *Theorem*, which is undoubtedly paradigmatic and exemplary of his cinema of the outside.

3.4.4 *Theorem* as a paradigmatic example of Pasolini's cinema of the outside

Pasolini's film *Theorem* (1968) illustrates and exemplifies his cinema of the outside, in a form of modern cinema that also reflects on Marxism's renewal by denouncing the successes of neocapitalism and the failure of official Marxism. The film's plot centres

around a rich and bourgeois Milanese family and the sudden arrival of an unknown guest, a young man who is handsome, charming, charismatic, and nameless. Every member of the family falls in love with him, is sexually attracted by his body and ends up in bed with him. However, when the guest leaves for ever, everyone lives in despair. The film ends with Paolo, the father, naked and screaming in a desert land.

The film is split into two parts. The first part portrays the arrival of the young man, his art of seduction, the falling in love and the desperation of family members – including the family's maid Emilia – when he leaves. The second part shows the dramatic and degenerative consequences on the lives of every family member caused by an apparition of the unknown guest: Lucia, the mother, has become a sex addict; Pietro, the son, an egoist; Odette, the daughter, a neurotic; and Paolo, the father, has sold his factory to the workers, a mad and foolish interclassist gesture. Only Emilia's destiny is not afflicted: she decides to leave her work and to return to her home village. The two parts of the film are, however, preceded by a prologue or exposition: before the title appears on the screen, there is a brief documentary in which a reporter interviews some workers about the rise of neocapitalism and the failure of the class struggle. Beginning with their hesitant answers – workers are not aware of the rise of neocapitalism – the reporter asks a question that remains unanswered. Hence the film asks, can someone respond? In other words, can someone explain the consequences of the rise of neocapitalism and the end of the revolutionary force of Marxism? It is at this point that the title 'Theorem' appears, suggesting that the film is a response to these questions.

The plot clearly needs adequate explanation. Pasolini himself said about his film: 'every action signifies another action'. Searching for an interpretation, many scholars are convinced that the film is an allegory of a personal and religious issue for Pasolini: the distance between the Gospel's radical values and bourgeois conformist ones. This is the interpretative horizon of many scholars (Bonitzer, 1969; Cesare, 1989; Deleuze, 1989; Ferrero, 1994; Brugnoli, 2005; De Kesel, 2017) who identify the unknown guest as Jesus bringing a radical form of love to all people and asking them to live it in their lives; yet this radicalism does not lead to the promised land, but to the desert. Hence the ambivalence of *Theorem*: is it a film that shows how the true love of a God can restore a humankind in need of love? Or, vice versa, is it a film that shows how belief in a God leads humankind into a desert land in which only desperation and screams exist? In other words, does *Theorem* reveal a profound sense of religion in Pasolini, or his

contempt for religious sentiment?

In contrast to this interpretative horizon, Viano and others (Viano, 1993; Fusillo, 2012; Peppel, 2012) suggest a psychoanalytical interpretation of the film. Here, the unknown guest represents the rise of real trauma breaking into the process of the signification of reality. *Theorem* is thus an allegory of the postmodern condition, revealing the current crisis of the signification of reality. The vision of the desert land that recurs throughout the film is an allegory of this crisis – the place where desires and lives meet each other in an open space, but a wasteland, too, towards which we are led by the postmodern condition.

Contrary to such scholarship, this study follows the political meaning of Pasolini's cinema of the outside, arguing that *Theorem* reflects on neocapitalism and refers specifically to what is outside bourgeois perceptions of reality, and that rather than being an allegory the film documents the real condition of the bourgeois classes in the coming of neocapitalism. My hypothesis is that the film is not directed at Marxist intellectuals, as in his early films, but directly to the traditional culture and values of the bourgeoisie. For Pasolini, these too are now outside capitalism.

Hence, although in *Theorem* Pasolini is portraying the bourgeoisie and not the subproletariat, the film is consistent with (a) his political theory, which deals with the including and excluding powers of capitalism; and (b) the aims of his cinematic turn and his cinema of the outside, which uses profilmic content related to what is forgotten, excluded, and denied by the changing nature of capitalism. Every sequence is a set of iconic signs of profilmic content: the values, the lifestyle and the bodies and faces of the high bourgeoisie, the big factory, the grand and elegant villa, the modern furniture, and the behaviour of family members, all of which clearly show the real status of a high-bourgeois family in everyday life in their mundanity and appearance, and their sophistication and superficiality.

For Pasolini, this bourgeois world is disappearing, crushed by the rise of neocapitalism. The extradiegetic music of Mozart's *Requiem* and the recurring images of the desert breaks into these sequences, making viewers perceive the impending crisis. Pasolini wants to prove logically how the bourgeois classes will be excluded by neocapitalism in the 1970s, just as the urban subproletariat was excluded in the 1960s. This demonstrates

how his cinema of the outside is oriented to display any elements excluded by capitalism – not only the marginalised condition of poor people – and how it always relates to the changing nature of capitalism over time. *Theorem* speaks of the moment when high-bourgeois values were replaced by a generalised petit-bourgeois conformism produced by neocapitalism's guiding language. In line with his political theory and his cinematic turn, the bourgeoisie do not die as a result of a class struggle and Marxist revolution, but as a consequence of the internal revolution of capitalism.

This interpretation can be supported by both title and plot. The film suggests the idea of a geometric rigor in its development of a hypothesis that is to be proved and that is illustrated through the questions posed in the film's prologue. Therefore, the arrival of the unknown guest, his being nameless, the emphases on sexuality and the consequent desperation, as well as the repeated images of the desert during the film, are signs and steps of this development: (a) neocapitalism is external to the previous cultural traditions of the bourgeoisie, and every bourgeois individual is unaware of its power (the guest is unknown and nameless for every member of the family); (b) the bourgeoisie, as were the subproletariat in Pasolini's early films (e.g. *Mamma Roma*), are first fascinated and affected (sexuality) but then annihilated (desperation) by neocapitalism; (c) the bourgeoisie will end up with no values and no hopes, no decency, no discretion and no shame (the diverse annihilated destinies of every member of this bourgeois family) in the hands of neocapitalism (the desert land).

The entire film is therefore a proof of the successes of neocapitalism over bourgeois values and traditions. It is also, for Pasolini, a further occasion to mention the failure of official Marxism in Italy and to show the need for its renewal. The iconic sign of itself – a hammer and sickle symbol drawn roughly on a wall by a supporter of the Communist Party – highlights the political meaning of the character of Emilia, the family maid. Her role indicates Pasolini's political theory in favour of Marxism's renewal. To best articulate this role, it is important to stress the fact that the name of Emilia is also the name of the most important communist Italian region of that time. Emilia-Romagna was often called the flag and the cradle of communism in Italy, and the maid Emilia is thus the personification of the Italian Communist Party and of official Marxism. Like Emilia with the unknown guest, the Italian Communist Party is unaware of the rise of neocapitalism and falls in love with neocapitalism and is now, temporarily, in despair and lost.

However, at the beginning of the second part of *Theorem*, Emilia decides to leave her work and to return to her home village. Here, unlike the other bourgeois family members who will be crushed with sorrow at their memories of the young man, Emilia changes her life: she lives as a 'saint', who in silence eats only nettles. There is a breakthrough in Emilia's life, as there should be in official Marxism. A fundamental scene at the end of film sees Emilia buried alive in the earth, with the saintly woman saying paradigmatically: 'Don't be afraid. I'm not here in the earth to die, but to cry. However, my tears are not tears of pain, they are from a spring'. After Emilia's words, Pasolini shows a tiny spring on the earth, which is clearly to be dug deeper so as to yield plenty of water.

Taking up the challenge of interpreting a film in which 'every action signifies another action' this study argues that (a) 'Emilia's return to her home village' shows how Marxism needs to go back to its origins (reading Marx, but not as a Gospel – HE: 38); (b) 'her body, buried and crying', infers the need to ground a new ontology (Pasolini's cinema theory); (c) 'the saintly woman who sacralised everything' illustrates the need for a new language (the trans-classist and transnational language of cinema); (d) 'Emilia's tears' are the source of a new Marxism that is harshly critical of the changing nature of capitalism (Pasolini's film production); and (e) 'the tiny spring that asks to be dug' shows his pedagogical intentionality towards audiences (Marxism's renewal).

Understood in this way, *Theorem* is one of the fundamental moments of Pasolini's cinema of the outside. It is aimed (a) at making the excluding power of neocapitalism perceivable; (b) at questioning (and even somehow at solving) the loss of reality created by neocapitalism; (c) at making viewers grasp the problem of, and give value and dignity to, the excluded elements of neocapitalism; and (d) at including on the screen a reality that is otherwise excluded. This is the eventual approach that Pasolini's cinema makes towards a new Marxism. If audio-visual technologies involve increasingly more communicative and cognitive political dimensions, to the point that the viewer's perception of reality is completely manipulated by television and the blockbuster, Pasolini's aim to assist the renewal of Marxism does not escape from the challenge. Notwithstanding, as he seeks in theory and in practice to reveal reality to the viewer, his work on cinema theory in order to develop his cinema of the outside has evolved into a condition for anticapitalism.

3.5 Pasolini's cinema of the outside and the renewal of Marxism

This study has emphasised how the concept of the outside allows for an original interpretation of Pasolini's cinema in light of Marxism's renewal. This emphasis shows that his cinema is never the individuation of a political subjectivity, but the affirmation of a radical anticapitalism that always requires knowledge of the changing nature of capitalism and a vision of what remains of reality. For Pasolini, how deep this knowledge goes, how far it perceptively disturbs neocapitalism's guiding language, and to what degree it shows the outside and makes it visible – this is the renewal of Marxism that his cinema of the outside seeks to consider and to foster.

The final section of this chapter considers the conditions that the cinema of the outside offers for the renewal of Marxism. First, Pasolini's cinema offers an ontology of cinema that allows people to perceive that which is outside capitalism, while acknowledging that there is a struggle between different degrees of perception of reality within audio-visual technologies. This twofold claim is central to understanding that Pasolini's cinema raises questions about both the effects of capitalism and its own internal revolution, in understanding the logic of capitalism's power to include and exclude parts of reality. It also raises questions about the language of audio-visual technologies, which are not an innocent and neutral form of entertainment for the masses, but constitute an ideology through which the viewer's perception of reality is shaped.

Second, Pasolini's cinema helps us to realise the changing nature of capitalism. The concept of the outside defines his militant engagement as much as his everchanging choices of profilmic content, which in turn invite the viewer to question and to discover where, how and why the power of capitalism changes over time. Third, if Marxism is antagonistic towards capitalism because it looks at reality and protects people from the loss of reality, Pasolini's cinema draws the viewer's attention and sympathy towards the outside in order to face and to counteract the ideological vision of capitalism, which hides the social and cultural exclusion produced by its changing nature. And lastly, Pasolini's cinema demands of viewers that they see, perceive, think about and even encounter a wider perception of reality 'in the now', rather than take contradictions as natural and immutable. The viewer's sympathy for the outside is a sharing both with the militant engagement of Pasolini and with a distancing from capitalism. Even more, this

sympathy brings a detachment among viewers from simply considering themselves as viewers in front of the screen. With this perspective, Pasolini's cinema is political because reality is more solid on the screen; and viewers, in turn, are not shielded or even cut off from reality; and because visions of the outside invite viewers to exit from the ideology of the common sense that prevents another reality and another politics.

However, it is also fundamental to note that Pasolini's cinema provides limits to an awareness of the present and for militant engagement. On the one hand, his cinema grasps a kind of law of capitalism through its logic of inclusions and exclusions in order to resist and to help viewers to see alternative ways of living and of loving reality. On the other hand, Pasolini's everchanging portrayal of the outside brings a clear and aware self-reflective critique to a militant engagement that is against capitalism, in order to recognise that capitalism continues to include and exclude parts of reality. This means that Pasolini is motivated to extend the viewer's interest in reality, particularly in what is excluded or in what is going to be excluded from reality. He does this even though, while his films require the development of awareness and engagement, they do not identify a political subjectivity capable of disturbing capitalism.

In methodological terms, three criteria can eventually be inferred from Pasolini's cinema in defining his trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics. First: Pasolini requires courage and awareness in looking at the relationship between ideology and reality in progressive and evolutive terms, as well as in technological and practical terms, precisely because capitalism is continuously revolutionary and repressive. Second: Pasolini reveals and considers the dialectic between the inside and the outside, and between the visible and the invisible, which ultimately rule how neocapitalism revolutionises itself and social relationships. Third: Pasolini elevates what is politically outside and invisible to a place of love and beauty in order to preserve the possibilities of a positive encounter with reality. This occurs through the direct relationship between political and aesthetic dimensions. In this way, Pasolini's cinema of the outside is not a sociological touchstone that denounces the evils of capitalism, but rather a pedagogical springboard imbued with anticapitalistic logic to increasingly feed the passion and love of audiences in search of a wider knowledge of reality.

CHAPTER 4
PASOLINI'S CINEMATIC TURN AS A PEDAGOGY OF THE OUTSIDE (1970s)

> 'Audio-visual techniques are in large measure already a part of our world, that is, of the world of technical neocapitalism, which moves ahead, and whose tendency it is to deprive its techniques of ideology or to make them ontological; to make them silent and unrelated; to make them habits; to make them religious forms.' (HE: 222)

> 'The first kind of reaction carries out the revolutionary destruction (revolutionary with respect to its own standards) of all the old social institutions—family, culture, language, church—the second kind of reaction ... is giving way to a new bourgeoisie that on an increasing scale and ever more profoundly is incorporating the working classes as well, consummating a tendency to definitively identify the bourgeoisie with humanity.' (CW: 27)

> 'I leap ahead immediately to say that the importance of what television teaches is enormous, because it does nothing else but offer a series of "examples" of being and behaviour. Even if announcers, presenters
> and other dregs of humanity of that kind talk and talk horrendously—in effect the true language of television is like the language of things; it is absolutely pragmatic and does not admit of rejoinders, alternatives, resistance.' (LL: 30)

Chapter 3 showed that, for Pasolini, to have the courage to look neocapitalism and its own changing nature in the face (HE: 47) means theorising the conditions of possibility for a renewal of Marxism that looks constantly at the reality of what is outside capitalism. With this perspective, this study has argued that Pasolini's political originality lies in recognising that his struggle is never static but is rather always a battle on the move: the affirmation of a radical anticapitalism that offers a wider perception of reality through his cinema of the outside – ultimately a vision of what remains of reality within the changing nature of capitalism.

This political originality, which I have proposed runs throughout his cinema, is also revealed in his late essays, collected in *Corsair Writings* (1974) and *Lutheran Letters* (1975), and in his last film *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*. In the mid-1970s, Pasolini recognises further changes in the nature of capitalism and new excluded realities. According to Pasolini, the political, innovative, and even revolutionary freedoms of the younger generations are disappearing, crushed by the pervasive pedagogical role of neocapitalism's guiding language, while neocapitalism shows that its new aim is not only the ideological conquest of the perception of reality, but also the direct production of subjectivities. For Pasolini, neocapitalism is further transforming itself into a new form of fascism through an anthropological mutation of consciousnesses and groups of people.[100] The new fascism is the attempt of a totalitarian reorganisation of the perception of reality – in which neocapitalism produces a claustrophobic regime without any real opposition (CW: 31). The result of this reorganisation is an anthropological mutation that operates through a pedagogy in which transgression and revolt have become forms of conformism among the young (CW: 49).

A key aspect of new fascism and of anthropological mutation is, for Pasolini, the consumerist pedagogy produced by neocapitalism's guiding language for young people. In my view, his awareness is the core of Pasolini's understanding of neocapitalism in the 1970s, reposing and compounding the problem of the relationship between ideology and reality on the screen. There has been absolute consistency of Pasolini's cinematic turn and the increasing insistence of his attention to a renewal of Marxism. As he himself writes in *Lutheran Letters,* 'I personally have always been anti-Fascist and have never accepted the new power of which Marx was in fact speaking prophetically in the Manifesto while thinking he was speaking of the capitalism of his own time' (LL: 12). Hence this study next considers how his last essays and films promote an audio-visual counter-pedagogy that can provide analysis, tools, and actions to counteract the ideological power of neocapitalism and find a way to address it.

In line with Pasolini's cinematic turn in the late 1950s and his cinema of the outside in the 1960s and early 1970s, I argue in this final chapter that his radical anticapitalism

[100] It is interesting to note that Deleuze speaks of a new form of fascism in the mid-1970s, differentiating it from the old fascism and defining it as micro-fascism (Deleuze, 2003:136-137). In addition, it is notable that Deleuze, as Pasolini, claims that the old fascism was folkloristic, a sort of superficial disguise in which power required people only to adhere to the economy of war. Lastly, Deleuze, like Pasolini, interprets the new form of fascism as a totalitarian device for organising a complex apparatus of deeply personal effects such as fears, anxieties and silences, a sort of phenomenological mutation.

ultimately resulted in a necessary 'paradigm shift' in the education of young people in the mid-1970s: a political education of the younger generation through film, including the ontology, semiology and semiotics of cinema, should be complementary to his (Pasolini's) cinema of the outside in order to struggle against the changing nature of capitalism. For Pasolini, this means having not only a critical understanding of the written language of reality, but also an active interest in filmmaking as a form of militant engagement, thereby increasing and enhancing the resources offered by the trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics.

To develop this counter-pedagogy, the first section of this chapter (4.1) will identify the relevance of 'adaptability' as a concept in Pasolini's political theory. Adaptability entails both his awareness of the changing nature of capitalism – what he calls 'a new fascism' and 'an anthropological mutation' (4.1.1) – and his presumption that Marxism can be renewed, which is seen as an audio-visual counter-pedagogy for the young (4.1.2). These issues clearly emerge through comments in his last film *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* (1975), where the direct production of the subjectivities of neocapitalism meets Pasolini's focus on a counter-pedagogy in favour of the young (4.2). In addition, in analysing his last pedagogical treatise, 'Gennariello' (1975), section 4.3 will show how such counter-pedagogy asks for 'a paradigm shift' from literary language to audio-visual language. This shift enables the organisation of cinematic antagonism and resistance in light of Pasolini's awareness of the changing nature of capitalism.

Therefore, these sections will show that Pasolini took an interest in filmmaking as a form of militant and active anticapitalism among the younger generation. In recent years, there has been a rising interest in Pasolini's focus on pedagogy (Annovi, 2013; Bondavalli, 2015; Carnero & Felice, 2015; Kirchmayr, 2016; Recalcati, 2022). Each of these authors, tied to the Forum of Italian Studies, has brought something new to the study of Pasolini's pedagogy and have guided and accompanied the work on this chapter. Yet, if they have something in common, it is that none puts the pedagogical role of cinema as its focus, nor then attempts an exploration of the political elements therein. For example, Kirchmayr defines Pasolini's counter-pedagogy as a passion for the rejection of society (Kirchmayr, 2016: 21-37). However, Kirchmayr does not define how this passion and rejection would work and be realised. In addition, Bondavalli (2015: 211) and Recalcati (2022: 31) leave no doubt that Pasolini points to a counter-pedagogy, but they also consider it the repudiation of the young as a revolutionary force.

Our focus remains on offering a reading of Pasolini's trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics as his attention to the conditions of the possibility for political dissent – something the authors above have generally ignored. A trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics has been followed in recent work by Shapiro (2013; 2020), Panagia (2013), and Fraser (2018), in order to provide a useful development of the state of political theory today. The contribution of this chapter to the relationship between cinema and pedagogy follows some interesting concepts and ideas from these scholars. The wider perception of reality is here understood through the pedagogical role of the whole filmmaking process, in which the main subject remains the reality that lies outside capitalism. Thus, this chapter will develop and further confirm the work of previous chapters regarding the relationship between Pasolini's cinema theory and his political theory in favour of Marxism's renewal – this time focusing on the role of pedagogy.

4.1 The changing nature of capitalism and the concept of adaptability

In the mid-1970s, in his essays collected in *Corsair Writings* (1974) and *Lutheran Letters* (1975), Pasolini argues for an awareness of further changes in the nature of capitalism. As described further in 4.1.1, he asserts that a new form of neocapitalism's guiding language – television advertising – transforms the revolt and transgression into pedagogical codes subjected to capitalism, making the perception of the real oppositions and factual contradictions of reality unpresentable. It is this awareness that allows Pasolini to understand a further degradation in the viewer's ability to perceive reality on the screen: the attempt of a totalitarian reorganisation of reality, that Pasolini calls a new fascism, is linked to an anthropological mutation that is fixed on young people who are entirely subjected to the pedagogical models proposed by neocapitalism.

Does this mean that the outside is missed, fully absorbed by neocapitalism? Does it imply that the political aims of Pasolini's cinema are completely lost? Or, instead, is Pasolini's political theory reiterated and confirmed – i.e. does the outside change over time in relation to the changing nature of capitalism? Is a vital element in the lives of young people disappearing – the parts excluded, forgotten, and denied by the internal revolution of capitalism? In 4.1.2 the answers to these questions are explored through Pasolini's concept of adaptability, a concept that explains his political engagement with

the conditions of the youth of his time. The concept of adaptability has also enabled me to interpret the meaning of his last essays and film in light of an audio-visual counter-pedagogy that, ultimately, allows a reiteration of the consistency of Pasolini's political theory and cinema of the outside.

4.1.1 Neocapitalism as a new form of fascism and an anthropological mutation

In *Corsair Writings* (1974), Pasolini argues that we should be aware of the ideological role played by television advertising as the new form of neocapitalism's guiding language. Pasolini asserts that television advertising is capable of absorbing and exorcising any real transgression by making it its own, and by transforming it into the marvellous light of a commercial product and a consumerist fashion trend (CW: 5). This new form of the written language of reality, which has put together capitalistic and transgressive codes, is not a product of the selectivity of the language of television and the blockbuster – those show the including and excluding functions of the power of capitalism. Instead, they represent a totalitarian reorganisation of reality in which the realism of the outside – represented by the main profilmic content of Pasolini's cinema – and the main concept of his political theory seem to be weakened and even included by neocapitalism.[101] In fact, this new form of written language reveals and specifies once more that the outside is not, for Pasolini, an opposition to capitalism, but a vision of what remains of reality within the changing nature of capitalism.

The concepts of naturalism and conventionalism clarified in chapter 3 along with some examples drawn directly from Pasolini's essays collected in *Corsair Writings* (1974) can best help us to understand the relationship between the new form of fascism and what remains of reality. Pasolini asserts that the written language of reality produced by television advertising puts together naturalism and conventionalism. On the one hand, television advertising absorbs a transgressive behaviour by transforming it into a symbolic sign that puts together rebellion and fashion. This entails that the revolt is a part of a code defined by capitalism itself. On the other hand, through the ubiquitous flowing of images on television, this symbolic sign will be reduced to a form of naturalism, transforming into something that is immediately real and objective for consumerism, but that in fact will soon fade in the memory of viewers. This means that

[101] The outside is not to be considered as an opposition to capitalism, but literally an outside, something that is excluded, forgotten and denied by capitalism yet that reveals to us where capitalism is going.

neocapitalism includes transgressive and oppositive codes and simultaneously weakens them until they are denied.

To illustrate this, there are two significant examples in the two first famous essays in *Corsair Writings* (1974). In 'The Discourse of the Longhairs' (CW: 1-6), Pasolini argues polemically that the signs that had represented the rebellion and transgression of a minority of young people in the 1960s – free sexuality, long hair, the creative and spontaneous expressiveness of behaviour and even their clothing of blue jeans, tee shirts and miniskirts – have by the early 1970s become main conformist symbols for the majority of young people, thanks to television advertising. Likewise, in 'The Linguistic Analysis of a Slogan' (CW: 6-14), Pasolini argues that the political radicalism of Jesus Christ – as he had represented in his film *The Gospel According to St Matthew* (1964) – was undermined and ultimately denied by the television advertising related to a famous Italian brand of jeans. Their Anglo-Saxon model was found in the blockbuster 'Jesus Christ Superstar', which called its jeans 'Jesus jeans' and presented them with the slogan 'you shall have no other jeans before me'.

These two examples drawn from film and television advertising are for Pasolini enough to claim that the successes of audio-visual advertising are evidence of the rise of a new claustrophobic regime, which impoverishes the alternative expressions of life (CW: 131), represses the political meaning of revolt and protest (CW: 133), and leads individuals towards 'an atrocious form of aphasia, a brutal absence of critical capacity, a conformist passivity' (CW: 142). The results of the new regime are the successes of interclassism, consumerism, political disengagement, and unproblematic visions of reality and capitalism itself. This entails the political inefficacy of an opposition to capitalism and confirms Pasolini's view that realism is politically outside capitalism. Pasolini understands that neocapitalism directly produces subjectivities and represses any real possibility of opposition, ultimately entailing the neurosis of future young generations who must live in a hopeless present day.

Thus, the rise of a new form of fascism means claustrophobic and homologised conditions for the young in which freedom, vitality and hope are entirely subjected to the pedagogical codes proposed by capitalism. According to Pasolini, this produces an anthropological mutation that will make new generations 'culturally, psychologically, and – most impressively – physically interchangeable' (CW: 24) as well as

'indistinguishable' from one another (CW: 31). Recently Wark has perfectly grasped Pasolini's attention to the capitalistic production of subjectivities. He writes that 'Pasolini's project is to work in and against the new modes of the production of such subjects'. Because 'One thing that is distinctive about neo-capitalism is that it mass produces subjects in much the same way as it mass produces objects. It makes consumers go with its products, and in doing so will more and more bypass the old superstructures in the role of subject formation' (Wark, 2019: 156-157).

It is at this point that Pasolini looks elsewhere in his cinema of the outside and his political theory. Through his last essays and last film *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*, Pasolini shows how his militant engagement is aimed at positively promoting an audio-visual counter-pedagogy that searches for methods of thinking about the trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics among the next generations. This militant engagement will start to be understood through his concept of adaptability, explained in the next subsection.

Before passing to 4.1.2, it is important to note that prominent scholars claim that Pasolini's last works are prone to pessimism, renouncing militant engagement in light of what Sollazzo defines as a politics of refusal in modern society (Sollazzo, 2016: 110). Considering the rise of new fascism and the coming of an anthropological mutation of young people, Esposito, for example, speaks of 'Pasolini's regression and his reactive resentment' towards politics as evidenced through the 'sacrificial and unconscious impulses' of his film characters (Esposito, 2009: 202-204). Bersani and Maggi define Pasolini's cinema in the 1970s as a form of 'negativity in art' (Bersani, 2015), or even 'catastrophic apocalypse' (Maggi, 2009), in their rejection of the myths of dominant culture. Wark argues that Pasolini looks back 'to premodern and precommodified forms of everyday life and reverts to the archaic' in order to struggle against neocapitalism (Wark, 2019: 156).

However, despite these claims of pessimism, this chapter suggests that Pasolini was cautiously optimistic. Through the concept of his adaptability, it is possible to allow the insertion of his last works into his political theory and his cinema of the outside. This optimism also enriches the understanding of Pasolini's attention to the conditions for Marxism's renewal through the development of an audio-visual pedagogy in favour of young people, even as they are being subjected to neocapitalism. It also confirms and

enriches our understanding of his trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics.

4.1.2 The concept of adaptability

To elaborate on how Pasolini's interest in the condition of the young is linked to his political theory and his cinema of the outside, this study briefly refers again to his claims within the preparatory manuscript for an interview with Gian Luigi Rondi, the non-edited document in Pasolini's archive in Florence noted in 3.4.3. The manuscript is relevant in explaining the political meaning of *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* (1975), Pasolini's last film before his death in November 1975 (Pasolini's Archive II, 1, 172, 22), and inserts it into his cinema theory in light of his cinema of the outside. Moreover, it confirms his political theory in favour of Marxism's renewal.

It is crucial to report what Pasolini declares about *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* in his explanation of the realism of his profilmic content: that it reveals the claustrophobic condition of young people. Notwithstanding, he says that *Salò* is not a pessimistic film, as it might appear to the superficial observer, but a film that shows his adaptability to the changing nature of capitalism. His choice to represent the conditions of the young is therefore to choose to portray what remains of reality for young people within the changing nature of capitalism. It also means that the term 'adaptability' is extremely interesting, because it reiterates both the political aims of Pasolini's cinema – showing what is excluded, forgotten, and denied by capitalism over time – and his desire for a renewal of Marxism that in its anticapitalism can nevertheless adapt to the changing nature of capitalism. Already in an article in 1965 Pasolini had argued that some polemical works against his request for Marxism's renewal showed themselves as suspicious in the presence of his militant engagement. He had commented then that those polemical works were written from an 'aversion to accepting a change of perspective, an adaptation to new problems which are presented as profoundly modifying every established condition in society as well as in individual consciousness' (HE: 26).

We can find a further clarification of this adaptability through another two essays in *Corsair Writings,* in which Pasolini continues to develop his interest in the conditions of youth. The first is from a talk at a Communist convention in the same summer of 1974.

Pasolini admits to the audience that his claims of a new form of fascism and of the anthropological mutation of the young can appear as apocalyptic but, he adds:

> 'If along with this vision and the anxiety that produces it, there were not also an element of optimism, the conviction that there is a possibility of fighting against all of this, then I simply would not be here, among you, to speak' (CW: 142).

This clearly means that adaptability is neither a pessimistic acceptance of capitalism, nor the absence of a desire to fight against capitalism. Adaptability is rather 'the conviction that there is a possibility of fighting', albeit Pasolini does not explain with whom, where or why. The second essay is drawn from an article entitled 'Further Reflections on my "Outline Sketch" of the Anthropological Revolution in Italy' (CW: 32). On 11 July 1974, he writes:

> 'I accept the ascetic invitation to keep working only on behalf of the smallest minorities; or even better, to wait for today's "similarities" to become tomorrow's "differences". In fact, I am indeed working on behalf of tiny minorities and if I am working this means that I have not given up (although I detest all optimism, which is always euphemistic)' (CW: 32).

Reading these statements, the bond between Pasolini's concept of adaptability and 'the possibility of fighting' is evident: Pasolini (a) keeps his political commitment in light of a cautious optimism; (b) he works on behalf of tiny minorities; and (c) he aims to create differences.

This study argues that these points are met in his last works. Pasolini's adaptability is focused on a new trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics in favour of Marxism's renewal and is in line with his cinema of the outside: an audio-visual pedagogy in favour of another minority – the young – creating criticisms and differences in order to counteract the anthropological mutation due to the changing nature of capitalism. In *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*, explored in 4.2, the final scene of the film witnesses the need of a counter-pedagogy in favour of young people; and in 'Gennariello', a pedagogical treatise for young people, explored in 4.3, young people are invited to understand the pedagogical role of cinema theory (LL: 31) and exhorted to realise that 'nothing forces one to look at things like making a film' (LL: 31).

This interest in pedagogy is important in that Pasolini seems to move from a pedagogy for audiences to a pedagogy for teachers, showing an evolution that needs to be assessed. In this case, the realism of the outside, for Pasolini, will be supported by those minorities who want to fight capitalism by critically studying neocapitalism's guiding

language and proposing alternatives through filmmaking – both in the young and among teachers.

Is this evolution a progression from materialism to idealism? Indeed, Pasolini has previously not looked for a political subjectivity in his cinematic oeuvre, but now he names the filmmaker as the teacher and a minority of the young as the students, and he considers them to be ideal political subjectivities. Pasolini indeed appears to be leaning towards a pedagogy of the educators rather than a pedagogy of the audience, a somewhat Platonic choice that denotes a change in his previous militant engagement.

Therefore, if 'nothing forces one to look at things like making a film' (LL: 31), then the term 'things' signifies the relationship between ideology and reality, resulting in the aims of his cinema of the outside and his future audio-visual pedagogy. This means that if Marxism is the only political theory affirming that reality is not ideology, and if the direct relationship between ideology and reality is determined over time, then the coming of the pedagogy of the educator will confirm the political meaning of Pasolini's cinematic turn: an anticapitalism aimed at counteracting the changing nature of the alliance between capitalism and audio-visual technologies. This anticapitalism is thus Pasolini's legacy in his political use of cinema, in order to offer conditions for a renewal of Marxism.

4.2 *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom:* Pasolini's adaptability and his counter-pedagogy

Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom is centred on a political question: how is it possible for young people to exit neocapitalism? In 4.2.1 the plot of *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* is seen to be rooted in Pasolini's concept of adaptability in light of the successes of neocapitalism among young people by the mid-1970s. Section 4.2.2 identifies how the title of the film, through the conjunction 'or', makes explicit Pasolini's pessimistic analysis of the conditions for the young within the new changing capitalism: this is a film speaking of a new form of fascism that determines an anthropological mutation among young people. In 4.2.3, starting from a reading of the 'iconic sign of itself' in Pasolini's cinema of the outside, it becomes possible to appreciate how his adaptability is aimed at developing a cautious optimism through a pedagogy that counteracts neocapitalism's guiding language (4.2.4).

To articulate these subsections, this study develops the claims that Pasolini presented to audiences through *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*. He argues that the political sense of the film can be outlined by the following sentence: 'in a society where everything is forbidden, you can do anything: in a society where some things are permitted, you can only do those things' (CW: 77). In line with his cinema and political theories, I have reinterpreted this sentence as follows: on a screen where everything is forbidden, you can imagine anything; on a screen where some images are permitted, you can only see those images. This reinterpretation allows us to understand the ideological and pedagogical role of naturalism on the screen for young people, along with the value of visibility[102] as the lowest degree of perception of reality that determines their education: what is seen, exists, and what is not seen, does not exist.

In my view, the value of visibility is the conceptual and theoretical, but also the social and political, framework in which Pasolini's adaptability foresees a new encounter between cinema and politics: a counter-pedagogy that is in fact an audio-visual pedagogy because the production and the consumerism of images is the central issue for politics. This is also surely one of the greatest challenges for politics today: to promote a counter-pedagogy dedicated to search methods for thinking cinematically (Shapiro, 2020: 1) and to encourage a cinematic mode of political thinking (Panagia, 2013: 48) – through, inside and against what is seen on the screen. Here, one may endorse what Shapiro and Panagia imply: to approach the current battlefield of political theory requires a counter-pedagogy 'in which attention and ways of thinking, skills and competences actively intervene in the dominant power of images of life worlds' (Shapiro, 2020: 2). Once more Pasolini's cinema of the outside is not understood as a prophetic, apocalyptic or exclusively pessimistic cinema; it is his militant engagement with his present times in favour of an endless anticapitalism, that is his version of an endless renewal of Marxism.[103]

[102]This concept of visibility emerges from a comparison of Pasolini's cinema of the outside and Rancière's aesthetics. Rancière suggests that the perception of reality in which we live is embedded in an aesthetic distribution of the sensible, revolving around what is seen and what can be said about what is common to the community, the forms of its visibility and its hierarchical organisation. Ranciére thus declares that the relationship between politics and visibility defines how people can participate politically and how they can perceive politics. For Rancière, aesthetic education is to be understood as a political state in which 'the activity of thought and sensible receptivity become a single reality' (Rancière, 2006, 27).

[103] McKenzie Wark has recently recognised that by working in cinema and mass media and by struggling in and against the audio-visual forces of the cultural productions of his time, Pasolini has understood that neocapitalism was producing subjects in much the same way as it mass-produced objects (Wark, 2019: 156). Wark argues that Pasolini's Marxism has seen cinema and the role of cinematic images and audio-

4.2.1 *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* – the film narrative

Before identifying the main aspects of *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*, a brief plot summary of the film is needed to develop a sense of Pasolini's adaptability. As the title of film suggests, the set is placed during the fascist 'Repubblica di Salò', a Nazi-controlled puppet-government which existed during the German domination of Italy in 1944. The plot is freely adapted from de Sade's novel, *The 120 Days of Sodom*. As discussed later, Pasolini's cinema equates fascism with sadism, dictatorship with perversion, and repression with sexuality. The opening scenes of the film tell of the taking of several young captives. From among these captives sixteen boys and girls are chosen – carefully selected by the fascists during a Nazi raid in the Po Valley. Their fate will be imprisonment in a claustrophobic setting within an ancient palace-prison located in Marzabotto, a village that, not coincidently, is also the site of one of the largest massacres of civilians committed by the Nazis in Western Europe during the Second World War. This palace has no way out, and any communication and relationship with external reality is strictly forbidden to its captives.

Inside the palace, these innocent young people will be in the hands of four fascist hierarchs, a duke, a bishop, a chief magistrate, and a president – as in de Sade's novel. These young people will be sexually brutalised and tortured by the sexual manias and perversions of these fascist hierarchs, who in turn are sexually aroused by three mature women who tell stories about their sordid and scabrous encounters with sex maniacs. A fourth woman accompanies their narration on the piano. A crowd of young fascists assist, watch, and collaborate with the hierarchs to implement their sexual desires.

The film is divided into three parts whose titles recall Dante's hell, composed of three circles: 'the circle of manias', 'the circle of shit', and 'the circle of blood'. A prelude, entitled 'Antinferno', shows us the arrest and selection of the young people and the establishment of the rules governing their captivity. This is a unilateral contract by which the four fascist hierarchs establish their absolute power over the bodies of the young people in order to receive pleasure through every kind of sexual and sadistic perversion. The young people are thus in the hands of an anarchic and totalitarian power

visual techniques as the necessary pedagogical subject formation to work in, versus the new modes of the production of such subjects.

throughout the course of the three infernal circles.

In the first circle, the plot is focused on the joy and pleasure of the sexual manias realised by the hierarchs in abusing their captive victims (in a perverse series of sexual abuses). In the second circle, the narration is centred on the perversion of coprophilia and coprophagy. After a scene showing a girl forced to eat the excrement of a fascist, the central scene of this circle shows a banquet, with excrements, organised by the four hierarchs for their young victims. In the final circle, the action is completely absorbed by the hierarchs' desire to torture those young people who don't comply with their manias. It is at this point that the film ends with an enigmatic, but paradigmatic, scene. While each of hierarchs voyeuristically watches the torture from the windows of the palace-prison and sadistically enjoys the lacerated and bloody flesh of the prisoners, two young fascist soldiers reject seeing the torture and learn to dance together to a softly playing tune on the radio. This final scene responds to the problematic question that the film clearly develops and shows Pasolini's adaptability: how is possible to exit from this claustrophobic and infernal situation that the young are experiencing?

4.2.2 *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* – the political connotations of the title through the conjunction 'or'

Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom illustrates the conditions for the young within the new form of fascism, and it understands the anthropological mutation of young people. With these perspectives, it is important to stress that Pasolini's film is neither a historical film about the crimes of Nazi-fascism, nor a rigorous filmic adaptation of the sexual perversions of de Sade's novel. On the one hand, throughout the film, the viewer can forget the historical phenomenon of fascism. No symbol, no gesture, no military uniform or discipline recalls the traditional and already cinematically stereotyped signs of old fascism. This means that, for Pasolini's film, the term fascism is not to be associated with the historical totalitarian regime of Mussolini, but with the existence of a violent, anarchic and unilateral form of power over people, i.e., with Pasolini's definition of a new form of fascism linked to conformism and consumerism in the mid-1970s.

On the other hand, Pasolini links the extended and diverse sexual perversion of de Sade's novel to a crucial issue in his cinema and political theory: the question of visibility, in this case the visibility of the cruel power relationship between torturers and

their victims. In *Salò*, perversion is not associated with a form of sadistic sexuality, but with the monstrous effects on the perception of a reality that is completely centred on a shocking visibility – a visibility that is in line with the pervasive pedagogical role of neocapitalism's guiding language: what is seen, exists, and what is not seen, does not exist. This is Pasolini's definition of the anthropological mutation of reality that is linked to the successes of television advertising and that constitutes the lowest degree of perception of reality in the mid-1970s.

These interpretative elements are presented through the title of film, paying attention to the conjunction 'or'. The conjunction links the new form of fascism (Salò) to anthropological mutation (de Sade). Generally, the conjunction 'or' performs either the function of disjunctive conjunction or of explanation. In relation to Pasolini's film, 'or' does not function in a disjunctive way; it is the conjunction by which Pasolini introduces a necessary explanatory connection between the first part of the title and the second one. Thus, the second part of the title is a clarification, an intensification and a consequence of the first part. *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* expresses the direct relationship between the violence of consumerism for the young – those who are completely imprisoned without any possibility of truly expressing themselves – and the pedagogical role of the value of visibility as the lowest degree of their perception of reality.

This brings about the conceptual and theoretical, but also social and political, framework in which the film is to be interpreted: the changing nature of capitalism produces a claustrophobic regime (the palace-prison of consumerism) in which the vital force of young people (sexuality as freedom and critical thought) is pedagogically forced (the violence of the hierarchs of neocapitalism's guiding language) to conform with the values and the meanings of capitalism (the value of visibility as the lowest perception of reality).

Following on from this, it is significant that Pasolini does not film any stereotyped signs of the old fascism. Instead he wants to shed light on the difference between the pedagogical violence of the old fascism and that of the new fascism. While the old fascism existed to educate young people needed for military power, for Pasolini the old fascism was a power 'all stage and play-acting in which young people had turned themselves into clowns, it did not profoundly affect them in their way of being' (CW:

143). In contrast, consumerism as a new form of fascism imprisons the vital force and intimate freedoms of young people in order to penetrate deeply into their language and behaviours through neocapitalism's guiding language.

This also explains why Pasolini links new fascism to de Sade's novel. Differently from his other films – *Theorem* and *Pigsty*, for example, from which many scandalising and strong scenes were cut, censored or only evoked, because of their potential effect on viewers – Pasolini's filmic adaptation of de Sade's novel shows brutal and shocking images of sexual abuses, cruel horrors, and violent mutilations in their entirety without any internal censorship. Pasolini's profilmic content is miserably expository, fully legible and highly pornographic for audiences. The selected and humiliated bodies of young people are on the screen only as an arid and lucid form of naturalism in which Pasolini's cinema and political theory are seemingly denied.

However, it is important to stress that the young captives themselves are forced not only to suffer violence, but also to see it happen to other young people, in front of the audiences of the film. The naturalism expresses the logic of the mutation through which the bodies of young people are in the hands of neocapitalism's guiding language: the lowest degree of perception of reality is completely centred on its visibility. As a result, the vision of tortured, lacerated, and bloodied bodies to which the young captives are subjected, identifies the anthropological mutation of the young: for them, visibility has become a fundamental criterion of reality and naturalism a fundamental degree of their perception of reality; and the violence and repression of capitalism and its own changing nature can now be seen, included, and forgotten. From these images, it seems hard to argue that Pasolini's vision is not pessimistic.

4.2.3 *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*: the 'iconic sign of itself' of Pasolini's cinema of the outside

It is only when looking at Pasolini's cinema of the outside that it becomes possible to begin to appreciate how Pasolini's adaptability is aimed at developing a new pedagogy that counteract neocapitalism's guiding language and reveals how his adaptability contains a cautious optimism.[104] For Pasolini, it is in the outside that the vital force,

[104] Again followed here is Shapiro's trans-disciplinary method of linking cinema and politics – defined as

freedom and hopes of young people lie, even if the conditions for dissent are crushed by the changing nature of capitalism.

Three instances of the 'iconic sign of itself' clearly show Pasolini's awareness of the problem and his pedagogical interest in conditions for the young. The three iconic signs are in an opening scene, a central scene and the final scene, appearing as a red line running throughout Pasolini's film and explaining what 'outside capitalism' means. The first scene presents Claudio, a boy who decides to join fascism, abandoning his peasant mother, who in turn chases him round the farmyard while he is escaping with fascists from the Republic of Salò. The scene recalls the scene of Anna Magnani's desperate race in the neo-realist film *Rome, Open City* by Rossellini. However, *Salò's* scene clearly has the opposite meaning. Claudio is not forcefully captured by fascists, but willingly escapes with them.

This opening scene shows that young people are free to join fascism and that Pasolini is aware that the freedoms of young people are disappearing not by force but by their own will. He is aware that neocapitalism as a new form of fascism replaces the old pedagogical institution of capitalism (family, school, church and so on, as indicated by the role of Claudio's mother) with the seductive power of consumerism (as indicated by the role of fascists), and that this is what young people freely join (as indicated by Claudio's voluntary escape). With these images, Pasolini opposes such forms of education – like Claudio's mother – unable as they are to be critical when confronted with consumerism and to defend young people from neocapitalism's guiding language (LL: 109).[105]

The second 'iconic sign of itself' is in a central scene that is core in developing the problem of visibility and the anthropological mutation of young people. Pasolini writes that this scene was the first intuition of his *Salò or 120 Days of Sodom* (Archive II, 1, 172, 22): the image of human excrement just evacuated by one of the fascist hierarchs over the shiny floor that one of the victims is forced to eat, while the other young captives are forced to watch. However, this brutal scene is not enough for Pasolini to

a post-Kantian attention to the conditions of the possibility for political dissent (Shapiro, 2013).

[105] It is interesting to note how these sequences connect with Pasolini's deep invective against the Italian educational system at that time. In *Lutheran Letters*, Pasolini proposes the immediate abolition of compulsory secondary education (Capitani, 2015) precisely because 'those who have had compulsory schooling are prisoners of their own miserable circle of knowledge' (LL: 108).

express the anthropological mutation in which the young live. In a succeeding scene, the young captives are condemned indeed to eat their own excrement. This is the apex of the disappearing freedoms of young people owing to the changing nature of capitalism: those who are accustomed to eating what is evacuated by neocapitalism (first scene), will necessarily become one with neocapitalism, producing, in turn, excrement to consume (second scene).

Through these brutal scenes, Pasolini shows us (and confirms) both his political and cinema theories. On the one hand, Pasolini is violently expressing the devasting consequences of neocapitalism's guiding language for young people. Neocapitalism's guiding language is the expression of a total reorganisation of reality that is transforming everything into a commodity (excrement) to be consumed. The effect of such a reorganisation of reality on young people creates a perception of reality in which they have to get used to eating the excrement that is forcibly offered them. The eating of excrement is therefore the iconic sign of the ongoing degradation of our perception of reality. On the other hand, by describing the sign of the excrement as the first intuition of his film, Pasolini reveals that the starting point of his semiotics is the iconic sign of itself, and the first declaration of the political meaning of *Salò*.

The political meaning of excrement as the iconic sign of itself is fully defined in a vicious circle that ultimately clarifies the conjunction 'or' in the film's title: neofascism produces an anthropological mutation in young people, and they in turn produce new fascism and so on. The problem is still: how is it possible to enable young people to exit this vicious circle? While the pedagogical pressure of neocapitalism's guiding language outlines the education of young people, such dominant education is also broadcast through peer education and the activism of the young, which Pasolini sees as a form of collaboration with neocapitalism (LL: 33). This is also the content of his last interview with Furio Colombo, his friend and a very important Marxist reporter in Italy. He says first about the anthropological mutation: 'the tragedy is that there are no more human beings, there are strange machines crashing against each other'. Second, he looks at the social condition of the young: 'young people parade with flags and slogans, but what separates them from "power"?'. Then, he repeats his accusations of the Italian education system: 'Power is a system of education that divides us into subjugated and subjugated. But careful. A same educational system that forms us all, from the so-called ruling classes down to the poor. That's why everyone wants the same things and behaves the

same way… it is a common, compulsory and wrong education that drives us all into the arena of having everything at all costs: having, owning, destroying'. And lastly, Pasolini asks where the critical voices and militant engagements are: 'Here I see the fine ranks of intellectuals, sociologists, experts and journalists of the noblest intentions, things happen here and the head looks over there'.[106]

4.2.4 *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom,* the final scene and Pasolini's adaptability as a counter-pedagogy

Before engaging with the third 'iconic sign of itself' in the final scene of *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom,* where Claudio dances with another young fascist named Maurizio, the reader is reminded of the point in 4.2.1: Pasolini has declared that his film is not a pessimistic film, but a film that shows his adaptability and his cautious optimism. The third iconic sign ultimately expresses these intentions. It results in the dance scene at the end of the film. Here the viewer sees that, in the middle of the horrifying tortures of the third circle of blood, the hierarchs are enjoying what they are seeing but Claudio and Maurizio are absent, freeing themselves from the cruel and violent framework in which they are embedded, and having a fleeting experience of another possible world. Here they do not look at the torture and violence but learn together to dance to music coming from the radio. The music is a jazz standard, 'These foolish things remind me of you'. The screenplay is as follows:

> Claudio: you dance?
> Maurizio: No
> *(Diegetic music: 'These foolish things remind me of you')*
> Claudio: Ok, shall we try?
> Maurizio: Well, just try!
> *(They are dancing)*
> Claudio: What's your girlfriend's name?
> Maurizio: Margherita
> *(Extradiegetic music: 'These foolish things remind me of you') (The end) (Film's end credits)*

This scene clearly reveals Pasolini's interest in the prevailing conditions for dissent among young people, along with his political sense of the concept of adaptability and

[106] http://www.centrostudipierpaolopasolinicasarsa.it. My translation. See the Appendix for the Italian text of the quotation.

his cautious optimism in relation to militant engagement. For these perspectives, four elements are relevant in the final scene: (1) Claudio and Maurizio are fascists; (2) they dance together rather than watch the torture; (3) the whole scene is a sort of pedagogical initiation (Chiesi, 2015: 85); and (4) the final scene connects with the opening scenes of the film – Claudio is the young man who freely escaped in the opening scene of film, and the diegetic music 'These foolish things remind me of you' is the extradiegetic music of the opening titles of the film. The iconic sign of dancing, or better of learning to dance, is a vital sign, a sign of joy, and it guides viewers in their reading of these four elements.

In addition, it is notable that Pasolini was undecided on what type of conclusion the film should have (Murri, 2001). Pasolini thought of four different final scenes: red flags in the wind? Too dogmatic and rhetorical. The performance of a wild dance of a whole film troupe? Too intellectualist for audiences. The presentation of arising moral issues related to the film's subject? Too explanatory and didactic. Finally, Pasolini chose to keep the idea of showing a dance between two young fascist boys.

In my view, his alternative choices reveal the political landscape in which Pasolini wanted to insert the film – the red flags, the wild dance of the crew, and a thesis to be shown could all represent the trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema (the crew) and politics (the red flags) in the name of Marxism's renewal (his thesis). But these would entail making explicit the continuity and consistency (the use of music and the character of Claudio) of the opening and final scenes as if the film was arguing a thesis and responding to a question (Deleuze, 1989: 157). Young people, in this case Claudio and Maurizio, must learn to dance within the vicious circle in order to regain a little of their vital force and freedom. This 'need to learn' explains the meaning of Pasolini's adaptability: Claudio and Maurizio completely reject the visibility of the tortured bodies for another possible pedagogical learning.

The fact that Claudio was the protagonist of the first scene, who escaped from his family to become a fascist, gives full meaning to Pasolini's adaptability in light of his interest in conditions for the young. Through the character of Claudio, the opening pessimism of the film ends up in a cautious optimism. So, if a new form of fascism determines naturalism as the lowest degree of perception of reality, then Pasolini's anticapitalism – as expressed by his cinema of the outside anew – needs an alternative

pedagogy to counteract the pedagogical role of neocapitalism's guiding language.

As a result, the film becomes Pasolini's urgent and pedagogical appeal for listening and helping those minorities of young people who want to learn something else from neocapitalism and its guiding language: these foolish things (the new form of fascism and the anthropological mutation) remind me of you (Marxism's renewal).

What is at stake for Pasolini's militant engagement is the elaboration of a new political battlefield between the apparently liberating but highly repressive production of subjectivities prone to neocapitalism, and the emancipatory role played by a counter-pedagogy that, as seen in 4.3, is an audio-visual pedagogy that polemically calls into question a pedagogical tradition based on spoken–written language. Young people need to learn to become actively and cinematically educated as the basic condition for fighting against the perception of the 'reality' broadcast by neocapitalism's guiding language.

4.3 'Gennariello', a pedagogical treatise in favour of an audio-visual pedagogy

The results of these comments on *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* are now developed through an analysis of the pedagogical treatise 'Gennariello'.[107] At the time of his death, 'Gennariello' remained unfinished and in that form was published posthumously. The text, collected in *Lutheran Letters* (1976), is a series of lessons published weekly in the magazine *Il Mondo* from 6th March 1975 to 5th June 1975, some months before Pasolini was killed. The lessons are addressed to Gennariello, a 15-year-old imaginary Neapolitan pupil. Gennariello is for Pasolini 'a miraculous creature' (LL: 18), someone whose sub-proletarian vitality meets typical bourgeois education. Pasolini says that Gennariello is thus the imaginary synthesis of the best values of the two social classes excluded by recent changes in capitalism: the spontaneous vital force, innocence, affection, and candour of a sub-proletarian person, and the desire to know and to

[107] It has been argued that young people populate both pages and images of Pasolini's oeuvre (Bondavalli, 2015: 6). Likewise, it is relevant that Foucault defined Pasolini's work as 'the great saga of youth' (Foucault, 1977: 73). In addition, prominent scholars have identified how Pasolini's interest in the condition of youth can reactivate critical resources for political resistance in our time (Kirchmayr, 2016: XI). I add to these fundamental references an argument in line with his cinematic turn and his political theory: in the mid-1970s Pasolini's adaptability in the face of further changes in capitalism brings a new encounter between his cinema theory and counter-pedagogy – an audio-visual pedagogy in favour of the young. Pasolini was aware that 'the pedagogy of neocapitalism is in Marxist terms the exploitation and subjection of [the] individual' (SC, 2063-2065).

explore and to revolutionise what was typical of the best of bourgeois culture (LL: 18).[108]

It is in favour of such a 'miraculous creature' that Pasolini theorises a paradigm shift in which audio-visual pedagogy is his destiny. However, there is a key problem that Pasolini's awareness of neocapitalism and its guiding language poses to pedagogy itself. It is that once more the political role played by audio-visual language is borne of it being the written language of reality, and the fact that it is the first vehicle of the perception of reality in the young. Pasolini had planned a complex programme of learning with a wide introduction, five preparatory lessons, and five fundamental sections in order to face what he considered the problematic subject of the changes of capitalism in consumerist and conformist societies: '[the] subject of our series (of lessons and sections) will essentially be pedagogy itself' (LL: 27).

Pasolini's wide introduction ultimately effects a fictional, friendly, and unilateral engagement between Pasolini and his pupils and students, presenting the methods, aims and scheme of work. The five preparatory lessons focus on an analysis of the problems that pedagogy faces at that time, i.e., a form of *pars destruens* in which Pasolini aims to show the total inefficiency of educators, teachers and the young themselves in fully grasping the pedagogical role of neocapitalism's guiding language as the written language of reality. These pages show that (a) Pasolini reveals a sociological analysis of the condition of the young within consumerism and conformism – reminiscent of his critical position expressed by the film *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* – and that (b) he drafts some interesting elements of a future counter-pedagogy, which link his cinema and political theory to his awareness of the changing nature of capitalism.

Unfortunately, the succeeding five sections were not written because of his death. These sections would have dealt with the *pars costruens* of Pasolini's pedagogy: the first was to be about sex, the second about the relationship between behaviour and fashion, the third about religion, the fourth about politics and the fifth about art. Owing to Pasolini's unfinished work, one may read only the introduction to the work and some of the five preparatory lessons. What is important to stress for this study is that the pedagogical

[108] Pasolini's early films were centred on the poor and on the peripheral conditions of subproletariat; this was followed in his developing oeuvre on the alienated conditions of the bourgeoisie, and then on the repression of sexuality. These aesthetic subjects were outside capitalism.

project of 'Gennariello' is once more understood and defined as a trans-disciplinary encounter between Pasolini's cinema and his politics to prepare the possible conditions for Marxism's renewal in the mid-1970s. In line with his radical anticapitalism, his political theory results in his cinematically ironic and detached vision of the changing nature of capitalism (see 4.3.1). This vision films and clearly analyses the sociological and anthropological consequences of further changes within capitalism and the exclusion of further parts of reality. It is a political horizon that Pasolini calls 'the scornful shadow of de Sade'.[109]

The succeeding subsection, 4.3.2, looks at a necessary 'paradigm shift' in Pasolini's political theory, to the education of young people: a shift from an education grounded in literary language to an education in which 'nothing forces one to look at reality like making a film' (LL: 31). It is the coming of a counter-pedagogy that accepts that the young are televisual natives and that their perception of reality is completely embedded in neocapitalism's guiding language.

In subsection 4.3.3 Pasolini's political theory addresses a minority of the young, who for Pasolini represent a political investment in the future and who, like Gennariello, are miraculous creatures: they are aware that on the one hand their perception of reality is mediated through the written language of reality, and that on the other hand audio-visual language can be used in an anticapitalistic politics – for which Pasolini's cinema of the outside is a precursor and a model.[110]

The tracing of this shift eventually produces an understanding of the concept of adaptability. The conditions for Marxism's renewal thus undergoes a further 'turn' by means of an audio-visual counter-pedagogy that is still to be understood through the trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics in light of the realism of the outside.

[109] Here, this study translates the Italian word 'ombra' not through the English word 'shade', as the translator, but through the word 'shadow': something slightly different – darker, even haunting, and psychologically threatening.

[110] One could ask if Pasolini's adaptability is linked to a realism of the outside, or, as it seems, to a utopian vision of reality. The insight and development of a counter-pedagogy allows us to consider the continuity and the consistency of his work.

4.3.1 'Gennariello' as a pedagogy 'in the scornful shadow of de Sade'

In 'Gennariello' Pasolini lists three critical starting points for his pedagogical treatise, which refer to an analysis of the conditions for youth in the mid-1970s. They are the same claims that Pasolini presents in *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*: (a) that young people are not seeing reality through the language of things, but directly through the language of the images (LL: 26) – the theme of Claudio's escape with the fascists; (b) that neocapitalism's guiding language transforms and deforms things into commodities and consumer goods (LL: 27) – the theme of excrement; and (c) that the majority of young people spread this consumerism and conformism among each other by playing a passive–active role in confirming and justifying neocapitalism (LL: 27) – the theme of the value of visibility.

If 'Gennariello' arises from the same sociological and anthropological analysis as *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*,[111] then it also makes explicit the relevance of the final scene of *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*: like Claudio and Maurizio, Gennariello needs to stay detached and look elsewhere, and learn something else. In short, the explanation of the sense of 'the dance' in the final scene is the imperative of Pasolini's pedagogical treatise (see 4.3.2): the young have to be given an alternative both to the fascism of the old pedagogical institutions and to the new fascism of neocapitalism's guiding language. With this perspective, Pasolini advises Gennariello to stay away from his main dis-educators – parents, teachers, adults, i.e., those who live and spread the old values of the institutions of the first capitalism, whose inefficiency is absolute in struggling against neocapitalism. He also suggests Gennariello avoid his main true peer and companion educators – those who unconsciously live and spread the new values of consumerism and conformism by means of the irresistible power of neocapitalism's guiding language in the press and television, 'terrifying pedagogic instruments which lack any alternative' (LL: 27).

It is at the end of the first part of the wide introduction of his project that Pasolini makes a cryptic statement revealing the political horizon before which he presents the results of *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom* and his request for a new form of pedagogy for the

[111] *Pannella intervistato da Pasolini*, *Il mondo*, 25 luglio 1974 (SLA 1992-1998).

young. Pasolini writes that 'instead of dedicating this pedagogic treatise to the monstrous shadow of Rousseau, I will dedicate it to the scornful shadow of de Sade' (LL: 28). This sentence clearly expresses a preference between two alternatives, which is to be seen and understood in light of his posthumously published political writings.[112] On the one hand, there is 'the monstrous shadow of Rousseau', which Pasolini links to Rousseau's pedagogical concept of the *bon savage* (Annovi, 2013). According to Pasolini, the *bon savage* represents something 'monstrous' both for consumerism and for conformism – a pre-modern, primitive and archaic vitality that survives in those undeveloped populations that have not yet been industrialised (SLA: 211). On the other hand, there is 'the scornful shadow of de Sade', which Pasolini connects with de Sade's concept of the obscene (SLA: 2002-2007) as an ironic and detached vision of capitalism (SLA: 2658).

Golino speaks of the obscene as Pasolini's choice of 'a pedagogy of scandal' (Golino, 1995); Mantegazza as a pedagogy showing eros at its best (Mantegazza, 1997). Bondavalli (Bondavalli, 2014: 193) considers this pedagogy of scandal arises from Pasolini's aim of tackling the stigma and discrimination of his homosexuality. Bazzocchi grasps a relationship between Pasolini's biographical alterity, his existential solitude, his contrarian militancy, and his pedagogy (Bazzocchi, 2015; 2016).[113]

In contrast to these readings, this pedagogy is considered as a continuity of Pasolini's conditions for the renewal of Marxism. Pasolini admits his love for the free and erotic vitality of the pre-modern form of society in primal cultures, but he also is aware that a return to the past is impossible within the reality of neocapitalism. Rather, in interpreting the obscene with what is 'out of scene' (ob-scene), Pasolini reiterates the political role of the realism of the outside in his cinema. If Pasolini has a pedagogical role for Gennariello, this role is evidenced by his being a film theorist and director who looks outside capitalism, not by his being homosexual or by his intention to shock

[112] Referred to here are some political and aesthetic writings collected in the 1990s from Pasolini's archives – 'Scritti Politici' (SP) and 'Scritti sulla Letterature e l'Arte' (SLA). They are not translated into English.

[113] In this regard, it is very interesting to note a remarkable volume edited by Roberto Carnero and Angela Felice on *Pasolini and Pedagogy* (2015). There are papers by Golino, Bazzocchi and other scholars on the theme such as Mantegazza, Casi, Lavagnini, and Meacci. The 'diversity' of Pasolini is exalted: Pasolini's oeuvre converges on biographical reasons and his solitary and heroic role in a society from which he is rejected. As already highlighted, this interpretation is also derived from Siciliano's biography of Pasolini.

viewers or even by his passion for pre-modern cultures, but by his recognising how capitalism works.

As a result, Pasolini's preference for de Sade over Rousseau clearly infers the political horizon already understood in previous chapters. First, it shows that Pasolini does not reject modern society; he accepts the further changes of capitalism, and he does not dream of any return to the wild thinking and archaic happiness of primitive society. It shows his adaptability. Second, it confirms that Pasolini's militant engagement works theoretically and cinematically to show how reality exists outside capitalism. It is his cinema of the outside, now understood as the obscene. Lastly, Pasolini's interest in pedagogy reveals that the encounter between his cinema and politics is always a battle on the move. In this sense one may suggest a new role for Pasolini's cinema theory, a role aimed at blending his cinematic and political vision of reality with audio-visual pedagogy, producing a counter-pedagogy. However, again this statement about de Sade and about an ironic and detached vision of capitalism recalls some suspicions about idealism, because Pasolini's militant engagement seems to prefer to be a master instead of to remain in contact with the viewer's sympathy.

4.3.2 'Gennariello' as an audio-visual pedagogy and counter-pedagogy

As a teacher, Pasolini invites Gennariello to realise that 'nothing forces one to look at things like making a film' (LL: 31). This sentence contains a crucial clue to a pedagogical alternative to the institutions of old and to neocapitalism's guiding language, a clue now followed to reach Pasolini's pedagogical aim. What does 'the language of things' mean? Pasolini asserts that 'the language of things' is the first authoritarian and repressive form of education for a child and that there is 'impotence in the face of the pedagogic language of things' (LL: 31).

In addition, about the language of things, Pasolini speaks in the first person of an epochal difference between his education and that of young people in the 1970s. The language of things, he says, has changed between his generation and Gennariello's, and it is his semiology that brings about an understanding of this change. For the language of Pasolini's generation, things are physical realities, merely present and surrounding us, and constituting the social set of our lives by socially and economically

distinguishing one class from another. But for Gennariello – and for other young people in the 1970s – 'things' are merely images that flow onto the screen, completely changing the perception of reality. According to Pasolini, this semiological phenomenon makes an encounter between the generations impossible.

To mark the difference, Pasolini uses the concept of crystallisation and of crystallised memory. He reiterates that the language of 'things' that has educated his childhood was crystallised within his memory: the physical sense of a thing (a tent, for example) is the first language through which reality is perceived (LL: 29). So, Pasolini says, his own memory is populated 'by images of things' that evoke the power relationship in which we live (LL: 29). But for new generations, Pasolini continues, it is completely different. Crystallisation and crystallised memory are impossible: Gennariello's memory is populated by 'the image of images' broadcast by neocapitalism's guiding language. The value of visibility and naturalism makes things elusive and insubstantial in the memory. With this perspective, Pasolini suggests that crystallisation has been replaced by 'the marvellous light of the image' (CW: 49). The marvellous light of the image is the new pedagogical language of things – visibility and naturalism, commodities and consumerism; that is, neocapitalism's guiding language has replaced the language of the old institutions of first capitalism; before, one could perceive reality as a physical presence, but now only as an image (LL: 33).

This explains and entails in ontological, semiological and semiotic manner the 'real abyss' between Pasolini and Gennariello (LL: 33), between parents and sons, teachers and pupils, intellectuals and other people. It is an abyss that reiterates and confirms Pasolini's cinematic turn, the aim of his cinema of the outside and ultimately his political theory.[114] As a result, it is very reasonable to assume that Pasolini wants to reveal the necessity of a paradigm shift in pedagogy, through this emphasis in 'Gennariello' on the decisive role of the making of a film. Is this 'paradigm shift' the sense of an alliance between cinema and pedagogy? Is this alliance what forces Gennariello to look at things? Is this new way of looking at things the main problematic subject of pedagogy itself?

[114] In Deleuze's terms, one may assert: while neocapitalism's guiding language makes things liquid or gaseous, Pasolini's cinematic turn tries to make things solid and perceptible, to crystallise them in the memory of viewer. In this way, a basic difference emerges between Deleuze and Pasolini, in their theories of cinema and capitalism.

In my view, Pasolini's treatise in favour of Gennariello goes in this direction, responding to these questions both by reiterating the reasons for his cinematic turn, as seen in chapter 1, and by presenting the results of his cinema theory, as explored in chapter 3. To Gennariello, Pasolini speaks of the difference between writing a novel and making a film in terms of a diverse relationship with the perception of reality, a difference that once more he explains through his most contested semiological thesis: that the language of cinema is the written language of reality within neocapitalism. Then, Pasolini suggests to Gennariello that he learn the semiology of cinema, the most necessary educative subject from which one receives an aesthetic and political education. According to Pasolini, semiology allows for an understanding of the fundamental importance of the written language of reality (LL: 26) and its 'subsequent pedagogic prevarication' (LL: 31)[115]. Lastly, Pasolini explains to Gennariello the political role of his awareness of the functioning of the cinematic camera, in grasping a wider perception of reality.

We pause on this argument to show how Pasolini reiterates the basis of his cinema of the outside. Speaking again in the first person with Gennariello, Pasolini explains his preparatory shooting for a set of a film about the contradictory condition of Yemen – a state that Pasolini defines as a mixture between faster developing capitalism and the ancient presence of an archaic reality outside capitalism. Starting from this ambivalent definition of Yemeni society, Pasolini shows Gennariello the difference between literary and cinematic gazes. Pasolini asserts that, as a writer on the Yemen, he would be forced to choose between either exalting or rejecting the narrative strength of 'the static and archaic condition of a still medieval world that now is in the middle of the rise of capitalism' (LL: 31). He argues that his crystallised memory would have chosen and provided to the reader one or other respectful view of these two different and opposing realities. To the contrary, as a film director, Pasolini argues that his awareness of the cinematic camera can potentially film and memorise the coexistence of two semantically contradictory worlds, which are united in a single, confused, and expressive vision of reality: 'the horrible and chaotic presence of capitalism in the middle of a burning desert populated by ancient villages, poor houses and miserable fields' (LL: 31).

[115] See note 98.

In short, Pasolini says to Gennariello that the essential pedagogical function of the cinematic camera is to describe and document parallel, contradictory, and different moments and spaces of reality in present time: a 'simultaneity' that (a) captures different dimensions of reality that are impossible for the crystallised memory of the writer (and the reader) and that (b) offers to the director (and viewer) a wider perception of reality. This can allow both the visible and the non-visible to coexist, eventually demonstrating once more the political sense of his cinema of the outside.

This awareness of the functioning of the cinematic camera allows Pasolini to reveal to his student the importance of semiotics. He says that whereas a writer crystallises reality in words, which in turn are nothing more than symbolic signs, the cinematic camera can show profilmic content composed of 'iconic signs of itself', i.e. the violent, singular and physical presence of reality. Pasolini thus confirms to Gennariello the central thesis of his cinema of the outside: his language of cinema as the written language of reality looks at profilmic content as 'what one might call a living sign of itself' (LL: 31).

Therefore, in these pages dedicated to a pedagogy 'in the shadow of de Sade' and where 'nothing forces one to look at things like making a film', Pasolini shows us how he intends to counteract the pedagogical prevarication caused by neocapitalism's guiding language. He seems to elevate his experience and his cinema of the outside to a superior model, to invite Gennariello to understand the pedagogical relevance of the whole theoretical and practical process of filmmaking. Because only through learning the language of cinema as the written language of reality – an ontology, semiology, and semiotics in its own right – along with the audio-visual techniques of filmmaking can one regain an awareness of the relationship between ideology and reality within neocapitalism and be afforded a wider perception of reality.

At this point Pasolini re-emphasises how audio-visual language expresses the direct relationship between ideology and reality. According to his cinema theory, this relationship allows one to develop a degree of perception of reality to the point that (a) nothing forces one to understand that things are images like making a film; and that (b) nothing like making a film forces one to realise that the perception of reality is determined by the different uses of the written language of reality. Hence, it is the learning and the awareness of audio-visual pedagogy that can help young people stay objective and see elsewhere, learning something else, as Claudio and Maurizio in *Salò*

or the 120 Days of Sodom. However, while in the film audiences see Claudio and Maurizio learning something different, here Pasolini is clear that young people must learn to be filmmakers.

Pasolini considers that making a film is a synthesis of anticapitalism and pedagogy, with the crucial role of learning about audio-visual pedagogy in order both to educate young people about a wider perception of reality and to acknowledge that they are the starting point in the struggle against neocapitalism. Ultimately, the whole process of filmmaking becomes a counter-pedagogy within cinema that, on the one hand, elevates audio-visual language to the level of critical thought, and on the other, shows how an audio-visual pedagogy can offer a wider perception of reality. Indeed, Pasolini's cautious optimism and adaptability in the mid-1970s seems oriented to a form of Platonism.[116]

4.3.3 'Gennariello', a counter-pedagogy in favour of a minority of the young

Gennariello, as Claudio and Maurizio, are a minority among the young and are the necessary interlocutors of Pasolini's adaptability. Gennariello certainly has an ideal persona, but again he represents for Pasolini someone outside capitalism: one of the minorities of the young (LL: 22) 'who can be called more or less disobedient' (LL: 42) to consumerism and conformism, but whose vitality is equally disappearing under the pedagogical prevarication of neocapitalism's guiding language (LL: 31).[117]

As a result, two types of the outside present themselves. There is that which is disappearing, with Pasolini writing that this includes the majority of the young obedient to neocapitalism's guiding language (LL: 42). Their vitality is for Pasolini 'destined to die' (LL: 42).[118] The second type of outside is a minority that is 'destined to be alive'

[116] My inference is that Pasolini wants to play a pedagogical role as a cinematic and political theorist, by means of his cinema of the outside.

[117] 'While in the case of the writer things are destined to become words, that is to say, symbols, in the utterance of a film director things remain things; the "signs" of the verbal system are therefore symbolic and conventional while the "signs" of the cinematographic system are nothing more nor less than the things themselves in their materiality and reality. It is true that they become "signs", but they are what one might call living "signs" of themselves. All that is part of a science of semiology – which you, Gennariello, must know at least by name and at least in its vulgarized sense if you want to follow what I am saying, particularly when I am speaking about the primary language of things and their subsequent pedagogic prevarication' (LL: 31).

[118] This sentence clearly explains the changing of the outside over time in Pasolini's cinema and political theories. The changing nature of capitalism also changes what is outside capitalism. About this fact,

since they will be able, as Gennariello, to support their own vitality with an adequate culture. The interpretative horizon that emphasises Pasolini's repeated political disappointments, as well as his declared pessimism about the future,[119] needs to be linked with another interpretative horizon, a reading that this study has proposed is present throughout his cinematic oeuvre. Cinema is for Pasolini an instrument of resistance, as well as the form of anticapitalism which prompted his cinematic turn until the mid-1970s – a dialogue with reality that has generated his cinema of the outside, and a pedagogical drive that reveals to the audience the relationship between ideology and reality.

However, Pasolini's militant engagement and his attention to the renewal of Marxism have identified a further potential political practice – an audio-visual pedagogy for the young – to be linked to his previous cinematic turn and to his cinema of the outside. With this perspective, the concept of adaptability becomes the very essence of his militant engagement. On the one hand, adaptability is core to the nature and sense of Pasolini's aim for Marxism's renewal, which in turn must take account of the changing nature of capitalism and which is always at risk of 'falling out of style'. On the other hand, his adaptability has evolved from his cinematic turn of the late 1950s into a new interest in a counter-pedagogy of cinema. This means that there is a continuity: Pasolini's cinematic turn, also expressed by an audio-visual pedagogy still in the pipeline, is demonstrated by his enduring legacy in favour of Marxism's renewal. There is also a progression, because Pasolini seems to look for a pedagogy of teaching rather than continue his pedagogical drive to influence the audience.

What is new in 'Gennariello' – and also in *Salò or 120 Days of Sodom* – is that Pasolini recognises a political subjectivity to which he hands over his cinematic and political legacy. His militant engagement results in an audio-visual pedagogy in favour of those who are a minority because they are outside, apart, elsewhere. This minority, shaped by audio-visual pedagogy and used to speaking and writing through the language of

Pasolini is 'aware objectively'.

[119] Recently, *L'ora è confusa e noi come perduti la viviamo – Leggere Pier Paolo Pasolini quarant'anni dopo,* edited by Tommasini and Venturini (2017), has collected several papers by prominent Pasolini's scholars in light of his pessimism. Rimini speaks of 'Pasolini's desperate vitality' (Rimini, 2017: 134), while Leonelli talks about 'Pasolini's desperation as an intellectual split between the end of society and an untouchable new world' (Leonelli, 2017: 152); Pierangeli associates *Salò* with 'the apocalypse of a society' (Pierangeli, 2017: 25), whereas La Porta identifies how Pasolini was 'desperately attached to life' (La Porta, 2017: 33); and Salsano speaks of 'Pasolini as a desperate and tragic philosophy' (Salsano, 2017: 50). To develop this interpretative horizon, it is also possible to refer to Nowell-Smith (1977), Fusillo (1996), and Humphrey (2020), who define Pasolini's oeuvre as a desperate attempt to give coherence to another vision of reality.

cinema, is the stake in Pasolini's cautious optimism. In light of further changes within capitalism, this minority has an active and militant role in being aware of having an effect on the perception of reality through the analysis and production of audio-visual language. This active and militant role may undoubtedly be minoritarian, but it is essential.

In accepting and developing the ontological, semiological and semiotic bases of Pasolini's cinema theory, this minority will love reality and live at the level of reality, and not be afraid to be free, different and resistant (LL: 44). There are two clear and fundamental political aims in reaching happiness: 'the cultural possession of the world' and 'the search for beauty' (LL: 45). This eventually means that the model for these attitudes and aims is Pasolini himself as director – whose cinematic turn has allowed him to stay in touch with reality, to perceive the outside and to be aware of the relationship between the changing nature of capitalism and the loss of reality.

4.4 Learning 'to think in images'

Behind Pasolini's pedagogy for educators may be a form of idealism, or even a utopian perspective, oriented to future revolutionary forces. Once more arguing his cinematic turn, reiterating the absolute difference between written–oral languages and audio-visual language, and considering the articulation of his cinema theory, this study hypotheses how Pasolini would have organised his pedagogy of cinema in order to promote Marxism's renewal.

Already noted are that: (a) in his last writings and films, Pasolini considers the value of the visibility produced by broadcast television and advertising as that of a pervasive ideology, which fully undermines the viewer's perception of reality and which constantly produces a higher degree of the loss of reality; (b) this ideology entails a new form of fascism and anthropological mutation, which seem to Pasolini to erase the possibility of a wider perception of reality through what is on the screen; (c) Pasolini argues that this ideology is the bearer of a dramatic ontological and pragmatic reduction of the perception of reality in which what is seen, exists; what is not seen, does not exist; and (d) in this historical and social context, people are crushed by the including and excluding powers of capitalism and therefore are not able to look somewhere else. In addition, previous sections of this chapter reveal that Pasolini's pedagogy is related to

his cinema theory, through: (a) the study of the sciences of semiology and semiotics; (b) the awareness and use of the cinematic camera; and (c) the relationship between politics and aesthetics through the selection of pro-filmic content and audio-visual techniques. These points are fundamental subjects in a new education for the young, as articulated in *Heretical Empiricism* and reiterated in *Corsair Writings* and *Lutheran Letters*.

It is important to recall how Pasolini speaks of his pedagogy of cinema. He speaks as a director who is aware of living in a society of images, and one who realises the political importance of images in everyday life and knows the relevance of understanding the use of the cinematic camera, cinematic subjects, and audio-visual techniques. Pasolini also speaks as a friend who invites his students not to analyse a film but to cinematically understand and practise recreating reality. This pedagogical style ties in with 'The screenplay as a structure that wants to be another structure' (HE: 189-193), an essay written in 1965 and collected in *Heretical Empiricism* – a further exemplary text showing how Pasolini's awareness of the political role of the whole filmmaking process connects his cinema theory with the development of a counter-pedagogy in favour of the young. It is interesting that the project of a form of a specifically audio-visual counter-pedagogy had already been drafted by Pasolini in his non-edited appendix to his text of 1965 (SLA: 1662-1663). The project, which had been only a draft or a dream, would have entailed the establishment of a film school (SLA: 1662) in which young students would have been encouraged to freely produce an analytical study of audio-visual language related to theoretical acquisitions of aesthetics and cybernetics (SLA: 1663). Pasolini's aim was to transform audio-visual language in mainstream social and political language, in order to inform young people about the functioning and power of neocapitalism. The project is several times suggested in *Heretical Empiricism* when Pasolini hypothesises that 'cinema may be a possible language of human communication in everyday life, the future language of social relationships' (HE: 69).

'The screenplay as a structure that wants to be another structure' (HE: 189) witnesses Pasolini's attention to the pedagogy of cinema well before the mid-1970s and confirms his cinematic turn, reiterating the absolute difference between cinema and literature. Pasolini argues that a screenplay is not a novel, and that the audio-visual technique of a screenplay cannot be compared to a literary technique. In addition, he adds an important note, considering the purpose of this chapter: that such a technique requests, forces, and develops new skills linked to cinematic requirements. He writes:

> 'The concrete element in the relationship between film and literature is the screenplay. I am not concerned, however, with observing the mediating function of the screenplay and the critical elaboration of the literary work which it undertakes, "figuratively integrating it" with the equally critical perspective of the cinematographic work which it presupposes. In this note, what interests me about the screenplay is the moment in which it *can be considered an autonomous 'technique', a work complete and finished in itself* ' (HE: 189).

To best articulate this autonomous technique and its pedagogical effects, Pasolini describes the screenplay as a dynamic and diachronic form of text in which language is in motion from words to images (HE: 189). He uses the term 'dynamic' because the words of a screenplay are aimed at becoming cinematic images; 'diachronic' because the writer of the screenplay, whose work is only apparently literary, concretely comes prior to any director; and 'in motion' because the language of a screenplay tends to be an explanatory language, capable of structuring the potential film and orienting the director. As a result, Pasolini argues that the screenplay moves from one structure (a text) to another (a film).

As a result, Pasolini infers how a screenplay's 'language in motion' brings about new skills and ability. He asserts that the transformation of a text into what will become visible on the screen allows for a more concrete and factual awareness of the relationship between things and images (HE: 189). That is, the imaginations of both screenplay writer and reader involve continuous references to things in order to cinematically complete the text and develop the images of a potential film. A possible definition of this exercise is what Pasolini calls 'the visual completeness of a text' (HE: 190), that is, how those who write or read a screenplay are invited to develop their capacity 'to think in images' (HE: 192), connoting an 'abnormal path' in the brain (HE: 190).

Pasolini makes two claims to best articulate this abnormal path in the brain, which are completely in line with his future idea of a paradigm shift in pedagogy. First, Pasolini notes that semiologically, learning audio-visual language is completely different from learning to communicate in another spoken–written language and that semiotically the signs of audio-visual language are not as abstract as the signs of an alphabetical language. This means that 'to think in images … is not another language in the sense that Bantu is different from Italian' (HE: 191) because this thinking in images forces one to understand the nature and use of the written language of reality. Second, the exercise of visual completeness is for Pasolini a dynamism of will, the exercise of

volition in motion towards an aim.

The exercise of visual completeness is indeed for Pasolini the discovery of a third kind of sign, which is separate from oral and written linguistic signs and which can individually and collectively acquire space in our brain. Indeed, Pasolini describes this as an 'abnormal path', in which the brain is involved in an incalculable series of conditioned reflexes of our 'mysterious cybernetics' (HE: 189) and which is due to the discovery of a wider and various framework under which a 'sign' is presented. In the screenplay, the sign is forced to be at the same time oral (phoneme), written (grapheme), and visual (kineme) (HE: 189). As a result, each time the brain, confronted by a sign of the screenplay, travels a new 'long and special' path (HE: 189) that is the expressive accentuation of audio-visual language (HE: 190) made up from the translation and transformation of the words of text in the concrete images of the potential film.

As a result, Pasolini argues that one who writes or reads a screenplay is initially stimulated, then educated and lastly encouraged towards the transformation of words into images, via the relationship between images and things and between things and reality. The abnormal path thus leads to a will in motion towards reality, understanding the relationship between reality and ideology, and articulating the different degrees of perception of reality on the screen. On the one hand, this entails that anthropologically the will is a human capacity (not an essence) that is determined, but also liberated, by the forms through which it is pedagogically shaped. On the other, it results in the value of an audio-visual pedagogy that teaches us 'to think in images' in a society fully determined by images.

Throughout this chapter, the aim of a counter-pedagogy that encourages people 'to think in images' has been developed, resulting in, for Pasolini, his identification of an abnormal path in the brain that can be pedagogically pushed to look at reality. This means that Pasolini's thinking in images is aimed at developing an awareness in the viewer's perception of reality that is semiologically populated by neocapitalism's guiding language. And that 'to think in images' orients the viewer towards the semiotic awareness of the different status of audio-visual language in its use of images (naturalism, symbolic signs and iconic signs), through which reality is revealed. Lastly it means that 'to think in images' results in the awareness that what we call reality on the screen is the product of filming different degrees of perception of reality.

This is clearly connected to Pasolini's cinema theory in favour of his desire for Marxism's renewal, and it is confirmed by a claim in the last part of the essay, a militant claim but one that reiterates his trans-disciplinary encounter between cinema and politics. With a very great deal of rhetoric and emphasis, Pasolini argues at the end of the essay that the screenplay asks the filmmaker to 'react to one system by constructing another' in the same way that people 'react to a social structure by building another through revolution, that is, through the will to transform the structure' (HE: 193). The screenplay, as one of the parts referred to in Pasolini's cinema theory, shows how reacting to one system by constructing another is the political aim of his cinema of the outside and therefore of his audio-visual pedagogy. For Pasolini, thinking in images can force the will to be in motion towards reality; it is a move to avoid the loss of reality and to offer an awareness of a wider perception of reality on the screen.

In conclusion, if a new form of fascism and an anthropological mutation produce subjectivities prone to capitalism in the mid-1970s by bypassing the old ideological apparatus in the role of subject formation, Pasolini's project is to work in and against the modes of production of such subjects through a wider perception of reality. His cinema theory supports not only his cinema of the outside, but also his pedagogy of cinema as a further reprise of his consistent relationship between technology and Marxism, considering audio-visual language and techniques as fundamental elements of a new educational system. An audio-visual pedagogy of cinema would result in a political practice through which viewers are invited to be aware that visibility on the screen is due to a variety of degrees of perception of reality and that true visual completeness is elsewhere. The old political task of producing antagonism assumes a new guise inside the society of images that immerses us: the focus is on the degree of perception of a singularity; on how ideology works; and on how such a degree relates those perceptions to humankind's capacity of inventing and reinventing its relationship with reality.

CONCLUSION

> 'Cinema is the poetic expression of an act of faith in reality, precisely because cinema expresses reality with reality … that is, cinema is my own philosophy, a hallucinated, childish, and pragmatic love of reality.' (HE: 220)

> 'So I came to the idea that the language of the cinema is not a national language; it is a language I like to define as "transnational" and "transclass"…. Then gradually I realised that [cinema] had taken the form of a great love for physical, sexual, objectual [*oggettuale*], existential reality around me…. By studying the cinema as a system of signs, I came to the conclusion that it is a non-conventional and non-symbolic language, unlike the written or spoken language, and expresses reality not through symbols but via reality itself (Stack, 1969: 29)

> So, in practice the cinema was an explosion of my philosophical and reverential love for reality.' (Stack, 1969: 40)

Pasolini's cinema of the outside reveals that his quest for Marxism's renewal shares something with the hegemonic means of the power of capitalism: both are interested in the viewer's perception of reality. Aware of this sharing, this thesis has suggested two concepts to reveal the political unity and consistency of the militant engagement of Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre in favour of Marxism: (a) the outside, by which Pasolini looks at those realities excluded by the changing nature of capitalism in order that the viewer is offered a wider perception of reality; and (b) adaptability, showing how one important aspect of Pasolini's work is that he is dynamic, changing his films' viewpoints and styles throughout his life and constantly alert to capitalism's changing forms and the possibilities of cinema. Therefore, I have argued a fundamental thesis: Pasolini's political theory is a combination of his cinema of the outside with his adaptability over time to the hegemonic functioning of capitalism, which includes and simultaneously excludes parts of reality, and he chose to express his political theory through cinema owing to its potential for showing reality and raising issues and passions for those singularities that are excluded, forgotten, and even denied by the changing nature of capitalism. In this, I have demonstrated, for the first time, how Pasolini's political

theory aims to contribute to the renewal of Marxism.

First, I have uncovered in his film production his dialectic of inclusion and exclusion, which replaces the dialectic of contradiction. On the one hand, this dialectic shows Marxism how the hegemonic functioning of capitalism works and how it proceeds to become a totality. On the other hand, this dialectic asks Marxism to become involved with what remains of reality in order to produce anticapitalism. With this perspective, I have argued that 'the outside' is, for Pasolini, the conceptual condition for Marxism's renewal.

Second, I have demonstrated how Pasolini's cinematic turn – as a shift from literature to cinema and then from cinema to a pedagogy of cinema – invites Marxism to understand technology positively. I have shown how Pasolini's renewal of Marxism understands technology (in his case, film production) as having the capacity to provide a battlefield in which he involves his militant engagement, never separating technology from philosophy and politics. I have also shown how Pasolini wants to enrich Marxism with audio-visual language and techniques and argued that his own adaptability to the changing nature of capitalism is, for him, a practical condition of Marxism.

Third, I have illustrated the materialist trajectory of Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre; how through his films and his cinema theory, Pasolini wanted to make the viewer sympathetic to what remains of reality, asking Marxism to replace its negative vision of art – to break and shock the viewer – with a positive vision of art as an encounter with and attention to dissent. I have argued that this positive vision of art, centred on the concept of singularity, mirrors an ontology as pure immanence.

Lastly, I have uncovered how Pasolini's political theory invites Marxism to shift from a pedagogy made up of words to one made up of images, in which learning to think in images and in which making a film demands a set of new practices, techniques, and skills aimed at avoiding the loss of reality and trying to look outside and gain a higher perception of reality.

From my perspective, these four points constitute the direct relationship of Pasolini's political theory to Marxist debate. Pasolini operated a strategic displacement, whereby different types of media could be politically assessed, and the use of audio-visual

technology re-evaluated as conditions for dissent. In concrete terms, Pasolini was aware that the internal revolutions of capitalism require continuing technological revolutions that favour capitalism. In his time, these produced a consequent crisis for Marxism, dismantling the old institutions and providing a new ideology over reality. However, through his cinematic oeuvre Pasolini asks Marxists to have courage: to look this technological revolution in the face and demand a deeply theoretical and practical reformulation of Marxism. In this, the information revolution, technological rationality, and a new technological era were facts, not a judgment. With this perspective, I have argued that Pasolini's political theory was precisely the synthesis needed for a relationship between the coming of new technologies and the need for the renewal of Marxism, i.e., a synthesis in which theoretical and practical potential could be determined in the struggle for reality.

As a result, I want to highlight that because of his work: (a) Pasolini invites the current cartography of Marxism today – divided between those against (the majority) and in favour of technology – to focus positively on the political role of technology. Pasolini's political theory aims to make Marxism aware that the technological revolution eliminates capitalism's dialectic competitors, that it is necessary to modify previous forms and practices of antagonism, and lastly that the best practice for Marxists is to learn the contemporary guiding languages and to discover new weapons. After all, Pasolini's cinematic turn arose from his awareness that Marxism was 'going out of style'.

(b) Pasolini contributes to the rethinking of Marxism as a tool for militant engagement in the technological language of the 'time of now', integrating antagonism and dissent into new social and political contexts. If technology is what determines and informs the perception of reality, and if it is through this perception that people perceive politics, then Pasolini's political theory asked antagonists to immerse themselves in the struggle by producing (in his case) films and by making pedagogical efforts to show reality over ideology. If, by watching the screen, the viewer's perception of reality was socialised, making them conform and become alienated, then a real militant engagement could also positively bring them to discover something else.

Three further remarks may be made at this point. The first is that if Pasolini looked positively at the relationship between Marxism and technology, his political theory

could be seen as close to those who optimistically saw the coming of our current digital technologies and dreamt of future antagonistic subjectivities or of accelerating the end of capitalistic processes (e.g., Negri, 1990; Guattari, 1995; Wark, 2015; 2019). I have shown that Pasolini's position was different, however. This is without doubt a form of resistance to capitalism, but is it also a break from any hope of revolution and change? Pasolini learns and appropriates cinematic technology because his militant engagement is politically aimed at adapting to capitalism, looking in fact outside capitalism and struggling for a wider perception of reality. Until the 1970s, he does not propose any political subjectivity, and only at the end of his life does he identify a political subjectivity, a 'miraculous creature'. In this, Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre remains a work critical of the capitalism of his time and a preparatory work aimed at something else.

The second remark follows from the first. Pasolini's relationship with technology can be posited as a continuity and an updating of a negative dialectics, as well as a political position that reveals contradictions, but which rejects any kind of synthesis (e.g., Adorno, 1966; 1968; 1970; Habermas, 1979; 1987). However, three basic differences from negative dialectics are clear. First, the core of Pasolini's political theory is a dialectic of inclusion and exclusion (and internal/external) that looks outside capitalism as the only way to liberate and produce dissent. Second, the force of Pasolini's analysis of capitalism is without doubt in his semiotic analysis of technological and specialised audio-visual language. Here, he shows his materialism because reality can be perceived cinematically within varying degrees of perception on the screen. This means that the relationship between ideology and knowledge on the screen is never between truth and error; instead it highlights the gap between the different degrees of perception of reality – as also illustrated in my analysis of the short film *La ricotta* (1.6), and of *Theorem* (3.4.4). Third, the materialist trajectory of his films is not oriented negatively to shock people, but to foster the viewer's sympathy. In my view, Pasolini's political theory is aware of the paradox of a negative conception of art as a rupture whose shocking results are destined to produce a pessimistic vision of reality and ultimately a reactive and conservative political position (e.g., Ranciére, 2000; 2009; 2010; Žižek, 2000; 2001; Badiou, 2015).

This brings about a third remark: Pasolini's attention to the degrees of perception of reality may be related to a post-structuralist vision of reality that inscribes reality in practices, discourses, and representations (Deleuze, 1986; 1989). In my view, Pasolini

runs into serious danger of his political theory being interpreted as a form of culturalism and of his cinema of the outside being understood as a form of historical representation of the power of capitalism. It is more opportune to go in another direction, by pointing to Pasolini's continuous refrain about his attention to reality. Pasolini's militant engagement certainly considers the language of cinema as a cultural and historical praxis that contains a certain vision of reality. I have shown that for Pasolini's political theory the philosophical problem is never reality as such, but how a reality is translated into different forms of cinematic language. His political problem is pragmatic and lies in his consideration of how those language forms produce effects on our perception of reality. The continuous reference to the outside makes it possible to drive people towards reality: to be aware of the ideology in which we all are embedded and to gain a wider perception of reality. As a result, the political awareness of the relationship between what is included and what is (or is going to be) excluded is crucial in developing a love for reality that is resistant to the hegemonic functioning of capitalism. In this, Pasolini asks Marxism to develop a passion and an attention to the violent, physical, and singular presence of reality.

This has been the route taken by this thesis, 'Pasolini's cinema of the outside and the problem of the renewal of Marxism'. As was shown in chapter 1, Pasolini's 'cinematic turn' was a paradigm shift in his militant engagement at the end of the 1950s, when he chose to organise a cinema capable of facing the crisis of Marxism and its own political language. In this, Pasolini paid attention to the technological development of the languages of his time and to the right form through which to struggle politically against the same specialised languages of capitalism.

In my view, Marxism's crisis was due to the successes of neocapitalism and the alliance between productive forces and audio-visual technologies, whose ubiquitous and selective guiding language was directly affecting the perception of reality by the masses and the working class through television, blockbusters and advertising (1.1; 1.2; 1.3). I have demonstrated that against this background, Pasolini shifted from literature to cinema at the end of the 1950s in order to stop understanding reality purely through words, and instead to include the technological languages of the present time (1.4.1; 1.4.2). I have revealed how his political theory invited Marxism to take full possession of cinema's technological and specialised audio-visual language in order to achieve his main political aims: to protect people from the loss of reality and to offer a wider

perception of reality than the one spread by capitalism's guiding language (1.5). In addition, I have identified how Pasolini invites to renew the concept of' the relationship between reality and ideology. On the screen, this relationship is not of truth versus error, but of greater versus lesser perception of reality. As such, although the multifaceted presentation of Pasolini's oeuvre excludes the problem of the renewal of Marxism from the main interpretive horizons of Pasolini studies, I have established a unity and consistency in Pasolini's political aims: if a poor perception of reality is connected with the reproduction of the capitalist order, the renewal of Marxism meant a higher degree of perception of reality.

With these perspectives, in chapter 2, I have explored previously uncharted territory. For the first time, my study has related Pasolini's political theory to Deleuze's books on cinema, looking at Deleuze's references to Pasolini's film production and his cinema theory (2.1). My contention has been that Deleuze misunderstands the political reasons behind Pasolini's opposition to those directors of the kind of modern cinema that ends up being homologous to the new cinematic tastes and contingent issues of the dominant classes (2.2.1). But I have also shown that Deleuze perfectly understands Pasolini's style, oriented as it was to make reality perceivable to viewers via the screen and to lead them somewhere other than the dominant values of society and culture (2.2.2). Hence, I have argued that even though Deleuze does not grasp Pasolini's political aims, Deleuze created two fundamental concepts, both referring to Pasolini's cinema and capable of orienting my study: the solid-perception image and the outside (2.3). Thanks to them, I have been able to argue that Pasolini pursued a wider perception of reality by focusing his attention on what remains of reality within the changing nature of capitalism. My innovative and personal redefinition of these concepts, in which I have articulated the unity and consistency of Pasolini's militant engagement, has directed my theoretical reconstruction of his cinematic oeuvre.

In chapter 3, I have connected together, in order, Pasolini's ontology, his semiology, and his semiotics in order to best organise a political theory of his cinema. I have revealed how Pasolini cinematically achieved his political aim: a wider perception of reality on the screen over the ideology spread by neocapitalism's guiding language. Here, for the first time in the panorama of Pasolini studies, I have drawn from Pasolini's references to Spinoza's materialism and Morris's pragmatism. These references have allowed me (a) to identify how 'the singularity' is the fundamental basis of Pasolini's materialism

(3.1.1; 3.1.2); (b) to reveal how the violent and physical presence of a singularity is pragmatically translated by different forms of cinematic language (naturalism, conventionalism, iconism) (3.2); (c) to explain how his materialism considers a variety of degrees of perception of reality on the screen (3.3.1; 3.3.2); (d) to uncover how the relationship between knowledge and ideology as represented by Pasolini on the screen is pragmatically related to a greater and lesser perception of reality (3.3.3); and (e) to argue that the core of Pasolini's political theory in his films always refers to what is outside capitalism as well as, pragmatically, to those 'things' that audiences are not accustomed to (3.4).

From these perspectives, I have demonstrated how Pasolini's renewal of Marxism is produced by his 'cinema of the outside', insofar as it is aimed both at showing those realities that are – or are going to be – excluded by the changing nature of capitalism (3.4.1), and at making his cinematic subjects meet with the sympathy and love of the viewer (3,4.3). I have shown, therefore, that the strategic role played by Pasolini's cinema is that of arguing a dialectic of inclusion and exclusion (internal/external), and of performing a pedagogical act (3.4.2). Pasolini's political theory asks of his cinema that it increase not only the critical attitude of audiences towards capitalism, but above all create in them the perception of, and loving feelings towards, what remains of reality within neocapitalism. In line with his materialism, I have claimed that rather than having a pessimistic vision of the present time and a negative conception of art, Pasolini wants Marxist cinema to foster the sympathy of viewers for anticapitalism, feeding their courage to resist the ideology imposed by the media and to support the challenge of counteracting capitalism in its changing guises. As a result, I have concluded that Pasolini does not promote a political programme for the outside, nor a political subjectivity related to what is excluded by capitalism. The materialist trajectory of Pasolini's cinema showed (a) how his cinema theory needs to make viewers encounter what he reveals of the progressive processes of capitalistic development and what remains of those realities crushed by the power of capitalism; (b) how his cinema leaves a democratic and non-hierarchical space for the viewer's perception, speculation and creativity; and (c) how his cinema is oriented neither to the class struggle nor to revolutionary forces, but to events, encounters, and possibilities.

In chapter 4, my theoretical reconstruction innovatively focused on Pasolini's pedagogy of cinema, asserting that, in the mid-1970s, Pasolini began using his cinema theory and

his cinema of the outside as starting points in promoting a further and necessary 'paradigm shift' from literary to cinematic language in the education of young people (4.1.1). I have revealed how Pasolini is aware that this further paradigm shift reveals what he himself defined as his adaptability to capitalism. I have argued for the relevance of his concept of adaptability for his political theory (4.1.2). This adaptability conceptualises and confirms the unity and consistency of his militant engagement in favour of Marxism. He now asks of Marxism that it construct a pedagogy to learn to think in images in order to help young people cinematically understand and intervene in reality. He also observes how he identifies a minority of young people to whom this pedagogy of cinema is directed. With this perspective, Pasolini's last film *Salò and the 120 Days of Sodom* (4.2) and his last treatise, 'Gennariello', have been studied in detail, focusing on the realisation of a kind of counter-pedagogy based on his political and cinema theories (4.3).

However, I have also highlighted how Pasolini's adaptability shows a progression that brings new considerations to my theoretical reconstruction of his political theory. This progression is a long way from materialism and indeed is possibly closer to idealism. First, Pasolini singles out a political subjectivity (a minority of the young) to entrust with his cautiously optimistic cinematic and political legacy, and this subjectivity is in fact a miraculous creature, an imaginary synthesis, an ideal persona. Second, Pasolini's pedagogical efforts have been shown to appear to be leaning towards a pedagogy of the educators rather than a pedagogy of the audience, a somewhat Platonic choice that denotes a change in his previous militant engagement. Lastly, Pasolini's militancy has now been seen as defining his engagement as an ironic and detached form of critical attitude, a claim that is completely different from his search for an encounter with the sympathy of the viewer. Indeed, these considerations turn away from Pasolini's political aim of making reality solidly perceivable by the viewer through his films. Instead, they mitigate his direct involvement with audiences and show that his militant engagement is oriented towards preparing for the future rather than being part of the present time. Was this progression the antechamber of the failure of his materialism? In other words, did Pasolini's progression from strong hope to cautious optimism relate to the discovery of the political inefficacy of his cinema of the outside?

On the other hand, I have also asked: is Pasolini's pedagogy a development or a regression of his materialism when it coincides with the rise of a new form of

capitalism? Although I continue to suggest the unity and consistency of Pasolini's materialism, I realise that this pedagogy of the educators seems to look elsewhere. A form of Platonism is very clear in Pasolini's pedagogy. This is shown in his attention to the condition of the young, his focus on the great obedience of the young to capitalism, his search for alternative pedagogical paths, his considering himself a master, and his claims for the political role of the minority in the future. However, rather than the suspicion of this being a form of idealism, or even of having a utopian perspective, I have asked if this pedagogy of the educators might be something else? In my view, what is interesting is the way Pasolini speaks of the relationship between pedagogy and cinema: he speaks as a director who is aware of the political importance of the cinematic camera and audio-visual techniques, one who invites his pupils not to analyse a film but to cinematically understand and practise representing reality (4.3.1). He argues that becoming cinematic is thus a way to live and to struggle in the present (4.3.2). It is a means that Pasolini proposes his ideas to a minority, clearly waiting for a world to come (4.3.3). And it is a fundamental basis for learning to think in images (4.4).

Of his materialism I retain at least this: Pasolini's political theory gives rise to a trans-disciplinary method which, linking cinema and politics, seeks to produce actions and concepts that can keep pace with the mutations that develop as capitalism changes, and that can reduce the gap between ideology and reality. In this, Pasolini's militant engagement shows his trust in the antagonistic potential of cinema to provide conditions for political dissent. It is from this standpoint that Pasolini's renewal of Marxism emerges, (a) by exploring the theoretical bases of the language of cinema to pragmatically make the viewer encounter reality or what remains of reality within capitalism, and (b) by constructing an audio-visual counter-pedagogy that makes students capable of the technical management of film production.

These results send me back to the other two questions that have guided this thesis: How can Pasolini's political theory of cinema be a part of the current academic attention to the relationship between politics and film? And what does the essential political unity and consistency of Pasolini's cinema add to the body of work in Pasolini studies?

On the first question, I have shown how Pasolini's political theory argues that audio-visual technologies are not only an innocent and neutral form of entertainment for the

masses, but they also constitute an ontological, semiological and semiotic framework through which audiences can gain a greater or lesser perception of reality. Likewise, I have revealed that Pasolini's cinematic turn does not separate technology from philosophy nor cinema from politics, using images to reduce the distance between languages and concepts. In this I have shown first how his profilmic films, his choice of audio-visual techniques and even his 'laboratory films' are exemplary. Second, I have studied how Pasolini's pedagogy of cinema is aimed at orienting students to learn to think in images. With these perspectives, I have argued that Pasolini's militant engagement reveals a void in those who continue to understand reality purely through words, even though the present time is mainly perceived through other languages and techniques. Pasolini requires scholars and pedagogists to increase their understanding of the distance between words and images, philosophy and technology, and text and film and asks how they can reduce it This has allowed me to distinguish two lines of research: into the work of those who consider a film as a text, albeit they still view it as more complex than a written language, and in which they recognise a set of equivalences between cinematic subjects and political problems (e.g., Shapiro, 2013; 2020; Rushton, 2013; Nelson, 2013; Fraser, 2018); and into the work of those who view a film more cinematically, implying that the technical choices of cinematic language and audio-visual techniques in a film production can create an atmosphere of political theory (Casarino, 2002; Thompson, 2006; Panagia, 2013; Deamer, 2016).

Here, I want to suggest how my thesis on Pasolini's political theory intertwines with this theoretical and historical context of inquiry. I believe that Pasolini's militant engagement can be inserted in this growing body of philosophical literature to develop two fundamental theoretical issues for further research on the conditions for political dissent. The first issue is the relationship between visibility, politics, and the perception of reality. Today it is banal to argue that visibility has become central for politics. The production and use of images has a pivotal role in maintaining the economic, political and social status quo and in prescribing a mainstream perception of reality. Current social media spread millions and millions of images through a continuous circle of interplay and interference with television, cinema, and advertising (Jones, 1999; Bernays, 2004; Foa, 2016).

In this, visibility is increasingly essential for politics, but also – in Pasolini's terms – it determines a variety of degrees of perception of reality, whose ontological basis,

according to his materialism, is the violent and physical presence of singularities. I repeat those observations: for Pasolini, the cinematic experience of naturalism, typically via television, provides the most highly ideological degree of perception of reality in which visibility seems to be pure and perceptible by viewers without any forms of singularity (3.2.3; 3.3.1). Whereas the cinematic experience of conventionalism, spread by blockbusters and advertising, is aimed at reproducing models and standards to the point that viewers are likely to perceive those images as objective and universal, never singular (3.2.2; 3.3.2). Lastly, the cinematic experience of the iconic sign of itself is one whose political force lies in the expression of the violent, physical, and singular presence of reality to which viewers are not accustomed (3.2.1; 3.3.3).

Pasolini invites academic attention to the relationship between cinema and politics to be aware that visibility on the screen is due to a variety of degrees of perception of reality. His focus is on the degree of perception of reality technically spread by an image. His purpose is that scholars and viewers are encouraged to learn how ideology works pragmatically through images, rather than through investigating the sense of those images (Fraser, 2018; Shapiro, 2020). Likewise, learning to think in images means relating to an individual and collective awareness of reality, inventing and reinventing the relationship with reality (Deamer, 2016). As noted in 3.4.3, Pasolini argues that when the viewer transforms the shocking experience of the outside into sympathy with the outside, the viewer becomes an author who reinvents reality by means of what is excluded by capitalism (Panagia, 2013). This means that the conditions for political dissent do not emerge from the aesthetic subject of a film (Shapiro, 2013), but from a non-homologous relationship between the degree of cinematic expression of reality and the viewer's perception of reality.

Hence, I have recognised a series of questions that could further help to explore such an awareness.

What degree of perception of reality can emerge from the images of a film?

Through which semiological choices does a film make visible this degree of reality?

Which semiotic clues reveal something else from or within capitalism?

What do we perceive and know of reality after watching a film?

And finally, therefore:

To what extent is Pasolini's urgent issue about the loss of reality, and his aims of

offering a wider perception of reality over the ideology of capitalism, related to the current debate on the relationship between films and political theory?

A second issue is the relationship between capitalism, anti-capitalism, and pedagogy. I have argued that in the face of his awareness of the changing nature of capitalism, the urgent question for Pasolini was which status of cinematic image helps liberate the viewer from ideology. In addition, I have noted that in the mid-1970s Pasolini questions which pedagogy is a counter-pedagogy capable of counteracting capitalism – now defined as new fascism and anthropological mutation (4.1.1). With the same perspectives, academic attention focuses on the political potential of cinema to alert the viewer to the main fantasy of capitalism: the myth of totality. According to this academic context (Shapiro, 2013; 2020; Panagia, 2013; Fraser, 2018), a film, when it is artistic and produces aesthetic subjects, presents an exceedance for the viewer that embodies something that is incommensurate and critical, and that has potential and liberated space beyond the aesthetic regimes of capitalism (Deleuze, 1986; 1989; Ranciére, 2009). The political task of cinema is to break into the presumed totality, revealing its ideological background. This is without doubt the political aim of Pasolini's cinema of the outside: to show a wider perception of reality over ideology. However, as seen in 3. 4, Pasolini's attention is not on contradictions but on exclusion and his focus is not on negatively shocking the viewer but on positively producing sympathy.

Therefore, I suggest that Pasolini's political theory contributes to the academic field with further questions:

Which realities constitute the outside in contemporary film production?

How does film make visible the changes of capitalism and its power of exclusion?

How can cinema produce sympathy for what is excluded by contemporary capitalism?

This eventually brings about some considerations about the relationship between my study and Pasolini studies. I have demonstrated how concepts of the outside and of adaptability reveal the unity and the consistency of Pasolini's militant engagement and how this latter is due to a political theory in favour of the renewal of Marxism. These acquisitions contribute to Pasolini studies in that they suggest that the extravagant interdisciplinarity of his militant engagement (Viano, 1993), the creative disorganisation of his methods (Gordon, 1997) and even the pluralistic interpretative horizons of his

oeuvre (Pacchioni, 2008) are caused by the materialist trajectory of his cinematic oeuvre, whose pedagogical act is to produce an event through what is on the screen: the sympathy of the viewer towards what remains of reality even when crushed by the ideologies of capitalism. In this, Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre pragmatically searches for ways to bring about a higher degree of perception of reality than the images spread by capitalism otherwise offer, in order to pursue his political aims in favour of the renewal of Marxism. These aims are related to Pasolini's love for reality, which in turn is understood as the violent and physical presence of singularities that are excluded by capitalism and that have become increasingly invisible to audiences over time. In this, Pasolini's cinematic oeuvre can be considered as a form of political resistance capable of adapting to the hegemonic functioning of capitalism.

This thesis contributes to the understanding of a series of reversal of perspectives in Pasolini studies, turning them away from some of their more habitual canonical interpretations. The first reversal is from the perception of Pasolini as a lover of an archaic and primal past (Wark, 2018; Humphrey, 2020) or, in contrast, a prophet of an authoritarian future (Sollazzo, 2016), or even as a modern Socrates who shocks people with his idiosyncratic lifestyle and his thinking to the point of being hated (Bazzocchi, 2006). Instead, it offers an interpretation that looks at Pasolini as someone who understands and adapts to the present and finds his way to intervene and struggle with 'the 'time of now'. Canonical interpretations in Pasolini studies underrate his materialism and his achievement in staying in touch with the present to the point that those interpretations remain within the detritus of a bourgeois reading of Pasolini as an ideal master (2016), a martyr (Schwartz, 1992) and even a prophet (Sassetti, 2009). Perhaps, more moderately, this study aims at least to recognise the co-existence and struggle of the two interpretative horizons of idealist–bourgeois and materialist–Marxist. Are not the final scene of *Salò or the 120 Days of Sodom*, in which the two young fascists dance together and alone (4.2.4), and his pedagogical treatise 'Gennariello', in which Pasolini makes himself master and model for an imaginary pupil (4.3.1), witnesses and marks of the co-existence of these two aspects of his work?

The second reversal is this: there is a change from defining Pasolini's theorising as disorganised, extravagant and non-academic to defining it as the internal perseverance of his political aims – as he pragmatically reveals what remains of reality while also struggling against capitalism. Does this not involve a different view of what theorising

means? Rather than assuming that theory imagines and practice realises, what Pasolini calls 'heretical empiricism' or 'corsair method' may be defined as the recruitment of concepts, practices and directions from a wide range of disciplines to verify if and how they help to find strategies that best struggle against capitalism. Rather than assessing how Pasolini has illegitimately contaminated and experienced disciplines not his own (Viano, 1993), or more positively defining how Pasolini invites 'a cross-fertilisation between disciplines' (Patti, 2016), I have shown that his theorising reveals the extent that Marxism's renewal is not a theory, but a practice, while remaining aware that he risks being overly ideological and culpable of errors and inaccuracies. In short, Pasolini's theorising is best documented through the eleventh part of Marx's thesis on Feuerbach: 'Philosophers have hitherto only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it' (Marx, 1845).

Third, there is a reversal away from the description of Pasolini's militant engagement as a form of humanism in favour of every marginalised person. Instead, his militancy aims at a form of radical anticapitalism in which what is – or is going to be – excluded, forgotten, and denied by capitalism becomes a good and pertinent element for showing the hegemonic functioning of capitalism. Such exclusion is the condition by which the progressive process of capitalistic development is understood (3.4.1). This entails that 'the outside' can never work as a political subjectivity in Pasolini's cinema, but rather as a clue, a proof, and a result of the changing nature of capitalism. I have argued that Pasolini focuses on the changing nature of capitalism as his main political enemy, although this enemy seems to disappear into canonical interpretation. As a result, I ask: what does it mean for the description of Pasolini's militant engagement that his cinema does not generate a political programme for what is excluded, but rather it shows the political conjuncture of the present and deduces capitalism's changes? I have demonstrated that this shows that Pasolini's cinema is always focused on conditions for the struggle against capitalism, not on a particular social or civil struggle that remains contingent and fleeting (Vighi, 2002; Rodhes, 2007; Caminati, 2007; Patti, 2014). This acquisition is very important in Pasolini studies because for the first time the myth that was made of Pasolini can be reduced, and a polyhedric and multifaceted interpretation afforded, ultimately allowing an understanding of the consistency of his political commitment (Antonello, 2012).

The fourth reversal is from pessimism to optimism, or at least, to cautious optimism. I

have shown how Pasolini's cinematic turn, his choice of elaborating on a cinema theory, his appropriate attention to what is outside capitalism over time, his pedagogy of cinema, and lastly the recognition of his adaptability to a battle on the move, reveal that his political action optimistically wants to be a springboard for antagonism. I have argued that many scholars have a poor grasp of Pasolini's perseverance and consistency, both as a political strategy against capitalism and as an intellectual and political imperative, as well as being a fundamental basis for his cinema. In this, my study criticises those interpretive horizons exalting Pasolini's pessimism because they have a poorer grasp of the significance of his adaptability (Nowell-Smith, 1977; Siciliano, 1982; Fusillo, 1996; Tommasini and Venturini, 2017; Rimini, 2017; Leonelli, 2017; Pierangeli, 2017; La Porta, 2017; Salsano, 2017; Humphrey, 2020).

Through my work on Pasolini's cinema of the outside, this adaptability may also be a future field of my own research in political theory – in two directions. The first direction is pedagogical. There is an analogy with Plato's Phaedrus, which speaks of the myth of the birth of writing, in that we live inside a world completely made and dominated by the language of images and which produces a revolution in perception. This language can favour the rise of such new and alternative possibilities as Pasolini's militant engagement invites the viewer to, and so it is central to find a way to feed the learning to think in images. Aware of number of critical voices, my study on Pasolini's political theory now orients my research towards a pedagogy that feeds a more affirmative view of technology, both as the necessary means of political awareness of the present time and as a political practice to empower being alive in this world. If the technological revolution of communication has clear consequences for the perception of reality, the pedagogy must change as technology changes. With this perspective, Pasolini enables the setting up of the idea of a direct relationship between technologies and reality, which must be significant both for antagonism and for its development.[120] An awareness of the surplus produced by technology and the appropriation of the means of production could be the political direction of this audio-visual pedagogy.

[120] From other starting points, Stiegler has rediscovered the concept of pharmakon to describe technology. It is the ideological poison that makes it impossible to see reality, but it is also the aid for inventing something with which to struggle against this disease. In contrast with Plato, whose prisoner wants to leave the cave (having considered the images of the false life lived inside the cave), Stiegler claims that the film-lover, the *amateur de cinema*, would like to get behind the camera or onto the screen. This appropriation of the means of production could be fundamental in understanding the political direction of audio-visual pedagogy (Stiegler, 2018).

The second direction is properly political, but it is directly related to the first one. The visibility of the outside and sympathy towards what is excluded are antagonistic strategies that can be constantly highlighted and, where possible, produce a wider perception of reality. This focus on a dialectic of inclusion and exclusion may attract people's attention to two fundamental conditions for grasping a wider perception of reality and feeding political dissent. The first is the sense of justice that derives from the visibility of inequalities that arise from the hegemonic functioning of the system. The second is the awareness that the power of capitalism to include and exclude is pragmatic and irrational, and as such it can eventually involve every social situation. In this way, the outside results in a political concept that directs the viewer's attention towards what is 'the common'. However, it is intriguing to note how current visibility on the screen has spread a total polarisation on a variety of political issues (e.g., Brexit–Bremain, Vax–Anti-Vax, divisions on confidence in the scientific and medical communities) and a politics of terror towards the excluded (e.g., migrants, foreigners, the poor, and so on). This visibility constructs an ideological social cohesion on inequalities and exclusions that fully ignores the outside, and as consequence 'the common', and it ultimately impedes the political expression of real antagonism. With these perspectives, a political theory that focuses on the reality of the outside is all the more necessary.

Therefore, I accept Pasolini's invitation to play in the field of inclusion and exclusion, and re-launch the political strategy to look outside:

> 'The circle was meeting at its own centre, excluding the world, which was there, outside, as the half open window on the ceiling of the Splendid demonstrated with shining clarity: a silken blue, from the Apennines, with the air of the sea… The circle is meeting around that centre it has full of certainty: the world is outside, radiant and indifferent. And the heart is rent. I am here, then.' (DM: 7-8)

AFTERWORD

> 'The question of philosophy is the singular point where concept and creation are related to each other.' (Deleuze, Guattari, 1994: 11)

What is the outside? It is the concept that for the first time represents Pasolini's materialism and his anticapitalism. To grasp the outside, I have circumscribed a space in Pasolini's cinema. The outside is what is excluded, forgotten, and denied by capitalism. This space has an irregular contour and many components that combine with each other over time: the outside includes the most disadvantaged people of this earth; the outside is a penis, a body lacerated, the shit; the outside means the desperate shouts of the bourgeoise, the archaic tradition of myths, the young *fascisti* who dance; the outside are the dreams, the clouds, the rubbish.

It is clear that I have dealt with a concept that is neither simple nor linear, but polyhedric, plural, articulated. I have revealed that the outside is characterised by a constant in Pasolini's cinema: the outside is always a violent, physical, singular presence of reality. It has several elements. First, the outside is not a universal idea or category. Second, the outside is not a special object through which we identify a subject (for instance, the outside is not Pasolini's homosexuality; the outside is not the unconscious). Third, the outside changes with the changing nature of capitalism.

A logic of contingency is at play in Pasolini's cinema: the outside is always second in relation to the hegemonic functioning of capitalism; each contingency is singular in relation to the totalising desire of capital; it is excluded in relation to the need of capitalism to select, reduce and conform; and lastly it is what remains of reality in relation to the massed ideology spread by capitalism. In this way, Pasolini wants to find a way to stay in touch with reality at any given moment in time.

I have argued that everything is overturned in Pasolini's cinema; the outside becomes politically precious and philosophically constructive, the outside logically comes first,

so that what remains of reality can eventually be made visible. This discovery brings a new consistency in Pasolini's political theory, uncovering the fact that for Pasolini the outside is *the* condition under which Marxism can be renewed. It is the condition under which its dialectic may be rethought, under which its political action is redistributed. In this, the outside is the refrain of Pasolini's cinema that eventually demonstrates the unity and consistency of his militant engagement.

This is Pasolini's cinema, and it is presented in images, figures and characters, and has great aesthetic value. It becomes concept, philosophy, politics. In this, this study helps Pasolini's political theory to be seen not as 'a comet inclined to burn' (Deleuze, Guattari, 1994: 103) but a light that illumines the path.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS BY PASOLINI

English Language Editions

(HE): (2005), *Heretical Empiricism*, transl. by Ben Lawton and Louise K. Barnett, Louise K. Barnett (ed.), with Pasolini's 'Repudiation of the Trilogy of Life' transl. and introduced by Ben Lawton, New Academia Publishing, Washington

(CW): (2018), *Corsair Writings,* https://libcom.org/article/corsair-writings-pier-paolo-pasolini

(LL): (1987), *Lutheran Letters*, transl. by Stuart Hood, Carcanet Press, New York

(DM): (1980), *The Divine Mimesis*, transl. by Thomas Erling Peterson, Double Dance Press, Berkeley

(PO): (2014), *The Selected Poetry of Pier Paolo Pasolini*, transl. by Stephen Sartarelli, Chicago University Press, Chicago

Italian Language Editions

(PI): (2009), *Passione e ideologia* [Passion and Ideology], Garzanti, Roma

(BB): (1997), *Le belle bandiere*, [The beautiful flags], Editori Riuniti, Firenze

(OI): (2009), *L'odore dell'India*, [The smell of India], Garzanti, Roma

(SLA): (2001), *Scritti sulla letteratura e l'arte*, [Essays on Literature and Art] Mondadori, Milano

(SP): (2001), *Scritti politici*, [Political Essays], Mondadori, Milano

(LE-1): (1986), *Lettere dal 1940 al 1954*, [Letters from 1940 to 1955], Einaudi, Torino

(LE-2): (1988), *Lettere dal 1955 al 1975*, [Letters from 1955 to 1975], Einaudi, Torino

(TE): (2001), *Teatro*, [Theatre, Complete Works], Mondadori, Milano

FILMOGRAPHY

1961

Accattone, [Beggars],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini, with dialogue collaboration by Sergio Citti

1962

Mamma Roma, [Mamma Rome],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini with dialogue collaboration by Sergio Citti

1963

La ricotta, [The Curd Cheese],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini

La rabbia, [Anger],
Subject and Verse Commentary: P. P. Pasolini

1964

Comizi d'amore, [Love Meeting],
Commentary written by P. P. Pasolini

Sopralluoghi in Palestina, [Location Hunting in Palestine],
Subject: P. P. Pasolini

Il Vangelo secondo Matteo, [The Gospel according to St. Matthew],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini (from The Gospel of St. Matthew)

1965

Uccellacci uccellini, [The Hawks and the Sparrow],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini

1967

La terra vista dalla luna, [The Earth seen from the Moon],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini

Edipo re, [Oedipus Rex],
Screenplay, inspired by Sophocles *Oedipus Rex* and *Oedipus at Colonus*

1968

Che cosa sono le nuvole? [What are the Clouds?],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini

Teorema, [Theorem],
Story and Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini

Appunti per un film sull'India, [Notes for a Film about India],
Subject and Direction: P. P. Pasolini

1969

La sequenza del fiore di carta, [The Sequence of the Paper Flower],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini (from an idea by Puccio Pucci and Piero Badalessi)

Porcile, [Pigsty],
Story and Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini

Medea, [Medea],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini, based on Euripides and Seneca

1970

Appunti per un'Orestiade Africana, [Notes for an African Orestes],
Script: P. P. Pasolini

1971

Il Decamerone, [Decameron],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini, based on Boccaccio's tales

1972

I racconti di Canterbury, [Canterbury Tales],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini, based on Chaucer's stories.

1974

Il fiore delle mille e una notte, [Arabian Nights],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini based on the Arabian Nights

1975

Salò o le 120 giornate di Sodoma, [Salò and the120 Days of Sodom],
Screenplay: P. P. Pasolini and Sergio Citti, based on the Marquis de Sade's novel *Les 120 Journées de Sodome*

SUBJECTS AND SCREENPLAYS

1954 *La Donna del fiume*, (Dir. Mario Soldati), co-scriptwriter

1955 *Il prigioniero della montagna*, (Dir. Luis Trenker), co-scriptwriter

1956 *Le notti di Cabiria*, (Dir. Federico Fellini), consultation on Romanesque street jargon

1957 *Marisa la civetta*, (Dir. Mauro Bolognini), co-scriptwriter

1958 *Giovani mariti*, (Dir. Mauro Bolognini), co-scriptwriter

1959 *La notte brava*, (Dir. Mauro Bolognini), subject and scriptwriter
Morte di un amico, (Dir. Franco Rossi), collaboration on subject

1960 *Il bell'Antonio*, (Dir. Mauro Bolognini), co-scriptwriter
La giornata balorda, (Dir. Mauro Bolognini), co-scriptwriter
La lunga notte del '43, (Dir. Florestano Vancini), co-scriptwriter
Il carro armato dell'8 settembre, (Dir. Gianni Puccini), co-scriptwriter
La dolce vita, (Dir. Federico Fellini), co-scriptwriter

1961 *La ragazza in vetrina*, (Dir. Luciano Emmer), co-scriptwriter

1962 *La commare secca*, (Dir. Bernardo Bertolucci), subject and co-scriptwriter
Una vita violenta, (Dirs. Paolo Heusch, Brunello Rondi), based on Pasolini's novel *Una vita violenta*

1966 *Il cinema di Pasolini Appunti per un critofilm*, (Short-film, dir. Maurizio Ponzi), includes clips from *Comizi d'amore*

1970 *Ostia*, (Dir. Sergio Citti), collaboration on subject and script; supervision of mise-en scène

1973 *Storie scellerate*, (Dir. Sergio Citti), collaboration on subject and script

SITOGRAPHY

- http://www.centrostudipierpaolopasolinicasarsa.it/
- https://www.cittapasolini.com/

OTHER WORKS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Marx, K. (1841), *Spinoza Notebooks*, Marxist Internet Archive, New York.

Marx, K. (1843), *Letter from Marx to Arnold Ruge*, Marxist Internet Archive, New York

Marx, K. (1845), *Thesis on Feuerbach*, Marxist Internet Archive, New York

Marx, K. (1887), *The capital,* Marxist Internet Archive, New York

Marx, K. (1972) *Quaderni Spinoza,* Mondadori, Milano

Marx, K. (1973), *Grundrisse, Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft*), Marxist Internet Archive, New York

Spinoza, B. (2002), *The complete works*, Hackett, Indianapolis

Spinoza, B. (1967), *Philosophie et politique*. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris

Gramsci, A. (1953), *Note sul Machiavelli, sulla politica e sullo stato moderno*, [Notes about Machiavelli's Politics and about Modern State], Einaudi, Torino

Gramsci, A. (1953), *Il materialismo storico e la filosofia di Benedetto Croce*, [Historical Materialism and Benedetto Croce's Philosophy], Einaudi, Torino

Gramsci, A. (1992), *Selection from Prison Notebooks*, International Publisher, New York

Gramsci, A. (2020), *Lettere dal carcere* [Prison Letters], Einaudi, Torino

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adorno, T.W. (1966), *Negative Dialectics*, Routledge, New York

Adorno, T.W. (1968), 'Transparencies on Films', *The Culture Industry*, T.W. Adorno and J. Berstein (ed.), Routledge, London

Adorno, T.W. (1970), *Aesthetic Theory*, Routledge, London

Alliez, E. (1998), 'On Deleuze's Bergsonism'. *Discourse: Journal for Theoretical Studies in Media and Culture,* 20, (3), pp. 226-246

Althusser, L. (1965), *Reading Marx*, New Left Books, London

Althusser, L. (1976), *Positions*, Editions Sociales, Paris

Angelucci, D. (2014), *Deleuze and the Concepts of Cinema*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh

Annovi, G.M. (2013), *Fratello Selvaggio*: *Pier Paolo Pasolini, tra gioventù e nuova gioventù*, [Savage Brother: Pier Paoli Pasolini between Youth and new Youth], Transeuropa, Massa

Annovi, G.M., (2017), *Pier Paolo Pasolini: Performing Authorship.* New York, Columbia University Press

Antonello, P. (2012), *Dimenticare Pasolini*, [Forgetting Pasolini], Mimesis, Milano

Bachman, G. (1974), 'Pasolini in Persia: The Shooting of 1001 Nights.' *Film Quarterly*, 27, (2), pp. 25-28

Badiou, A. (1998), *Handbook of Inaesthetics*, Stanford University Press, Redwood City

Badiou, A. (2000), *Deleuze. The Clamour of Being*, Verso, London

Badiou, A. (2015), Metafisica della felicità reale, [The Metaphysic of Real Happiness], Derive e Approdi, Roma

Baudrillard, J. (1996), *The Perfect Crime*, Verso, London

Bazzocchi, M.A. (2006), *I burattini filosofi. Pasolini dalla letteratura al cinema*, [Philosophical

Puppets. Pasolini from Literature to Cinema], Mondadori, Milano

Bazzocchi, M.A. (2015), 'Alterità e pedagogia, il corpo dei ragazzi', [Alterity and Pedagogy, the Body of Young], Carnero R., Felice A. (ed.), *Pasolini e la pedagogia*, [Pasolini and Pedagogy], Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Bazzocchi, M.A. (2016), 'Abiura, parresia e sessualità', [Abjuration, Parrhesia and Sexuality], *Pasolini, Foucault e il politico*, [Pasolini, Foucault and Politics], Kirchmayr, R. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Bazzocchi, M.A. (2017), *Esposizioni*, [Exposures], Il Mulino, Bologna

Benini, S. (2015), *Pasolini: The Sacred Flesh*, The University of Toronto Press, Toronto

Bersani, L. (2015), *The Homoerotics of Orientalism*, Columbia University Press, New York

Betti, L. (1991), *Le regole di un'illusione*, [The rules of an illusion], Associazione Fondo Pier Paolo Pasolini, Roma

Bernays, E.L., (2004) *Crystallising Public Opinion*, Kessinger Pub, Whitefish

Bidet, J., Kouvelakis, E., (2008) (ed.) *Critical Companion to Contemporary Marxism,* Brill, Boston

Bogue, R. (2003), *Deleuze on Cinema*, Routledge, London

Bondavalli, S. (2007), 'Charming the Cobra with a Ballpoint Pen: Liminality and Spectacular Authorship in Pier Paolo Pasolini's Interviews', *Italian Issue*, 122, (2), pp. 24-45

Bondavalli, S. (2010), 'Lost in the Pig House: Vision and Consumption in Pier Paolo Pasolini's Porcile', *Italica*, 87, (3), pp.408-427

Bondavalli, S. (2014), *Fiction of Youth*, The University of Toronto Press, Toronto

Bonitzer, P. (1969), 'Pasolini: Teorema*' Cahiers du Cinema*, 211, pp. 53.

Bourdieu, P. (1993), *The Field of Cultural Production*, Columbia University Press, New York

Bourdieu, P. (2015), *Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, Stanford University Press, Redwood City

Brisolin, V. (2011), *Power and Subjectivity in the Late Work of Roland Barthes and Pier Paolo*

Pasolini, Peter Lang, Bristol

Brugnoli, O., (2005), Per un cinema di idee, [For the cinema of idea], Messaggero, Padova

Bruno, G. (1991), 'The body of Pasolini's semiotics', in *Cinema Journal*, 30, (3), pp. 29-42

Caminati, L. (2007), *Orientalismo eretico, Pier Paolo Pasolini e il cinema del Terzo Mondo*, [Heretical Orientalism, Pier Paolo Pasolini and the Cinema of Third World], Mondadori, Milano

Caminati, L. (2016), 'Notes for a Revolution: Pasolini's Postcolonial Essay Films'. *The essay Film: Dialogue, Politics, Utopia*, Papazian E.A., Eades C. (ed.), Wallflower, New York

Capitani, L. (2015), 'Pasolini: il clemente principio di autorità e la scuola impossibile', [Pasolini: the Gentle Principle of Authorship and the Impossible School], *Pasolini e la pedagogia*, [Pasolini and Pedagogy], Carnero R., Felice A. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Carmosino, D. (2016), 'Conoscere per analogia. Pasolini e la categoria del periferico', [Knowledge by Analogy. Pasolini and the Category of Peripheral], *Pasolini e le periferie del mondo*, [Pasolini and the Peripheries of the World], Martino P., Verbaro C. (ed.), ETS, Pisa

Cesare, T. (1989), 'Pasolini's Theorem', *Film Criticism*, 14, (1), pp. 22-25

Chiesa, L. (2011), The Bio-Theo-Politics of the Birth', *Journal of Theoretical Humanities*, 16, pp. 101-115

Chiesi, R. (2015), 'Balli di iniziazione e seduzione. Un rito pedagogico nel cinema di Pier Paolo Pasolini', [The Dances of Initation and Seduction. Pedagogical Rites in Pier Paolo Pasolini's Cinema], *Pasolini e la pedagogia*, [Pasolini and Pedagogy], Carnero R., Felice A. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Colman, F. (2011), *Deleuze and Cinema. The film Concepts,* Berg, Oxford

Costa A, (1977), 'The semiological heresy of Pier Paolo Pasolini', *Pier Paolo Pasolini,* Willemen P (ed.), British Film Institute, London

Crick, P. (1970), 'Pasolini: Philosophy of Cinema', *Cinema*, 6-7, pp. 13-14

Deamer, D. (2016), *Deleuze's Cinema books. Three introductions to the Taxonomy of Images*,

Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh

Deleuze, G. (1983), *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, The Athlone Press, London

Deleuze, G. (1986), *Cinema1: The Movement-Image*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis

Deleuze, G. (1989), *Cinema2: The Time-Image*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis

Deleuze, G. (1967) *Proust e i segni*, Einaudi, Torino

Deleuze, G. (2003), *Proust and the Signs*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis

Deleuze, G., Guattari, F., (1987), *A Thousand Plateaus*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis

Deleuze, G., Guattari, F (1994), *What is philosophy*?, Columbia University Press, New York

Desogus, P. (2018), *Laboratorio Pasolini. Teoria del segno e del cinema,* [Pasolini Laboratory. The Theory of Sign and Cinema], Quodlibet, Macerata

De Carolis. L. (2008), *'Pasolini e il cinema, il progetto di una teoria semiotica in Empirismo Eretico'*, [Pasolini and Cinema, the Project for a Semiotic theory in Heretical Empiricism], Atheneum, Firenze

De Lauretis, T. (1984), *Alice doesn't: Feminism, Semiotics, Cinema*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington

De Kesel, M. (2017), 'A Sleepless dream', *Theoremes*, 10 (1), pp.17-27

Duflot, J. (1982), *Il sogno del centauro*, [The Centaur's Dream], Editori Riuniti, Roma

Dunghe, A.P. (2012), 'Semiotics of the Sacred', *Italica,* 89, (4), pp. 582-588

Eco, U. (1968), *La struttura assente*, [The absent Structure], Bompiani, Roma

Esposito, R. (2009), *Living Though. The Origins and the Actuality of Italian Philosophy*, Stanford University Press, Redwood City

Fabbri, P. (1994), 'Free/Indirect/Discourse', *Pier Paolo Pasolini, Contemporary Perspectives*, Rumble P. and Testa B. (ed.), The University of Toronto Press, Toronto

Felice, A. (2016), 'Pasolini e la giustizia. Il caso Pilade', [Pasolini and the Justice. The Pilade

Case], *Pasolini, Foucault e il politico*, [Pasolini, Foucault and Politics], Kirchmayr, R. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Ferrero, P. (1994), *Il cinema di Pier Paolo Pasolini*, Marsilio, Padova

Fine, B., Boffo, A., Saad-Filho, A. (2012), (ed), *The Elgar Companion to Marxist Economics*, Elgar, Northhampton

Flaxman, G. (2000), *The Brain is the Screen: Deleuze and Philosophy of Cinema,* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis

Foucault, M. (1982), 'Grey Mornings of Tolerance', *Stanford Italian Review*, 2, (2), pp. 72-74

Fraccaroli, G. (2016), 'Appunti (con molti punti) per una ricezione di Pasolini nella filosofia contemporanea', [Notes (with several points) for a Review of Pasolini in Contemporary Philosophy], *Pasolini Oggi. Fortuna Internazionale e ricezione critica,* [Pasolini Today. International Fame and Critical review], Felice, A; Larcati, A., Tricomi, A. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Fraser, I. (2018), *Political Theory and Film, From Adorno to* Žižek, Rowman and Littlefield, London

Fusillo, M. (2012), *La Grecia secondo Pasolini: mito e cinema*, [The Greece according to Pasolini: Myth and Cinema], Carocci, Roma

Gragnolati, M., Holzhey, C. (2015), 'Active Passivity? Spinoza in Pasolini's Porcile', *Pier Paolo Pasolini, Dissidenze, Resistenze, Ibridazioni*, [Pier Paolo Pasolini, Opposition, Resistance, Hybridization], Lucci, A., De Fiore L. (ed.), ETS, Pisa

Greene, N. (1990), *Pier Paolo Pasolini*: *Cinema as Heresy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton

Golino, E. (1995), *Tra le lucciole e il palazzo. Il mito Pasolini dentro la realtà,* [Pier Paolo Pasolini, Opposition, Resistance, Hybridization], Sellerio, Palermo

Golino, E. (2015), 'Pasolini, pedagogo di massa', [Pasolini, Educator for the Masses], *Pasolini e la pedagogia*, [Pasolini and Pedagogy], Carnero R., Felice A. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Gordon, R. (1996), *Pasolini: Forms of Subjectivity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Gordon, R. (1997), 'Recent Work on Pasolini in English', *Italian Studies*, 52, pp. 180-188

Guattari, F. (1995), *Chaosmosis. An Ethico-Aesthetic paradigm*, Indiana University Press, Indianapolis

Habermas, J. (1979), *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, Beacon Press, Boston

Habermas, J. (1987), *The theory of communicative action*. Beacon Press, Boston

Hallward, P. (2006), *Out of this World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation*, Verso, London

Hamza, A. (2016), *Althusser and Pasolini, Philosophy, Marxism and Film,* Palgrave Macmillan, London

Hardt, M. (2009), 'Pasolini Discovers Love Outside', *Diacritics*, 39, (4), pp. 113-139

Harvey, D. (2010), *A Companion to Marx's Capital*, Verso, London

Heath, S. (1973), 'Film/Cinetext/Text', *Screen*,14, pp. 102-128

Humphrey, D. (2020), *Archaism Modernism, Queer poetics in the Cinema of Pier Paolo Pasolini,* Wayne State University Press, Detroit

Ives, P. (2010), *Gramsci. Language and Translation*, Lexington Books, Lanhan

Jones, N. (1999), *Sultans of Spin*, Orion, London

Kirchmayr, R. (2015), 'Imparare a vivere. Una pedagogia della passione e del rifiuto', [Learning to Live. For a Pedagogy of Passion and Rejection], *Pasolini e la pedagogia*, [Pasolini and Pedagogy], Carnero R., Felice A. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Larcati, A. (2016), 'Pasolini e Bachmann. Due intellettuali a confronto', [Pasolini and Bachmann. Two intellectuals face to face], *Pasolini Oggi. Fortuna Internazionale e ricezione critica,* [Pasolini Today. International Fame and Critical review], Felice, A; Larcati, A., Tricomi, A. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Lazzarato, M. (2015), *Signs and Machines. Capitalism and the Production of Subjectivity*, Semiotexte, Los Angeles

Lazzarato, M. (2019), *Video-Philosophy: The Perception of Time in Post Fordism*, Columbia University Press, New York

La Porta, F. (2017), 'Quando canta la cicala. L'idea - tragica, antistorica, dionisiaca - di felicità in Pasolini', [When the Cicada sings. The Tragic, Anti-Storical and Dionysian idea of happiness in Pasolini], *L'ora è confusa e noi come perduti la viviamo -Leggere Pier Paolo Pasolini quarant'anni dopo*, [Times are Confused and We Live as Lost -Reading Pier Paolo Pasolini, forty years later], Tommasini F., Venturi M. (ed.), Università di Roma Tre, Roma

Leonelli, G. (2017), Introduzione alle Ceneri di Gramsci, [Introduction to The Gramsci's ashes], *L'ora è confusa e noi come perduti la viviamo -Leggere Pier Paolo Pasolini quarant'anni dopo*, [Times are Confused and We Live as Lost -Reading Pier Paolo Pasolini, forty years later], Tommasini F., Venturi M. (ed.), Università di Roma Tre, Roma

Libasci, F. (2016), 'Pasolini selon la France. Enquete sur une passion', [Pasolini according to France. Inquiry on this Passion], *Pasolini Oggi. Fortuna Internazionale e ricezione critica,* [Pasolini Today. International Fame and Critical review], Felice, A; Larcati, A., Tricomi, A. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Lucci, A. (2015), Pasolini e la Germania, [Pasolini and Germany], *Pier Paolo Pasolini, Dissidenze, Resistenze, Ibridazioni*, [Pier Paolo Pasolini, Opposition, Resistance, Hybridization], Lucci, A., De Fiore L. (ed.), ETS, Pisa

Lukacs, G. (1978), *Ontologia dell'essere sociale,* [The Ontology of Social Being], Riuniti, Roma

Maggi, A. (2009), *The Resurrection of the Body: Pier Paolo Pasolini from Saint Paul to Salò*, Chicago University Press, Chicago

Marcuse, H. (1964), *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society,* Marxists Internet Archive, New York

Marcuse, H. (1972), *Eros and Civilisation. A philosophical inquiry into Freud,* Marxist Internet Archive, New York

Mantegazza, R. (1997), *Con pura passione: l'eros pedagogico di Pier Paolo Pasolini,* [Through Pure Passion: Pier Paolo Pasolini's Pedagogical Eros], Edizioni della Battaglia, Palermo

Mariniello, S. (2009), 'Teorema, Porcile e Salò: il potere e le società storiche' [Theorem, Pigtsy

and Salò: the Power and Historical societies], *Pier Paolo Pasolini: In Living Memory,* Lawton, B., Bergonzoni, M. (ed.), New Academia Publishing, Washington

Marrati, P. (2008), *Gilles Deleuze: Cinema and Philosophy*, John Hopkins University, Baltimore

Massumi, B. (2002), *Parables of the Virtual. Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Duke University Press, Durham

Merjian, A. (2019*), Against the Avant-Garde: Pier Paolo Pasolini, Contemporary Art and Neocapitalism 1960-75,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Metz, C. (1973), *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*, Chicago University Press, Chicago

Murri, R. (2001), *Salò o le 120 giornate di Sodoma,* [Salò and the 120 Days of Sodom], Lindau, Torino

Negri, A. (1990), Arte e moltitudo, [Art and multitude], Riuniti, Roma

Nelson, J.S. (2013), *Popular Cinema as Political Theory. Idealism and Realism in Epics, Noirs and Satires,* Palgrave Macmillan, London

Novell-Smith, G. (1977), 'Pasolini's Originiality', *Pier Paolo Pasolini*, British Film Institute, London

Oster, A. (2009), 'La teoria del cinema di Pier Paolo Pasolini in Empirismo Eretico', [Cinema's theory of Pier Pasolini in Heretical Empiricism], *Studi Pasoliniani*, 3, pp. 1-12

Pacchioni, F. (2008), 'Pasolini in North America. A Bibliographical Essay on Scholarship between 1989 and 2007', *Studi Pasoliniani,* 2, pp. 1-16

Panagia, D. (2013), *Impressions of Hume. Cinematic thinking and the politics of discontinuity*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington

Paolucci, L. (2006), *La lingua scritta della realtà tra visibile e dicibile. Pasolini, Eco, Peirce, Deleuze*, [The Written Language of Reality between Visible and Speakable], Università di Bologna, Bologna

Patti, E. (2006), 'A poetic idea of re-sacralising the World', *Politics and culture in Post-war Italy*, Risso L., Boria M. (ed.), Cambridge Scholar Press, Cambridge

Patti, E. (2016), *Pasolini after Dante. The divine mimesis*, Routledge, Abingdon

Patti, E. (2022), 'Che cosa sono le nuvole? Intermedialità riflessiva e strategie di

decolonizzazione tra cinema e teatro', [What it the Clouds?. Reflective Intermediality and Decolonization Strategies between Cinema and Theatre'], *Studi Pasoliniani,* 16, pp. 207-220

Peloso, L. (2015), 'Scienze del segno e amore per la realtà. Ovvero, Pasolini e la semiotica', [The Sciences of Sign and the Love for Reality. Pasolini and Semiotics], *Filosofi(e)Semiotiche,* 2, (2), pp. 70-81

Peppel, C. (2012), 'The Guest: Transfiguring Indifference in Theorem', *The Scandal of Self-Contradiction: Pasolini's Multistable Subjectivities*, *Traditions, Geographies,* Di Blasi L., Gragnolati M., Holzney E. (ed.), Turia+Kant, Wien

Pierangeli, F. (2017), 'C'è troppa violenza su Roma. Non c'è più un fiore che sbocci in questa periferia. Da Petrolio all'orazione funebre di Casarsa', [Too much Violence in Rome. There is not longer a Flower in this Periphery. From Petrolio to the Funeral Talk in Casarsa], *L'ora è confusa e noi come perduti la viviamo -Leggere Pier Paolo Pasolini quarant'anni dopo*, [Times are Confused and We Live as Lost -Reading Pier Paolo Pasolini, forty years later], Tommasini F., Venturi M. (ed.), Università di Roma Tre, Roma

Ranciére, J. (2000), *La partizione del sensibile*, [The Partage of Sensible], Derive e approdi, Roma

Ranciére, J. (2009), *The emancipated spectator*, Continuum, London

Ranciére, J. (2010), *The Politics of Aesthetics,* Continuum, London

Ravetto, K. (2001), *The unmaking of fascist aesthetics,* Minnesota University Press, Minneapolis

Ravetto, K. (2003), 'Heretical Empiricism: Pasolini's cinema Unpopular', *Strategies for Theory: from Marx to Madonna,* Rutsky R.L., Macdonald B.J. (ed.), SUNY Press, Albany

Recalcati, M. (2022), *Pasolini, il fantasma dell'origine*, [Pasolini, the Gost of Origin], Feltrinelli, Milano

Rimini, S. (2017), 'The Imitation Game. Variazioni del personaggio Pasolini fra scena e schermo', [The Imitation Game. The Variations of the Character Pasolini between Scene and Screen], *L'ora è confusa e noi come perduti la viviamo -Leggere Pier Paolo Pasolini quarant'anni dopo*, [Times are Confused and We Live as Lost -Reading Pier Paolo Pasolini, forty years later], Tommasini F., Venturi M. (ed.), Università di Roma Tre, Roma

Rodhie, S. (2019), *Montage*, Manchester University Press, Manchester

Rodhes, J.D. (2007), *Stupendous Miserable City: Pasolini's Rome*, University Minnesota Press, Minneapolis

Righi, A. (2011), *Biopolitics and Social Change in Italy, From Gramsci to Pasolini to Negri*, Palgrave Macmillan, London

Rumble, P. (1996), *Allegory of contamination: Pier Paolo Pasolini's Trilogy of life*, The University of Toronto Press, Toronto

Rushton, R., (2013), *The Politics of Hollywood Cinema: Popular Film and Contemporary Political Theory*, Palgrave Macmillan, London

Sangalli, F. (2017), *Pasolini e lo sguardo del poeta. Uno studio su che cosa le nuvole? di Pier Paolo Pasolini,* [Pasolini and Poet's Gaze. About What is the Clouds by Pier Paolo Pasolini], Vozza, Casolla di Caserta

Salsano, R. (2017), 'Passione e critica in una sui generis descrivibilità di descrizioni', [Passions and Critics about 'The Description of Descriptions'], *L'ora è confusa e noi come perduti la viviamo -Leggere Pier Paolo Pasolini quarant'anni dopo*, [Times are Confused and We Live as Lost -Reading Pier Paolo Pasolini, forty years later], Tommasini F., Venturi M. (ed.), Università di Roma Tre, Roma

Sassetti, G. (2009), L'eredità di Pier Paolo Pasolini, [Pasolini's legacy], Mimesis, Milano

Scalia, B.R. (2012), 'Toward a Semiotics of Poetry and Film: Meaning-Making and Extra-Linguistic Signification'*, Literature/Film Quarterly*, 40, (1), pp. 46-58

Schwartz, B.D. (2017), *Pasolini Requiem*, Chicago University Press, Chicago

Shapiro, M.J. (2010), *The time of city. Politics, philosophy and genres,* Routledge, London

Shapiro, M.J (2013), *Studies in trans-disciplinary method. After the aesthetic turn*, Routledge, London

Shapiro, M.J (2020), *The cinematic political, Film composition as political theory*, Routledge, London

Siciliano, E. (1978), *Vita di Pasolini*, Rizzoli, Milano

Sitney, P.A. (2015), *The Cinema of the Poetry,* Oxford University Press, Oxford

Sollazzo, F. (2016), 'Pasolini con Marcuse', [Pasolini with Marcuse], *Pasolini, Foucault e il politico*, [Pasolini, Foucault and Politics], Kirchmayr, R. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Stack, O. (1969), *Pasolini on Pasolini*, Thames and Hudson, London

Stiegler, B. (2018), 'The Power and Knowledge of Art in the Twenty-First Century', www.academia.3669950

Tommasini, F, Venturini, M, (ed) (2017) *L'ora è confusa e noi come perduti la viviamo -Leggere Pier Paolo Pasolini quarant'anni dopo*, [Times are Confused and We Live as Lost - Reading Pier Paolo Pasolini, forty years later], Università di Roma Tre, Roma

Thomas, A.J. (2018), *Deleuze, Cinema and the Thought of the World*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh

Trentin, F. (2013), 'Organising Pessimism. Enigmatic correlations between Walter Benjamin and Pier Paolo Pasolini', *The review of the modern language*, 108, (4), pp. 1021-1041

Tricomi, A. (2016), Un intellettuale eroicamente novecentesco, [An intellectual-hero in the Twenty Century], *Pasolini Oggi. Fortuna Internazionale e ricezione critica,* [Pasolini Today. International Fame and Critical review], Felice, A; Larcati, A., Tricomi, A. (ed.), Centro Studi Pier Paolo Pasolini, Casarsa

Vanin, R. (2017), 'Tra ur-codice e infrazione. Pasolini e lo strutturalismo in Empirismo Eretico', [Between Ur-Code and the infraction of code. Pasolini and Structuralism in Heretical Empiricism], *Pier Paolo Pasolini, Dissidenze, Resistenze, Ibridazioni*, [Pier Paolo Pasolini, Opposition, Resistance, Hybridization], Lucci, A., De Fiore L. (ed.), ETS, Pisa

Viano, M. (1993), *A Certain realism: Making Use of Pasolini's Film Theory and Practice,* University of California Press, Berkeley

Vighi, F. (2001), *Le ragioni dell'altro. La formazione intellettuale di Pier Paolo Pasolini tra saggistica, letteratura e cinema*, [The reasons of the Other. The Intellectual Training of Pier Paolo Pasolini among Essays, Literature and Cinema], Longo, Ravenna

Vighi, F. (2002), 'Beyond objectivity: The Utopian in Pasolini Documentaries', *Textual Practices*, 16, (3), pp. 491-510

Vighi, F. (2003), 'Pasolini and Exclusion: Žižek, Agamben and the Modern Sub-Proletariat',

Theory, Culture and Society, 20, (5), pp. 99-121

Vighi, F. (2006), *Traumatic Encounters in Italian Film, Locating the Cinematic Unconscious*, Intellect Ltd, Portland

Vighi, F. (2012), 'Salò between Hegel and Lacan', *Corpus XXX: Pasolini, Salò, Petrolio*, Messina, D. (ed.), CLUEB, Bologna

Virno P., Hardt M. (2010), *Radical Thought in Italy,* Minnesota University Press, Minneapolis

Žižek, S. (2000), *The ticklish subject, The absent centre of Political ontology,* Verso, London

Žižek, S. (2001), *The Fright of Real Tears: Krzysztof Kieslowski Between Theory and Post-Theory*, British Film Institute, London

Žižek, S. (2008), *In Defence of Lost Causes*, Verso, London

Zourabichvili, F. (2012), *Deleuze: A philosophy of the Event*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh

Wayne, M. (2020), *Marxism goes to the Movies*, Routledge, Abingdon

Wark, M. (2015), *Molecular Red. Theory for the Anthropocene,* Verso, London

Wark, M. (2019), *Capitalism is dead. Is this something worse*, Verso, London

Ward, D. (1995), *A Poetics of Resistance: Narrative and the Writings of Pier Paolo Pasolini*. Farleigh Dickinson University Press, Madison

Welle, J. (1991), 'Postmodernism in Pasolini's Film Poems', *Annali d'Italianistica*, [Italian Studies], 9, pp. 314-321

APPENDIX

From Betti, L. (1991), *Le regole dell'illusione.*

'Le accuse al mio film Accattone mostravano il razzismo della borghesia italiana ... Nel 1961 la borghesia italiana vedeva i ceti bassi come i razzisti americani vedevano i neri... I personaggi di Accattone erano tutti ladri, papponi, e le persone che hanno vissuto fino ad oggi ... eppure erano personaggi molto belli e al di là del moralismo borghese... La ragione è che volevo dire che stava accadendo un genocidio sulle classi inferiori ... che questo genocidio stava cambiando il significato politico della storia collettiva e esistenza personale ... che altri genocidi sono stati testimoniati da Marx ...' (Betti, 1991: 27).

'Nel Vangelo secondo Matteo, come ne La ricotta, c'è una demistificazione dell'iconografia intesa secondo gli schemi della tradizione: Così, nel film, l'iconografia tradizionale è solo un pretesto per costruire qualcosa di antitradizionale' (Betti, 1991: 106).

From: *Le Belle Bandiere* (BB) in 1.1

- (BB: 130): Il neocapitalismo tende ad integrare la classe operaia '(9 November 1961).
- (BB: 192): il neocapitalismo è il nuovo potere ed è il nuovo conformismo della normalità… il trionfo del digest, del rotocalco, di tabloid e gossip, soprattutto della televisione.
- (BB: 30) Il Marxismo non è in grado di cogliere l'irrazionalità delle masse a causa degli strumenti ideologici e di una razionalità positivistica.
- (BB: 164) C'è un errore pratico e teoretico che riguarda l'intellettuale marxista nei confronti delle masse e del sottoproletariato.

From: https://www.cittapasolini.com/post/pasolini-il-mio-sacro-testo-1970-avvenire, in 3.1.1

'La realtà è tutto un segno che posso analizzare semioticamente, un segno che mi dice qualcosa. Per voi cattolici, qui c'è un dio trascendentale che parla attraverso la realtà. In

altre parole, la realtà non è altro che il sistema dei segni di Dio. Per me, che non sono un credente, Devo fare affidamento su una sorta di ontologia. La realtà è una complessità di segni attraverso cui la realtà si esprime. Quindi, la mia visione è sacra e religiosa, ma immanente. Pertanto, se volete armonizzare questa trascendenza con la mia ontologia sacra e immanente, questa componente è tipica in tutti i miei film, da Accattone a Porcile' (*Avvenire,* 1970).

From: http://www.centrostudipierpaolopasolinicasarsa.it, in 4.2.3

'Salò e i 120 giorni di Sodoma presenta il sesso come un'allegoria, la metafora della mercificazione dei corpi da parte del potere. Penso che il consumismo manipoli violentemente i corpi non più o meno del nazismo. Il mio film rappresenta questa terribile coincidenza tra consumismo e nazismo. Beh, Non so se questo sarà compreso dal pubblico perché il film è presentato in modo enigmatico, quasi come una rappresentazione sacra, dove la parola sacra ha anche il senso latino di maledetto' (*Intervista a Stoccolma*, 30th October 1975).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to my supervisors Professor Gary Browning, Dr. Andrea Bardin and Professor Dan Bulley.

They have aided me to best formulate and articulate my approach to Pasolini's political theory, with their experience and knowledge and have discussed the varied topics and complex aims of this thesis both through structured meetings and informal chats and by reading and responding to the drafts of my work. One could not wish for better attention from supervisors. I wish to especially acknowledge my dearest friend Andrea Bardin, always ready to encourage and support my enterprise; and Frances Grant, whose patient and intelligent copyediting has contributed to my expression of English in this thesis.

I would like to thank Olinto Brugnoli, Marco Gazza, Lucia Pavan and Susanna Mezzadri whose sincere friendship pushed me to continue this work.

Finally, I thank my parents, Liliana and Silvano, my brothers Marco and Enrico, and my children, Lorenzo and Federico and Amin.

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, Lia Timillero, to whom I am grateful for sharing her love and her surpassing sensitivity to humankind and life, as well as for her caring and loving attention to my work more than most: thanks are not enough, but I hope that my love may be.