

**PROBLEMS IN THEORISING A PRIORI CONDITIONS
OF CINEMATIC-SPECTATORIAL EXPERIENCE IN ASIA**

SANA DAS



DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

JANUARY 2018

PROBLEMS IN THEORISING A PRIORI CONDITIONS OF CINEMATIC-SPECTATORIAL EXPERIENCE IN ASIA

by

SANA DAS

DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Submitted

in fulfilment of the requirements of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
JANUARY 2018

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that this thesis entitled **“Problems in Theorising A priori Conditions in Cinematic Spectatorial Experience in Asia”**, being submitted by **Ms. Sana Das** to the **Indian Institute of Technology Delhi** for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** is a record of bonafide research work carried out by her. She has worked under my guidance and supervision and has fulfilled the requirements, which to my knowledge, have reached the requisite standard for the submission of this thesis. The results contained in this thesis have not been submitted in part or full to any other University or Institute for the award of any degree or diploma.



Date:

Dr. Sanil V.

Place: New Delhi

Professor

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The years of doing film and philosophy together have not been merely arduous but deeply exciting. The research would never have branched out in this area had I not attended a lecture course on Film Philosophy by the supervisor when I was not even a registered student at IIT. Right from the time I joined formally there were challenges he set, be it for a minor course assignment when I worked on the idea of 'obstructions' in the cinematic, and was introduced by him into the world of Bachelard and Hegel's '*Aesthetics*', or the famous Comprehensive Exam that every PhD scholar has to appear for in IIT, to later when I was studying Pasolini's poetics of cinema and began dwelling into the ontology of *chaos* in metaphysics. I remember the strictness with which he forbade me to write anything about *chaos* without reading Nietzsche's views in Heidegger's *The Will to Power as Knowledge and Metaphysics - Vol. III*. I thank him profusely for placing these glittering hurdles that made these beautiful minds a part of my long walk through film philosophy, and without which the joy of research would have been much diminished.

Researching an area where literature was scarce – the field of Japanese thought – I would still have happily ambled along with Heidegger and Nietzsche, Bachelard and Bergson, but it was Dr. Sanil who constantly reminded me to pursue the elusive Japanese thinker Watsuji, till he too became an indelible part of my research and journey to understand 'Asia' and aesthetics.

I am deeply grateful to him, for the patience and guidance he has provided throughout the changing nature of the research. If I leaned too much towards the Asia question in my research he would be there to ensure that cinema and philosophy had not fallen off the table, and would pull Asia into frame when the situation was otherwise. I must mention that no one has defended my right to research this challenging area I chose, that was so full of contestations across domains, as much as he has. His emphasis was always on method and verification, and making one a better thinker, and at this juncture I hope that I have demonstrated, at least in part, the trust he placed in my abilities to research this field.

I am also deeply grateful to Vivek Dhareshwar for the course he taught us on Foucault at the Centre for the Study of Culture and Society. Titled, "Objects, Concepts, Experience", it

changed, for many of us in the class, the way we thought about knowledge and shaped our research questions.

I thank Ashish Rajadhyaksha in no small measure for introducing me to the Japanese film historian, Yoshimoto and his famous essay "*The Difficulty of Being Radical*" that had its hand in ensuring that I made it through the most difficult path.

I would like to thank all the faculty members at my department in IIT and also at CSCS, Bangalore. For my friends and family who patiently waited on the side because there was always writing to be done, my colleagues at work who accommodated my research preoccupations, friends who burnt midnight oil to go through my writings, friends in particular who devised projects for the 'safe custody' of my research so it would not capsize into the black holes of 'system crash', and those who mischievously offered to even write my last chapter as the only way to ensure my freedom, I will always be grateful that I studied with them, that they are my family, and they are my friends.

Sana Das

ABSTRACT

The research is an exposition and inquiry into the ontology of obstructions, epistemological obstacles, and occlusions covering up the field of knowledge about the structures of cinematic-spectatorial experience in Asia and the 'Idea' of Asia as cultural difference. The research question starts at a point where it asks 'What is Asian about Asian Cinema?' 'Why can we not access the structures of spectatorial experience at the level of 'our' experience?'

The research opens up the inquiry at various levels for an understanding of the cinematic and problematization of the idea of Asia and cultural difference in a way that they illuminate each other as objects of inquiry.

At the level of the *a priori*, the research identifies the *a priori* as both an object of study in so far as it sees its performativities in the form of meta-discourses that have acted as epistemological obstacles hindering us from recognising or accessing certain structures of experience that either already were or could also be ours; and at another level, the *a priori* is approached as a resource to discursively open up those problem areas where experience was locked out of disciplinary gaze, either because of error, wrong concepts, or too great an emphasis on concepts, ideas and stability. It was seen as the site to locate the workings of the transcendental, phenomenological and the historical archives and how they change the framework within which cinema experience occurs, to see whether the *a priori* aids in stripping the 'cinematic' of the 'theory laden', thereby furthering aesthetic experience, or whether the 'necessity' principle defining the *a priori* becomes yet another obstruction to experience. The idea of limit and finitude of our experience discovered through the *a priori* and discourses on it, has been significant to answer the research question for both cinema and the idea of Asia and cultural difference.

The *a priori* is also the resource that helped the research to transcend the disciplinary boundaries of cinema studies and the research draws upon aesthetics, philosophy of science to understand the nature of aesthetic judgment and various representation rules by which cinematic experience could be approached other than that of Film Theory bound to the tropes of nation, semiotics and psychoanalysis. It provided the research to explore the connection that cinema holds with the world at an ontological rather than political, industrial or reception theory level. The *a priori* helped to foreground the significance of the experiencing being even as it technically stood outside of experience.

At the level of opening up the 'disciplines', the research is also an analysis of the workings of meta-discourses of the archives of psychoanalysis, post-colonialism, and modernism in film history and cinematic experience in the region, that complicate the place of language, linguistics, form, essence, identity and cultural difference in the project of understanding cinema structure and the structure of 'Asian' experience. Here it drew upon the extra-cinematic fields of aesthetics and philosophy of science to explain the structure of aesthetic judgment and the cinematic beyond the Kantian and Aristotelian frameworks. Various representation rules have been discussed alongside the questioning of rules themselves through philosophy of science, cultural philosophy and cinema practice. Here the research looked critically at the works of Bachelard and Bergson, filmmaking practice of Lars von Trier and Jorgan Leth; it also builds discussion around the 1960s linguistic debate in cinema that privileged *chaos* over the order of concepts and semiotics, drawing upon the views and works of Pasolini, Wollen, Eco, Heidegger and Hou Hsiao Hsien.

The research also opens up an inquiry into what could constitute a 'first order theorisation' that can speak more directly of and to our experience in the region, and in the process, further revises the terms of such definition so as to significantly influence and invigorate the re-aestheticisation of cinema studies. Here, the research looks specifically at discourses on the idea of Asia and aesthetics as a site of sameness and difference vis-à-vis the West. One of the attempts made by the research is to 'bring near' or bring close the discourses on Asia and Asian aesthetics not easily accessible to us within Asian cinema history or discourses on Asian aesthetics. Here the research probed into the early 20th century debates on space and spatiality as structures of Asian experience developed on *Fudosei* or climate-spatiality aesthetics, by Japanese philosopher Watsuji Tetsuro to see how it addresses our distinctiveness as well as our sameness vis-a-vis the West. This comparative work on space as possible *a priori* of Asian aesthetic experience that actually takes us beyond culture and necessity to chance and chaos aided with the robust philosophy of Nietzsche's conception of 'will to power' brings to the field of cinema and film-philosophy research the requirement to understand aesthetics and the cinematic through the force field of *chaos* and *becoming*.

Just as historical *a priori* provide the condition of experience through discourse, similarly, or differently, transcendental *a priori* of time and space were seen to be divided up culturally within discourse to define our pre-disposition and representation regimes along lines of difference. The research looks into these cultural distinctions to evaluate their tenability and implications for the aesthetic and cinematic. It does so in a discursive manner, choosing

films/film practicing styles and film practice driven theories that fall on various sides of culture, unrestricted to Asia, to locate the points at which cinema could be seen and shown in its ontological relations with being's tenuous relation with Aristotle's Law of Contradiction. Here the works of Lars von Trier, Pasolini, Mani Haghighi and Kim Ki Duk and Hou Hsiao Hsien provide the field to demonstrate *chaos* and *chance* as structure of aesthetic/cinematic experience, anywhere.

With this the research is able to provide a critical response to the points of inquiry initiated and the urging of certain film historians in the region to abandon the question of Self-Other in the pursuit of making cinema studies *radical*. The research maybe seen as having carved a path to outline what the 'difficulties' of being 'radical' in the overdetermined site of cinema studies could mean as well how the radicalisation could be undertaken by a modification of objects and questions.

यह शोध एशिया में सिनेमाई-दर्शक अनुभव के संरचनाओं और एशिया की 'आइडिया' के सांस्कृतिक अंतर के रूप में ज्ञान के क्षेत्र को कवर करने वाली रुकावटों, घटनात्मक अवरोधों, और अवसरों के तंत्रिकीकरण में एक प्रदर्शनी और जांच है। शोध प्रश्न उस बिंदु पर शुरू होता है जहां यह पूछता है 'क्या एशियाई सिनेमा के बारे में एशियाई है?' 'हम' हमारे अनुभव के स्तर पर प्रेक्षक अनुभव की संरचनाओं का उपयोग क्यों नहीं कर सकते? '

अनुसंधान ने एशियाई और सांस्कृतिक अंतर के विचार के सिनेमाई और समस्याकरण की समझ के लिए विभिन्न स्तरों पर पूछताछ की है ताकि वे एक दूसरे को जांच के सामान के रूप में उजागर कर सकें।

एक प्राथमिकता के स्तर पर, शोध में एक अध्ययन के ऑब्जेक्ट दोनों के रूप में एक प्राथमिकता को पहचानता है, क्योंकि यह मेटा-प्रवचन के रूप में अपनी क्रियाशीलताओं को देखता है, जिसने हमें तंत्र-संबंधी बाधाओं के रूप में कार्य किया है, जिसमें हमें कुछ संरचनाओं को पहचानने या उनका उपयोग करने में बाधा है। अनुभव है कि या तो पहले से ही थे या ये भी हमारा हो सकता है; और दूसरे स्तर पर, एक प्राथमिकता को उन समस्याओं वाले क्षेत्रों को अनवरत रूप से खोलने के लिए एक संसाधन के रूप में संपर्क किया जाता है जहां अनुभव, अनुशासनात्मक टकटकी से बंद किया गया था, या तो त्रुटि, गलत संकल्पना या अवधारणाओं, विचारों और स्थिरता पर बहुत अधिक जोर देने के कारण। यह ट्रान्सेडेंटल, विस्मयकारी और ऐतिहासिक अभिलेखागार के कामकाज की खोज के लिए साइट के रूप में देखा गया था और यह कि कैसे सिनेमा के अनुभव के भीतर ढांचे को बदलते हैं, यह देखने के लिए कि क्या 'सिद्धांत लादेन' के 'सिनेमाई', जिससे सौंदर्य अनुभव को आगे बढ़ाया जाए या क्या प्राथमिकता को परिभाषित करने के लिए 'आवश्यकता' सिद्धांत अभी तक अनुभव करने के लिए एक और बाधा बन जाता है। हमारे अनुभव की सीमा और परिधि का विचार उस पर एक प्राथमिकता और प्रवचन के माध्यम से खोजा गया, यह दोनों सिनेमा और एशिया और सांस्कृतिक अंतर के विचार के लिए अनुसंधान प्रश्न का उत्तर देने के लिए महत्वपूर्ण है।

एक प्राथमिकता भी संसाधन है जो सिनेमा अध्ययनों की अनुशासनात्मक सीमाओं के पार जाने में अनुसंधान में मदद करता है और शोध सौंदर्यशास्त्र पर ध्यान दिलाता है, जो कि सौंदर्य के फैसले की प्रकृति और विभिन्न प्रतिनिधित्व सिद्धांतों को समझने के लिए विज्ञान के दर्शन को दर्शाता है जिसके द्वारा सिनेमाई अनुभव अन्य से भी संपर्क किया जा सकता है फिल्म थ्योरी के लिए देश की तर्ज, सांकेतिकता और मनोविश्लेषण। इसने उस संबंध को तलाशने के लिए शोध प्रदान किया है जो सिनेमा दुनिया के साथ राजनीतिक, औद्योगिक या रिसेप्शन सिद्धांत स्तर की बजाय एक आंटलौज पर रखती है। एक प्राथमिकता ने अनुभव के महत्व को अग्रभूमि में मदद करने के लिए भी मदद की, क्योंकि यह तकनीकी रूप से अनुभव के बाहर खड़ा था।

'विषयों' को खोलने के स्तर पर, शोध भी मनोविश्लेषण के अभिलेख, उपनिवेशवाद के बाद, और फिल्म के इतिहास में आधुनिकता और क्षेत्र में सिनेमाई अनुभव के मेटा-प्रवचन के कामकाज का एक विश्लेषण है, जो इस जगह को जटिल बनाता है सिनेमा संरचना को समझने की परियोजना में भाषा, भाषा विज्ञान, रूप, सार, पहचान और सांस्कृतिक अंतर और 'एशियाई' अनुभव की संरचना। यहां यह सौंदर्यशास्त्र की संरचना और कांतिन और अरिस्टेलियन फ्रेमवर्क से परे सिनेमाई को समझने के लिए सौंदर्यशास्त्र के अतिरिक्त-सिनेमाई क्षेत्रों और विज्ञान के दर्शन को आकर्षित किया। विज्ञान, सांस्कृतिक दर्शन और सिनेमा प्रैक्टिस के दर्शन के माध्यम से नियमों की पूछताछ के साथ-साथ विभिन्न प्रतिनिधित्व नियमों पर चर्चा की गई है। यहां पर शोध बेलार्ड और बर्गसन के कामों पर गंभीर रूप से देखा गया, लार्स वॉन ट्रॉएर और जोरगन लेथ के फिल्म निर्माण अभ्यास; यह सिनेमा में 1960 की भाषाई बहस के बारे में चर्चा भी करती है, जो कि संकल्पना और संकाय के क्रम पर विशेषाधिकार

प्राप्त अराजकता, Pasolini, Wollen, Eco, Heidegger और Hou Hsiao Hsien के विचारों और कार्यों पर ड्राइंग।

अनुसंधान ने एक जांच की भी शुरुआत की जो 'पहले ऑर्डर थ्योरीजेशन' का गठन कर सकती है जो इस क्षेत्र में और हमारे अनुभव को और अधिक सीधे बोल सकता है, और इस प्रक्रिया में आगे इस तरह की परिभाषा के नियमों को संशोधित करता है ताकि महत्वपूर्ण रूप से प्रभावित हो सके और प्रोत्साहित हो सके सिनेमा अध्ययनों के पुनः सौंदर्यीकरण। यहां, एशिया और सौंदर्यशास्त्र के विचारों पर शोध विशेष रूप से पश्चिम के समरूपता और अंतर के स्थल के रूप में दिखता है। अनुसंधान द्वारा किए गए प्रयासों में से एक 'निकट लाने' या एशिया और एशियाई सौंदर्यशास्त्र पर प्रवचन को करीब लाने के लिए है जो एशियाई सिनेमा इतिहास या एशियाई सौंदर्यशास्त्र पर व्याख्यान के लिए हमारे लिए आसानी से सुलभ नहीं हैं। यहां पर शोध 20 वीं सदी की शुरुआती बहस में अंतरिक्ष और स्थानिकता के रूप में जांच की गई, क्योंकि जापानी अनुभव फूदोसी या जलवायु-स्थानिकता सौंदर्यशास्त्र पर विकसित एशियाई अनुभव के रूप में, जापानी दार्शनिक वत्सजी टेदुसरो द्वारा यह देखने के लिए कि यह हमारी विशिष्टता कैसे बताता है और साथ ही हमारे समानताएं पश्चिम। एशियाई सौंदर्यवादी अनुभव के आधार पर यह संभवतः अंतरिक्ष पर तुलनात्मक काम है जो वास्तव में हमें संस्कृति और जरूरत से परे ले जाता है और नीत्शे की 'शक्ति के लिए इच्छा' की अवधारणा के मजबूत दर्शन से सहायता मिलती है, सिनेमा और फिल्म-दर्शन के क्षेत्र में शोध अराजकता के बल क्षेत्र के माध्यम से सौंदर्यशास्त्र और सिनेमाई समझने की आवश्यकता और बनने के लिए

वैसे ही ऐतिहासिक रूप से एक प्राथमिकता, प्रवचन के माध्यम से अनुभव की स्थिति प्रदान करती है, समान रूप से, या अलग-अलग, समय और स्थान की अतुलनीय प्राथमिकता को हमारे पूर्व-स्वभाव और प्रतिनिधित्व शासन को अंतर के साथ परिभाषित करने के लिए सांस्कृतिक रूप से भाषण में विभाजित किया जाता था। सौंदर्य और सिनेमाई के लिए उनके स्थायित्व और प्रभाव का मूल्यांकन करने के लिए शोध इन सांस्कृतिक भेदों में दिखता है यह ऐसी फिल्मों / फिल्में अभ्यास शैली और फिल्म प्रथा प्रेरित सिद्धांतों की चुनौतियों का चयन करती है जो संस्कृति के विभिन्न पक्षों पर पड़ती हैं, जो एशिया के लिए अप्रतिबंधित हैं, उन बिंदुओं का पता लगाने के लिए जो सिनेमा देखे जा सकते हैं और अपने तात्त्विक संबंधों में दिखाए जा सकते हैं। अरस्तू की विवाद के कानून के साथ संबंध। यहां पर लार्स वॉन ट्रार्, पासोलिनी, मणी हाघी और किम की ड्यूक और होउ सियाओ एचएसआईएन के काम करता है, कहीं भी कलात्मक / सिनेमाई अनुभव की संरचना के रूप में अराजकता और मौका प्रदर्शित करने के लिए क्षेत्र प्रदान करता है।

इसके साथ-साथ यह जांच शुरू की गई जांच के बिंदुओं और क्षेत्र में कुछ फिल्म इतिहासकारों को आग्रह करने में सक्षम है, ताकि सिनेमा के अध्ययन में कट्टरपंथी होने की कोशिश में स्वयं का सवाल छोड़ दिया जा सके। शोध को देखा जा सकता है कि सिनेमा अध्ययन के अति-निर्धारित स्थल में 'कट्टरपंथी' होने की 'कठिनाइयों' का मतलब क्या हो सकता है कि वस्तुओं और सवालों के संशोधन के द्वारा कट्टरता कैसे किया जा सकता है।

CONTENTS

	Page No.
TITLE	i
CERTIFICATE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
CONTENT LIST	ix
SECTION I: INTRODUCING PROBLEMS IN THEORISING A PRIORI CONDITIONS OF CINEMATIC-SPECTATORIAL EXPERIENCE IN ASIA	
CHAPTER - 1: 'PROBLEMS' IN THEORISING CINEMATIC SPECTATORIAL EXPERIENCE IN ASIA	
A. Introduction:	2
A(i) The A Priori	
(Aii) Disciplinary Performativity & Obstacles to Theorising A priori Conditions of Cinematic- Spectatorial Experience	
A(iii) Why an Enquiry into Disciplinary Performativity & the Idea of 'Asia'	
B. Methodological Appliances.....	20
(Bi)The first point of <i>meconnaissance</i>	
B(ii) The second point of <i>meconnaissance</i>	
C. Epistemic Deadlock & Impasse in Film Historiography: The Need for a Meta Question and Re-return to Aesthetics.....	34
C(i) Western debate on historiography	
C(ii) Relevance of the A priori: Aesthetics as Method	
C(ii)a The A Priori and Cinematic Experience	
C(iii) Asia As Method	

C(iv) Treatment of Asia

D. Cinematic & the Spectator: Relationship Between Cinema, the Arts and Aesthetics.....	54
E. Chapter Plan.....	58

CHAPTER 2: THE DIVERSE A PRIORI

A. Introduction	64
A(i) Logical/Formal/Transcendental <i>A priori</i>	
A (ii) The Plural, Phenomenological/ Material/ Objective <i>A priori</i>	
A(iii) Contingent <i>A priori</i>	
A(iv) Archival or Historical <i>A priori</i>	
A. Conclusion	88

CHAPTER 3: THE IDEA OF ASIA AS HISTORICAL A PRIORI: META-DISCOURSES AS EPISTEMOLOGICAL OBSTACLE

A. Introduction: Context of Various Attempts to see ‘Asia’ and Cinema as and through Cultural Difference.....	89
B. Meta-discourses as Epistemological Obstacles.....	93
B(a) The Meta-discourse of Post-Coloniality:	
B(ai) Cosmopolitanism – Invisible <i>A priori</i> or Death of a Structure of Experience	
B(aii) The Death of Intellectual Traditions as Structure of Experience	
B(aiii) Asia as Spirit of Fudo & Space as Ontology of Being	
B (aiv) Cultural Difference of Asia as Relationality and being-between	
B(b) The Meta-discourse of Psychoanalysis	
B(c) Meta-discourse of Modernism & Cultural Difference	
B(ci) Universalism, World History, Genre Problematique & the Epistemological Problem of Cultural Difference	
B(cii) Image as Epistemological Obstacle	
C. Conclusion.....	149

SECTION II: UNCONCEALMENT, OBSTRUCTION & CINEMA POETICS

CHAPTER 4: CRITIQUING THE LINGUISTIC A PRIORI: POETICS AS CINEMA STRUCTURE

A. Introduction	152
B. The Epistemological Obstacle to Cinema Experience: The Linguistic Debate of the 1960s.....	159
C. Irrationality, Distrust of the Concept as Structure of Art and Cinema.....	171
C(i)Heidegger's Originary & Unconcealment & Nietzsche's Chaos C(i)aNietzsche's Chaos	
D. Poetics of <i>Three Times</i>	192
E. Conclusion.....	209

CHAPTER 5: OBSTRUCTION: LIMIT AND FALSE MOVEMENTS OF CINEMA

A. Introduction.....	214
B. Five Obstructions	217
B(i) False movements	
C. A Tale of Two Regimes & the Crisis of the Aesthetic.....	224
D. Limit and Being of Continuity and Discontinuity: Bachelard, Bergson and the Cinematic.....	233
E. Rule following as Limit and Structure of Experience	258
F. Making True.....	272
G. Falseness of Cinema as Poetics of Cinema.....	275
H. End Game.....	284

SECTION III: SECTION III: CLIMATE, CHAOS, CINEMA

CHAPTER 6: SPACE AS A PRIORI STRUCTURE AND LIMIT OF AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE: WHITHER CULTURAL DIFFERENCE?

A. Introduction: Search for a First-Order Theorisation on Asian Structures of Aesthetic Experience	288
A(i) The Staging of Oppositions.....	290
B: Space as Constitutive of Being and Experience	301
B(a) Primary & Environmental Spatiality	
B(ai) Aroundness and Concern: Heidegger	
B(aii). Climatic Structure and Spatial Existence: Watsuji	
B(aii)a. Climate-Existence as Limit and Opening	
B(aii)b. Climate as Limit	
B(aii)c. Ex-sistere as Climate-Limit of Existence & Intentionality as Structure of the Self	
B(aii)d. Purpose Relation of Climate-Existence	
B(aii)e. Climate-feeling Structure as Climatic Limit and Opening: The Imposed & The Free	
B(aii)f. Permanence as Need to Schematize	
B(aii)g. Resignationism to Climate as Transcendental Limit	
C. Climate-Limit as Opening: Climate Receptivity, Chance/Chaos and Art.....	330
C(a). Climate, Chance & Chaos and their Significance for Art headlong	
D. The Spatiality of Relationality and Authenticity.....	340
D(a) Being-with, Dasein as Co-Dasein, <i>Das Man</i> , Public and Care: Heidegger	
D(b) Watsuji's Betweenness & Ethics	
D(bi) Ningen as Aidagara	
D(bii) Double Structure of Ningen	
D(biii) Being as beyond-itself	

E. Interrogating the Law of Contradiction: Chaos as Structure of Experience.....	359
F. How does Watsuji challenge the Law of Contradiction.....	364
G. Spatiality of Becoming: Whither Cultural Difference?	369

CHAPTER 7: WORKINGS OF CHAOS IN CINEMA: 'BECOMING' IN THE FILMS OF MANI HAGHIGHI AND KIM KI DUK

A. Introduction.....	375
B. Why Do we Build Limits as Reason: Wittgenstein's Hinge Proposition: Chaos vs Closure.....	380
C. Two Films.....	383
C(a)Modest Reception by Mani Haghighi	
C(b)Time by Kim Ki Duk	
D. Conclusion: From Stability to Chaos:	411

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS AND CLAIMS ON A PRIORI, CULTURAL DIFFERENCE AND THE CINEMATIC

A. Conclusions and Claims	420
A(a)Conclusions regarding the A Priori, Question of Necessity and the Cinematic	
A(b) Conclusions regarding Cultural Difference	

BIBLIOGRAPHY	439
--------------------	-----

BIO DATA	451
----------------	-----