

SUMMARY (translation of *Förtext* meaning "Pretext")

*Örat nära munnen: samtal mellan film och filosofi*

(Ear close to mouth: conversations between film and philosophy)

Marius Dybwad Brandrud

Performative and Media Based Practices with specialization in Film and Media

Stockholm University of the Arts

2024

### *Questions and proposal*

*Örat nära munnen* (Ear close to mouth) stems from two areas of interest. One is about film, the other about philosophy. In both cases, the main focus is conversation. As a filmmaker, I want to help create filmic conversations. As a philosophy student, I want conversation to play a larger part in philosophy education. These two interests lay the foundation for the film *Samtal om samtal* (Conversations on conversation) and lead on to the main research question: How can filmic conversations be used as philosophical expression?

The overall interest in conversation is about possibilities for doing things together. While I work as a film maker in various constellations, this study is focused on my own productions. My film practice belongs to an auteur tradition, in that I produce, film and edit my works myself. Most importantly, I am the initiator and the manager of the project. In that sense, *Örat nära munnen* does not come from the search for more collective forms of filmmaking, but rather from an exploration of how the process in filmmaking, even in a practice like mine, is always relational. Perhaps this kind of study – in and through a practice where the positions in front of and behind the camera are made clear – can help shed a light on how asymmetrical relationships can shape also more explicitly collective processes. *Örat nära munnen* wants to contribute to this discussion by exploring issues of representation and responsibility: What signifies the practice of making a film about or with someone? How are those involved in a film project affected, and how can the film act (in the world) independently? How could responsibility be understood in the process of making a film and in the final result?

Philosophy, and more specifically a philosophical learning situation with others, could also take the form of collective doing. However, this project is based on experiences of doing less collective than they could have been. Those experiences are the source of my interest in the role of conversation in philosophy. *Samtal om samtal* begins by addressing the manner of which we speak to one another in a seminar; and by extension how that manner decides which philosophy is at all made possible: Who is speaking and who is listening? Whose experiences count and whose ideas are welcome? What is being said and what is being heard, and how can responsibility be understood in relation to that? Yet, conversation is not only of interest as practice but also as expression. Sometimes something is said through/as conversation that could not have been expressed in any other form. What would happen if conversation, as a communal way of saying things, would constitute a form of philosophical expression in its own right, on par with the individually written text? What form would such an expression be allowed to take? Could philosophy be expressed through the medium of film?

*Samtal om samtal* is an attempt to create a filmic conversation that could be understood as a philosophical expression. Here, the focus is on the expression itself, rather than on the practice. With conversation as practice (conversation as doing) forming the foundation, the materialization (film as a medium) is what is being suggested as philosophical expression (on par with a written text, for example). In order to conceptualize this shift from practice to expression, it is suggested that the filmic (and potentially the philosophical) expression is understood as the literal meaning of the Swedish word for conversation *samtal* as "sam-tal",

which is “co-speech” as “one speech coming from more than one”. How that speech is created, and how it is defined and separated, is a question of responsibility.

### *Aim and meaning*

The attempt to bring forth filmic conversation as philosophical expression is aimed for the field of film as well as the field of philosophy. This is about studying and developing a filmic form of conversation, as well as a desire to, through that practice, do philosophy with film. Thus the ambition is to develop something in film as well as in philosophy. On an institutional level, however, the philosophical ambition is more utopic than the filmic one, and therefore to a larger extent to regard as speculation. At this point in time, the infrastructure that would make it possible to create film as philosophy is not that available, at least not in the academic philosophy context that this project relates to. Even so, *Örat nära munnen* is and remains a study in and through filmic expression. This is the reason for the work being a dissertation in artistic research rather than one in philosophy. Thereby, it is also aimed towards the field of artistic research, in hope of being able to contribute to strengthening the field as an academic discipline in its own right. This could also be seen as a way of reinforcing artistic expression as its own kind of thinking, without having to strive towards the legitimacy granted by a philosophy institution. Meanwhile, *Örat nära munnen* is not about isolating disciplines, but rather about how they could evolve through connecting. In that sense, artistic research could also be a place for conversations between film and philosophy.

When it comes to the relationship to philosophy, the focus on film and conversation does not stand in opposition to the written word either. I view filmic conversation as complement to text, and firstly as a different media of expression. The project is guided by an idea of film and text as different forms of media, which by right of their (media) specific expressions never express the exact same thing. Philosophy, on the other hand, is understood as not being bound to any specific medium (even if it, historically, has been defined by the written word). This means that both film and text, as well as other forms of media, are potentially equal in their ability to do or express philosophy.

In terms of filmic practice, the aim of the study is to investigate how the creation of filmic conversations is undertaken. It is not about capturing or recreating conversations that are already being had, but rather about how conversations created on film would not take place otherwise. The question is then how ethics can be considered in relation to this kind of process and expression. The project wants to pose questions on responsibility and representation, through trying to listen to the actual bodies included (and not included) in the filmic conversation, as well as to what the filmic conversation could express in its own right. Such listening is, on the one hand, about a recognition of an ethical impossibility, and, on the other hand, about making it your aesthetic task to, in spite of this impossibility, try to find a way forward.

### *Method and material*

*Samtal om samtal* is the mainstay of *Örat nära munnen*. The research questions originate in the concrete filmmaking. This process has also resulted in the films *Rehearsals* and *Ett jag som säger vi* (An I who says we). *Rehearsals* was made at the very beginning of this study, while *Ett jag som säger vi* has developed over the course of the whole project. While these films constitute independent works, they are presented as appendices to this dissertation, primarily functioning as sub studies in the process of making *Samtal om samtal*.

*Örat nära munnen* is driven by an urge to do research in and through film and trusting the ability of film to express the research results by its own means. This is also connected to the aspiration to express philosophy through film. This, however, does not rule out other modes of expression, such as text. In my filmmaking, I read and write as much as I work with images

and sound, if not more. In *Örat nära munnen*, I have also been writing “after” the the filmic work. To begin with, the text that you are reading right now offers a framework and introduction to the research project as a whole. The main text part of the work, however, is *Eftertext* (End credits). The text refers back to the filmic at the same time as it continues the exploration, from the same questions but through a different medium (text). *Eftertext* is a way for me to achieve things that the film cannot, in the same way as the film is doing things that the text cannot do. While the films and the text are presented separately, I hope that they will also convey something together, perhaps in conversation, something that could not be said by one of the parts independently. In addition, the document *Transkription* (Transcription) occupies a space between text and film. *Transkription* is not presented as an independent work, but as a key part of the process both of *Samtal om samtal* and *Eftertext*.

The design of *Örat nära munnen* calls for watching the film *Samtal om samtal* after reading this text *Förtext* (here called “Summary” but meaning more exactly “Pretext”), and reading *Eftertext* after the film. Since *Eftertext*, in its turn, refers to *Ett jag som säger vi*, *Rehearsals* and *Transkription*, the idea is that these parts are considered as they are pointed to in *Eftertext*.

Below, I will give a brief overview of the manner of which these different parts have been created within the research project. While this kind of description, from a media specific perspective, are always doing something else, I want to leave space for the presented expressions to talk for themselves (and to each other), without adding another layer of analysis here. The aim is rather to give a background to and an overview of how the queries of the research project have evolved in and in between the different parts being presented.

#### *Samtal om samtal* (Conversations on conversation)

The process of *Samtal om samtal* begins with two of my philosophy course mates, Maria Välvainio and Kajsa Eriksson, starting a conversation group (called “*Samtal om samtal*”). They want to create a space for talking about learning and knowledge, using the conversation culture in the philosophy seminar as a starting point. I ask them if I can film something in relation to that. They say yes, and we start filming their own conversations before and after the group conversations. The group is discontinued after one semester, but the practice of conversation created by the filming continues. Before long, the question about the current nature of the conversations arises. What kind of thinking or doing is happening in our filmic practice, and can it be put in relation to philosophy? Could it even be a different way of doing philosophy? Something we do together, in a manner not achieved in our individual writing?

After a year of filming, we set a week aside to look through all the material. I continue filming and the filmic conversations grow in number. After another five years of filming we realize the need to put the camera away to progress further. We read texts, review the material that I have started editing, and start writing up our ideas of what our project is all about. Could we create a course where we use the film as material? What if it would be an introductory course in philosophy? Or something like *Examen Philosophicum* in Norway, which is a mandatory introductory course for every program student in the university? At this point in time, we do not dare to stretch our imagination that far. Instead, we invite a group of philosophy students to get some feedback. The invitation comes with a hope of continuing the conversations with others.

When the group starts watching the film, it consists of 17 episodes. The setup is based on the group meeting up once a week to watch an episode and then follow it up with a conversation. This develops into a philosophy seminar of sorts, with the film as study material. I film this, too. Maria and Kajsa do not participate but watch the filmed material afterwards. The group watches it too. Finally, we all meet to formulate some of the questions of conversation and philosophy that arise from the filmed material. We filter them down to a number of queries for a future study group to keep working with, for example: What is

philosophy? What are the conditions determining a philosophical conversation today? How do we value conversation as philosophical practice? How do we value a more collectively practiced philosophy? How do you imagine a functioning collective learning process? Can conversation be a philosophical expression, and in that case, how?

By staging a philosophical seminar on filmic conversations, the question of how filmic conversations could form philosophical expression is activated. The edit lets the viewer follow the group through the seminar and see the episodes with Maria and Kajsa at the same time as the group. (When the group starts to watch an episode, the film cuts to that same episode). In this way, the group conversations evolve parallelly with the conversations between Maria and Kajsa. Through this editing a filmic conversation transpires, not only moving between the characters of the film, but between conversations being had on different timelines. In addition, multiple levels of reviews create further layers of filmic conversations, forming over time.

In this manner parallel timelines and multiple reviews make space for self-reflection, not only in relation to the film but also to us, the participants. This makes it possible to address some of the issues of responsibility and representation surfacing in and through *Samtal om samtal*. Three specific events highlight the ethical issues. The first one is when I keep recording the sound when a participant asks me to stop filming. The second one is a situation in which a participant is isolated from the conversation and not being listened to. The third event takes place after the filming, towards the end of the editing phase, when one of the participants asks to be cut out of the film. These events educate me as filmmaker, and challenge me to stay with the unsolvable ethical situations, at the same time as continuing to look for responsible ways out of them.

### *Rehearsals*

The film *Rehearsals* is part of a larger project, *Rehearsals: Eight acts on the politics of listening*, that was initiated and run by Sofia Wiberg (researcher in urban studies) and Petra Bauer (artist) at Tensta Konsthall in Stockholm. They brought about 30 people, including me, together to partake in a workshop in eight acts about various forms of listening, over the course of a year. After being asked to make a short film (for the Swedish Film Institute and Swedish Television) I asked if we could make a film based on this project.

Many aspects of *Rehearsals* are relevant to *Örat nära munnen*, in particular as the film is a result of an explicitly and concretely collective process. The reason for submitting it as an appendix is that, in relation to the dissertation in general and to *Samtal om samtal* in particular, its main importance has been in supporting the idea of conversation as filmic expression. The film is made in one take – in the room where most of the acts of the workshop took place – while the sound consists of a more fragmented edit from interviews with all of the participants on how they experienced these acts of listening. In its 13 minutes, the film allows a different expression of filmic conversation than *Samtal om samtal*, which takes place over the course of several hours. Also, more voices participate, and only recorded with sound. These are contributing factors to the creation of a filmic conversation that can appear as more tangibly constructed and abstracted than the conversations in *Samtal om samtal*. *Rehearsals* is shaped from an array of different conversations, had in many different rooms, and following many different timelines. The film process illustrates how also *Samtal om samtal* is about the construction of a new filmic conversation rather than the reconstruction of a conversation already being had. This has inspired the editing of *Samtal om samtal* and helped develop the idea of the filmic conversation as speech from more than one, i.e. a filmic co-speech (the literal translation of the Swedish *sam-tal*).

Through its construction of filmic conversations, *Rehearsals* poses questions about listening and responsibility in a manner also important to *Samtal om samtal*. These are issues of who

listens to whom and why, and of how positions and relationships are in constant transformation and under continued negotiation. Even if these questions stem from experiences that predate the film, they helped shed light on how similar questions were present and ongoing in the concrete filmic work with *Samtal om samtal*. With the uninterrupted take in *Rehearsals* moving in a circular way around its own axis, and with the edit organizing fragments from the multitude of voices along a single timeline, a question about the center from which the form originates arises. This question has also been important for the idea of the filmic conversation as *one* speech coming from more than one, and of what kind of responsibility that could entail.

#### *Ett jag som säger vi* (An I who says we)

In *Ett jag som säger vi*, I am the producer, just as in *Samtal om samtal*. I also film speaking faces in a similar way. The faces speak to each other but also to the camera and to me. This is an opportunity for me to try out a hands-on way to talk alongside the camera, a method I develop further in *Samtal om samtal* (where I initially do not talk as much). This is because I, to a large extent, only film with one person, philosopher Jean-Luc Nancy, but also because I thereby have the opportunity to film with a larger group of philosophy students, who I do not know from before like I know Maria and Kajsa.

Thus, *Ett jag som säger vi* is closer to *Samtal om samtal* than *Rehearsals*, in that the philosophy focus is more tangible. Philosophical questions are more explicitly discussed, concerning topics such as subjectivity, listening, materiality and meaning. Also, the location is the academic institution for philosophy. Along with the philosophy students, and Nancy, I also get the opportunity to film in a seminar situation, which can be seen as a sort of test for the filming with the group in *Samtal om samtal*. A number of important questions surrounding the function of conversation in the seminar, and the significance of conversation for philosophy in a broader sense, are also articulated here.

In addition, *Ett jag som säger vi* has a more biographical and personal aspect. Nancy is an incarnation of a lot of the French continental philosophy tradition and authority I have spent so much time reading (and which is central to *Samtal om samtal* as well). Nancy is perhaps the one I have read the most (except for Emmanuel Levinas). The meeting with him is to me a showdown as well as a recognition. Starting to film with him, I want to settle with the fact that he is not at all as good as listening, and even less so at conversation, as his texts suggests. However, in time, he educates me in how listening always is a speaking, as well. Furthermore, he teaches me about how responsibility is about trying to hear what is being said. When Nancy, shortly after the last time we film together, dies, I film birds for the first time.

#### *Eftertext*

*Eftertext* is written like a letter to the participants in *Samtal om samtal*. It is also a sort of dedication to all the conversations being had and created throughout the project and all that they have learned and taught. At its core, the text is an attempt to take responsibility for *Samtal om samtal*. Accepting this responsibility means trying to develop a deeper understanding of how the film came into being, what part I play in that process, and what the final film is and does. These questions are addressed already in and through the film itself, but writing about them is an attempt to see the film from the outside and try to understand more of its questions by other means.

To be able to look back on the film, the writing needs to look forward. Writing to understand the questions about responsibility both posed and studied by the film turns into a continued study of the same questions, but through a different medium. I feel like I want write what seems to be on the tip of the tongue of *Samtal om samtal*. In order to do this, I turn first and foremost to philosophy.

I want to continue the idea of filmic conversation (as *sam-tal*, “co-speech”) as philosophy, and how it is connected to responsibility, by writing, and reading, philosophy. In that sense, *Örat nära munnen* does not stand in opposition to the individually written philosophical text, despite it being study in and through filmic conversations (as social practice as well as some kind of collective expression). Rather than one or the other, I would like to try both. The proposition of filmic conversations as philosophy does not immediately stem from the filmmaking but stands on the shoulders of a tradition of individually written philosophy. Writing with the film as a starting point, with the support of other written philosophy, is placing the film in conversation with something outside of it, still somehow always within its perimeters.

For these reasons, letting the writing run its own course has been important. The text uses the questions of the film as a starting point, but needs to approach them in its own manner. Thus, *Eftertext* consists of several longer parts of a more concentrated philosophical text. While these parts stem from the filmic, and largely want to develop it, I still want to let them operate in their own right, all the time being mindful of not directly translating them to or applying them onto the filmic. Rather, I aspire to lay out film and text next to each other in an attempt to listen to potential conversations between them. This is why I, eventually, connect the more philosophical explorations to the concrete filmic work in order to situate the research project in a discussion about film as philosophy. In this final part of *Eftertext* I collect the recurring themes of the text, about how filmic conversation is created as responsibility, and how it can be a starting point for philosophical expression. In this sense a kind of conclusion of *Örat nära munnen* is articulated in written form (at the same time as a kind of conclusion is expressed in the final episode of *Samtal om samtal*.)

To reach this point, *Eftertext* turns to names making philosophy with film and/or text; Raymonde Carasco, Anne Carson, Jean-Luc Godard, Harun Farocki, Trinh T. Minh-ha, Gilles Deleuze, Judith Butler, Adriana Cavarero, Chantal Akerman, Adriana Monti, Rosalyn Diprose, Elisabeth Hjorth, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Jakob A. Nilsson among others. While *Eftertext* largely relates to *Samtal om samtal*, in places the text refers to *Ett jag som säger vi* and *Rehearsals* as well. However, these reference points are mainly to explain aspects of the work with *Samtal om samtal*.

To give a short summary of *Eftertext*; the text is trying to understand conversation as a relationship of responsibility between listening and speaking. The aim is to, using this understanding as a foundation, respond to the filmic conversations put forward by *Örat nära munnen*. The philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas is a foundation, even if *Eftertext* does not use his texts primarily. Instead, it explores how Judith Butler, Adriana Cavarero and Rosalyn Diprose, each in their own manner, politicize Levinas’ ideas through pointing out how each piece of speaking, listening and thinking is already physically, socially and politically conditioned.

Butler poses the question of what it means to take responsibility for one’s actions, in terms of trying to giving an account of yourself. The text recounts how Butler, in her early readings of Hegel, proposes that we, in each act of giving account of ourselves, are taken outside of ourselves, always starting from conditions and premises we have no overview of. In her interpretation of Levinas, responsibility is not something we can “take”, but rather something that is always there, in that we are constituted as responsibility, as a response to the other. This means we are fundamentally dependent on others in ways we cannot control. However, Butler proposes, this deep relationality is also what connects us. The ethical is about admitting our shared inability to fully give account of ourselves. The responsibility consists of trying to acknowledge what we do not recognize and to recognize what we do not want to acknowledge. This says something about the experience of being in a conversation, where

what we do not recognize or want to acknowledge sometimes is excluded, a situation occurring in *Samtal om samtal*.

The text discusses Butler's ideas on the basis on a model of representation determined by identity and recognition. It also connects this with the question of what it is to depict someone. For a more critical perspective on representation, *Eftertext* turns to Gilles Deleuze. The text looks into how Deleuze imagines a thinking beyond the human, and how images could be understood as thinking agents in their own right; images distinguishing themselves from everything else (as difference) rather than images based on likeness (as identity). Here, the question is how this kind of understanding of thinking and images affects the issue of responsibility, which in its turn is connected to the events in *Transkription* (which constitutes a phase of the *Samtal om samtal* process – see below). The tension between Butler's social ethics and Deleuze's philosophy of difference characterizes *Eftertext* to a large extent. It is recalled in experiences of how responsibility, in the concrete film practice, can be about who does (not) ends up in the filmic expression as well as what that expression could do (or think) independently, as film.

*Eftertext* then turns to Rosalyn Diprose, with her movement between Butler, Levinas and Deleuze. Diprose answers her own question about what (feminist) philosophy is by politicizing Deleuze. She brings up his ideas of philosophy being about creating new concepts, but adds how this can never occur outside of social relationships. Using Levinas, she states how it is always the other making herself think. This helps develop this project's idea about conversation being created *as* responsibility.

From this foundation, *Eftertext* approaches some of the situations in *Samtal om samtal* bringing the ethical matters to their heads. This is especially the case when it comes to the event of me continuing to record the sound, after being asked to turn off the camera. Using Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, the text reflects upon that situation as an ethical impossibility, rather than an ethical dilemma. Without it being explicit in the text, this part could be read towards the background of the current discussion (in Sweden) on ethical review in artistic research. Without dodging the question of responsibility, the aim here is to look for a more complex understanding of the ethical aspect of the discussion, in terms of the artistic research practice as well as on a more philosophical level.

In conjunction with this, *Eftertext* is also attempting to listen to Elisabeth Hjorth's call to follow up the ethical event with an ethical and political task. This call reminds us of the undertaking of *Samtal om samtal*; an aspiration to widen the individualistic, academic classrooms of philosophy by making space for more collective conversations, and of how filmic conversations, if they want to be part of this widening, need to take their responsibility in trying to understand their own becoming.

This reasoning leads us on to Adriana Cavarero's philosophy on voice. To secure the position of the writing, solitary and male philosopher much of the history of philosophy has, according to Cavarero, been dedicated to silence the voice since it is connected to the "female", understood as the corporeal and relational. But, says Cavarero (as well as Diprose and Butler), nobody says or thinks anything independently from their own and others' corporeality. Each voice, to Cavarero, is unique as body, but it also already speaks in communion with other voices. The voice spontaneously communicates its specific nature and thus it awakens a response in others. For Cavarero, speech comes before listening, but only in the sense that the voice says what it says in relation to others. Each voice lets a relational plurality of unique voices resonate. Each speech is a conversation, a "co-speech" (*sam-tal*), a speech coming from more than one voice.

Finally, *Eftertext* tries to bring all of the ideas mentioned above into a discussion about film as philosophy as it is first and foremost developed within the academic field of film studies. After an introduction to that discussion the text approaches Jakob A. Nilsson's idea of

*cinecept*. With this concept, Nilssons wants to suggest how film can do philosophy (in Deleuze's strict definition of philosophy, i.e. as creating concepts). Nilsson's point is that film – understood as medium rather than as institutional discipline – has potential to create its own filmic concepts – *cinecepts* – in a way that is no less sophisticated than when written philosophy creates concepts by the means of text. The point is that philosophy is understood as medially independent and therefore that film can express it as well as text. *Eftertext* explores the idea of filmic conversations as *cinecepts*, for instance by having a closer look at the editing of *Samtal om samtal*. By adding the social, political and ethical aspects of the philosophical action that have been highlighted by Butler, Diprose, Spivak, Hjorth and Cavarero, the text – along with the filmic works presented in *Örat nära munnen* – suggests how filmic conversations could be understood as philosophical expressions.

### *Transkription* (Transcription)

The document *Transkription* is a part of the process of working with *Samtal om samtal*, not visible in the film but referred to and more closely described in *Eftertext*. It was created after the recording; during the editing when one of the participants wanted to be cut out. When I edit, I often work with transcriptions of the filmed material. When I started crossing out the parts that would not be included, I also had to cross out what the crossed-out words were in conversation with, until finally everything was crossed out.

*Transkription* is a constellation of a poem by Anne Carson, followed by the crossed-out transcriptions. In *Eftertext*, I write about how Carson's words do something to the crossed-out transcriptions. Scrolling through the document on the computer, it looks like sound levels in motion. Something keeps on sounding. The crossed-out words are animated into moving images and become film again. It becomes a way to stay with an ethical impossibility but also a search for another conversation that responds to that impossibility. *Transkription* gives a glimpse of a double experience of making an image, that on the one hand is about making an image of somebody, but on the other hand about being put in front of an image acting in its own.

### *Participants*

*Örat nära munnen* is an individual PhD project in the sense that I am doing it as an individual PhD student (with employment and monthly salary). But the project is also carried by the efforts of its participants, in particular in *Samtal om samtal* which is the heart of the project. This is especially the case with Maria Välivainio's and Kajsa Eriksson's initiative to create the conversation group about conversations, and their continued work throughout the film, but also how this work is maintained and further developed by the seminar group, consisting of Linnea Johnels, Klara Lord, Sophie Bäärnhjelm Pousette, Arild Säll, My Valkama, Anonymous, Julia Videgård and Hedvig Fischer. The participants are paid (from the project funding I have as a PhD student, and from own funds) not only to compensate the time they put into the project but also to recognize their roles as collaborators in these parts. Still, I credit them as "participants" here and in the end credits of the film, to clarify their position in front of the camera. I also spell out my role as producer, film photographer and editor (even if I, at times, participate as character in sound and video). This is about making a clear distinction between who is behind and who is in front of the camera. Again, I would like to stress that this is the situation I want to study in the project, rather than letting it try out more directly collective filmic forms. The reason for this is that the idea of *Samtal om samtal* as film project is initiated by me, and that I want to explore that kind of initiative. That, to me, becomes the most honest way of understanding what it is to film with others like I do, and how filmic conversations are created in that process. My hope, however, is that a study of such a practice can also be of value to other filmic processes, by revealing more explicitly



asymmetrical relationships. At the same time, *Örat nära munnen* does not think of those kinds of relationships as completely unavoidable, or necessarily undesirable. Rather, it is trying to explore how these relationships come about and how they are the subjects of constant negotiation. In that sense, this research project is a result of a common effort, in that the participants as collaborators also agree to consider their own participation in the filmic practice of *Samtal om samtal*.

The participants contribute to the filmic as well as the philosophical aspects of the project, and also to how these aspects approach each other. The participants share their experience and knowledge of conversation and listening to then enact and conceptualize them in different ways in the film. Through their performances, and their reflections during the reviews, they articulate what it is like to be in front of the camera and how it can both enable and hinder a thinking through filmic conversations. These tangible efforts are pivotal for the manner in which the project questions about representation and responsibility, as well as the idea of filmic conversation (“co-speech”) as philosophical expression, take shape.

This is true for *Rehearsals* and *Ett jag som säger vi* as well, but in a more indirect and limited sense, in that these films are submitted as steps in the *Samtal om samtal* process. *Rehearsals* has a collective sender, but I still want to emphasize the importance of Sofia Wiberg and Petra Bauer, as they have been as active in the film work as I have (in addition to initiating and running the larger project predating the film and my own PhD studies). I would also like to mention how much of a privilege it was to interview the participants about their widely varying experiences of listening. While only a fraction of those interviews made it into *Rehearsals*, they stayed with me as lessons on how hard it can be to listen even when you really want to. One example making it obvious was me listening to the interviews, hearing how little I was actually hearing.

The work with *Ett jag som säger vi*, as opposed to the *Rehearsals* process, has been going on throughout my studies, with Jean-Luc Nancy as a main inspiration, albeit on a more personal level. Nancy was a sort of caricature or antitype of a mentor, making me think back on how I arrived at (and left) philosophy. But in time this idea also changed, and reminded me of how I always seem to be on my way back to philosophy (but with a camera). This shift is expressed in *Ett jag som säger vi*, through questions of conversations, listening and thinking, which gained meaning in the *Samtal om samtal* process. In the seminar scene the other participants formulate more concise and concrete questions as well: What kind of conversation do we wish to have in the seminar room? How can we stage a conversation? Valuable ideas were also shared after the filming by the participants in *Ett jag som säger vi*: Edwin Gold, Aron Bodelson, Eoghan Shortall, Simon Hedelin, Max Frieberg, Sophie Bäärnhielm Pousette, Jonatan Löwstedt, Theodor Zetterberg and Brigita Gelžinytė.

#### *Other artistic research*

As a filmmaker, I have more often than not turned to philosophy for inspiration. Perhaps because that field is where I started out, which means I initially moved from philosophy to film. But in that movement filmmakers led the way, albeit these were filmmakers who more or less directly approach philosophy in various ways. In *Örat nära munnen*, Raymonde Carasco, Jean-Luc Godard, Adriana Monti and Chantal Akerman have been particularly important. Their significance for the project is further explained in *Eftertext*. Other important names for shaping the work, without me going into detail about them in the text, are Anne-Marie Miéville/Jean-Luc Godard, Peter Watkins, Laura Mulvey/Peter Wollen, Eric M. Nilsson, Gunvor Nelson, Alexander Kluge, Harun Farocki, Trinh T. Minh-ha, Thomas Hirschhorn and Hito Steyerl. These film makers are also forerunners in much of the artistic research in film today. In terms of more institutionally defined artistic research the following researchers have guided my work: Magnus Bårtås, Elke Marhöfer, Lisa Tan, Petra Bauer,

Pekka Kantonen and Eva la Cour. Regarding my research question of film as philosophy, Eleanor Bauer's dissertation *choreo | graphy*, as well as Patrik Eriksson's dissertation *Melankoliska fragment: om essäfilm och tänkande* (Melancholy Fragments: On Essay Film and Thinking), have made valuable contributions, which are discussed more closely in *Eftertext*.