Guy Debord’s Time-Image:

\textit{In girum imus nocte et consimimur igni} (1978)

For time flows on, and if it did not, it would be a bad prospect for those who do not sit at golden tables.

Bertolt Brecht\textsuperscript{1}

All revolutions go down in history, yet history does not fill up; the rivers of revolution return from whence they came, only to flow again.

Guy Debord\textsuperscript{2}

In his \textit{Rhapsody for the Theatre} (1990) Alain Badiou complimented Guy Debord’s final film \textit{In girum imus nocte et consimimur igni} (1978) for revealing a “pure temporal moment [that] speaks to the glory of cinema, [and] which may very well survive us humans.”\textsuperscript{3} It is not much of a speculation to imagine that Guy Debord would have been dismissive of Badiou’s claim. Already, in a letter to Jacques Le Glou (15 November 1982), Debord had expressed particular ire concerning the opinions of Badiou on \textit{In Girum}, describing him as “Maoist carrion”.\textsuperscript{4} Certainly Debord regarded time as central to his work, both individual and collective, in film and in writing.\textsuperscript{5}

Noting, in a text co-written with Gianfranco Sanguinetti at the time of the dissolution of the Situationist International (SI), that “the SI had been, from the beginning, a much vaster and more profound project than a simply political revolutionary movement,”\textsuperscript{6} he argued that the reason for this was its conception of time as “made of qualitative leaps, of irreversible choices, of occasions that will never return.”\textsuperscript{7} But this
conception of time was, precisely, political; not a “pure temporality,” and certainly
not in the service of “the glory of cinema”.

Therefore, my own use of the Deleuzian term “time-image” to describe
Debord’s final work might be treated with equal suspicion. Isn’t it expressive of a
desire to translate a particular political use of time to a more metaphysical and
Bergsonian register? After all, despite Bergson’s own wariness concerning the
cinema, Deleuze would deploy Bergson’s conceptuality in his two books on cinema.8

In Deleuze’s argument post-World War Two cinema, in its modern forms, ruptured
with the organisation of the “movement-image,” in which the image was coordinated
to the schema of bodily movement. This would then allow a passage to the “time-
image,” in which, to use a phrase of Tarkovsky’s that Deleuze recurs to, “the pressure
of time” can be felt directly in the image.9 What Deleuze produces is a typology of the
forms of modern cinema oriented around this crystallization of time and its capture in
particular “time-images” as image or intuitions of the duration of pure time.10 To
assimilate Debord to the “time-image” would also seem again to dissolve his own
singular achievements, and their political edge, into the canon of modern cinema,
placing Debord as another auteur, alongside Welles, Renoir, Rossellini, Antonioni,
etc., and Debord’s particular bête noire Jean-Luc Godard.

To avoid this fate requires a more precise delimitation of exactly what
Debord’s politics of time might be, and how they might find their particular “image”
in In Girum. The fact that Debord was a filmmaker first demands a revision of the
usual false assumption that Debord and the SI incarnated some purist vision of social
transparency and immediacy that tried (and failed) to rupture absolutely with the
realm of the spectacle.11 Debord developed a particular practice of the image, usually
associated with his critical and dialectical reworking of existing images through what
he called détournement, rather than the simplistic desire to break with the image per se.\textsuperscript{12} That said, Debord’s esoteric invocation of time, often reinforced through references to Taoism and Romanticism, might be thought to incarnate just the “rotten egg smell” of “mystical cretinism” that the Situationists had excoriated in the American Beats.\textsuperscript{13} The metaphysics of time as flux and flow might also, as Anselm Jappe has intimated, still mark Debord as an unwilling and unwary inheritor of Bergsonism.\textsuperscript{14}

It is true that Debord’s thinking of time owes a more obvious debt to the Lukács of History and Class Consciousness (1923), who wrote that under capital:

\begin{quote}
    time sheds its qualitative, variable, flowing nature; it freezes into an exactly delimited, quantifiable continuum filled with quantifiable “things” (the reified, mechanically objectified “performance” of the worker, wholly separated from his total human personality), in short, it becomes space.\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

Despite Lukács’s objection to Bergson, for promoting an “irrationalist” philosophy of life,\textsuperscript{16} this has not prevented his work for also being regarded as Bergsonian, precisely because of its identification of spatiality with commodification.\textsuperscript{17} We therefore cannot simply absolve Debord’s time-image from the charge of surreptitious Bergsonianism without a patient consideration of exactly how Debord tries to pose the problem of time in relation to spatiality and abstraction. A dialectical thought must at once sharpen the contradiction between time and space, to avoid a false monism, a solution merely in thought, and sublate or supersede that contradiction so as not to fall into a dualism; we could say this is precisely the dialectical function of détournement. We have, of course, learnt to be suspicious of such dialectical “supersession,” but here I want to assess the political stakes of Debord’s project in exactly these terms,
including the limits of such a project. This is not to suppose a metaphysical immunity of Debord’s work from the kinds of charges that I have listed; my intention is not simply to exculpate Debord, or to celebrate or delineate his, quite obvious, political intentions. Instead, I am concerned with the sharpening of the questions time, life, and the forces of the abstract that Debord’s time-image calls us to.

**Insulting the Audience**

In many respects *In Girum* requires little or no explication. The function of commentary in Debord’s films, which clearly details the politics concerned and engages with the images shown, provides a pedagogy that can render further commentary otiose. Also, the film does not appear as a necessarily complex intervention; it seems to stage the opposition between the dead time of the abstract spectacle and the living, flowing time of the negativity of revolution and revolt in the most obvious and even static fashion. This is most evident in the repeated images of the spectacle rendered in the abstract form of modernist housing blocks, or other instances of “gridded” space, which are contrasted with the tracking shots taken from the water in Venice. This initial seeming simplicity, the tendency Anselm Jappe has remarked on the tendency of Debord to “reduce society to two opposing monolithic blocks, neither of which has any serious internal contradictions, and one of which may be either the proletariat, or simply the Situationists, or even just Debord himself.”

I want to suggest that *In Girum* complicates both this dualism, and the tendency to recompose any simple monism of the flow of time.

The film begins with a lengthy excoriation of the new cinema-going public – the petit-bourgeois serfs of the spectacle, who compose the “class” of minor functionaries and administrators. Over a series of images drawn from advertising that
are intended to convey the joy of the life of consumption but, under the gaze of Debord’s camera and commentary, turn uncanny and malignant, Debord’s commentary anatomizes and critiques the so-called “life” of this class. The articulation of the misery to be found in seeming abundance has a certain mordant humor, tinged with Debord’s own aristocratic critique of the vacuity of spectacular capitalism:

For the first time in history we are seeing highly specialized economic professionals who, outside their work, have to do everything for themselves. They drive their own cars and are beginning to have to personally fill them with gasoline; they do their own shopping and their own so-called cooking; they serve themselves in the supermarkets and in the entities that have replaced railroad dining cars.¹⁹

The film also dissects its own potential recuperation at the hands of these servants of the spectacle, and tries to resist this through the depth of its antagonism.

It appears that these initial images of the “false life” will find their answer in the later images of “true life” of Debord and his confederates in a “quarter [of Paris] where the negative held court.”²⁰ Despite this seemingly obvious opposition, which might, at worst, recall the clichés of “hip” versus “square,” there is already a more subtle differentiation and sharpening of the question of time, life, and the abstract at work. This is condensed in two parallel images which stage the relation of the abstraction of life for the serfs of the spectacle. The first is an image of pseudo-vitality, frozen in the image of false happiness of a family at “play” (Figure One). This image, used repeatedly in the first sequences of In Girum, and returned to in the closure of the “movement” of the film devoted to the petit-bourgeois administrative class, stages the claim that abundance conceals misery. Linked to other images from
advertising displaying happy, and often sexualized, families, Debord’s intervention demonstrates that it is not simply a matter of opposing life and exuberance, sexuality and youth, to the dead time of capitalism. These forms have been recuperated in the image, and their own implicit failure can only be revealed by rendering the image static, revealing its truly abstract image of life, and then playing the camera over the image. In this way the image is extracted from the seamless image-time of capitalism, one image after another in a succession of instances of time, and revealed as the congealing and stagnation of time.

Figure One – the discreet charm of the petit-bourgeoisie

This implicit abstraction at work in the seeming “liveliness” of life is reiterated by the pairing of this image of the family relaxing and playing on the sofa with another image of a vertical downward view of an empty sofa (Figure Two). In this way we can “see” the abstract grid in which this pseudo-life “plays,” which is
now revealed as the constrained grid of a “life” lived in dead time, the cramped space of so-called freedom, the haven in a heartless world of the family that is itself played out as a pseudo-game. The seeming image of life and liveliness is revealed as composed of the empty, dead, and abstract. This is, however, not simply demonstrating the dead abstract space that constrains living actuality into the contortions of bourgeois repression and repressive desublimation, but rather revealing the abstraction that penetrates and shapes the gestures that seem most lively.

Figure Two – the modular field of pseudo-life

We remain, however, at a preliminary level. The composition may still seem to involve the opposition of time and life to the abstract and dead time. In fact, the sharpening of the contradiction does not take place at the level of positing a superior life “captured” by the grid of abstraction. Debord does not, in the style of Bloch or Jameson, argue that these images code a utopian promise encrypted even within the false happiness of the capitalist spectacle. Instead, drawing on other images, Debord
will particularly select the child, that capitalist symbol of reproduction, futurity and hope, as really incarnating a barely-concealed hatred, and a certain violence towards the destitute misery that lies coded within this seeming abundance. In this way abstraction is not broken by another, “better” life, but rather through the sharpening of hatred in the image. This hatred extends to the medium itself. Debord’s commentary remarks: “I am simply stating a few truths over a background of images that are all trivial or false. This film disdains the image-scrap of which it is composed.” There is no consolation in these images, and hence perhaps another reason for the edge of pessimism so-often attached to Debord’s thinking.

**Advancing by the bad side**

After exercising its bitter critique of the petit-bourgeois cinema audience and petit-bourgeois cinematic conventions, *In Girum* transits to become the autobiography of Debord: “I am going to replace the frivolous adventures typically recounted by the cinema with the examination of an important subject: myself.” This begins with Debord exploring at length his own experiences in Paris in the 1950s when he belonged to the avant-garde group of Lettrists and mixed in a bohemian milieu of petty thieves and nihilists. It would seem that the answer to accusation of pessimism dictated by total critique that could be made at the first section of the film is answered by a simple dualism or opposition, itself abstract, between the petit-bourgeoisie and the milieu of the Lettrists and nihilists in the Paris of the 1950s. The transition would then seem to be from false life to real life, from the heterosexual grid of the petit-bourgeois family to the libertine (although still heterosexual) adventures of the elective freedom of the avant-garde.
What we do not have, however, is the movement from the false positivity of petit-bourgeois life to the true positivity of the avant-garde and dissolute existence of Debord and his compatriots. Instead, we must take seriously Debord’s remark about a place in which the negative holds court. Confined precisely within a geometric space, and this section of the film constantly uses vertical downward views of Paris (Figure Three), the Lettrists and petty criminals Debord knew construct their own relation of negativity to this abstract space. In a sense, then, we move from the negativity revealed as the poverty of petit-bourgeois life to an inhabited negativity. Of course, the risk here is the turning of negativity into a pseudo-concrete – into a state which can be simply inhabited and which is, in fact, then abstract. As we will see, Debord tries to displace the potential “authenticity” of such a dwelling in negativity for a relational concept of negativity that operates through a traversal of abstraction.

Figure Three – The “quarters” of the negative
In the classical style of Marx, taken from his critique of Proudhon,\textsuperscript{28} Debord insists that the negativity of the Lettrists, and later the SI, advances by the “bad side”. Whereas Milton, according to Blake, was “of the Devil’s Party without knowing it,” the SI would consciously inhabit this radicalised position of negativity. The reason for this, as Debord’s commentary makes clear, is that it is the “bad side” which corrodes all established codes and mores. In this it is correlated with Debord’s politics of time. The image accompanying the identification with the “bad side” is that of a tracking shot from a boat in a narrow canal in Venice (Figure Four). In this image time qua negativity, as the erosion of all values and forms, is figured in the “passage” of water through the space of the city. Venice is the privileged signifier of the corrosive force of time as negativity for the obvious reason of its own finitude due to the effects of the water on which it depends. It also makes literal the metaphors of navigation and exploration that the Lettrists would deploy in their dérives through Paris, again suggesting a relational effect of negativity. Paris, a city which Debord will argue later in the film is a city that has been destroyed through development, finds its double in the “preserved” and yet vulnerable Venice.
In a brief note written on the film’s themes Debord had identified its primary theme as “water,” contrary to the Promethean ambience of the title and to the film’s détourned images of the devil warming himself before a fire. While fire, Debord argues, instances “momentary brilliance – revolution, Saint-Germain-des-Prés, youth, love, negation in the night, the Devil, battles and “unfulfilled missions” where spellbound “passing travellers meet their doom; and desire within this night of the world (“nocte consumimur igni”)” – much of what is treated in this section of the film – it is in fact water which evidences the true negativity of “the evanescence of everything”.29 Therefore, it is water that announces a more extreme negativity and the transition through the existent negativity of contemporary society. This “evanescence” gives the most extreme formulation of the “advance by the bad side” that comes in the conclusion of the film. Here Debord presents the dissolution of the SI, its radical failure, as the condition of its effective critique of the world. It was the sacrifice of the
SI in its assault, represented by images from *The Charge of the Light Brigade*, which ensured they did not outlive their own time, and displaced their own struggle onto a wider terrain. The sign of an historical project is, precisely, its historicity.

The effectiveness of the SI lies not in its building of itself, and Debord famously expelled nearly all its members after its interventions in May ’68, but in its negativity forcing the exposure of the “air of innocence” that had surrounded spectacular society. The radical antagonism of the SI has forced the managers of society to construct a change that was the opposite of that desired by the SI: “What they have done is a sufficient negative demonstration of the nature of our own project.” Debord disdains the common image of him as arch-conspirator and manipulator for that of someone immersed in this negativity, and engaged in the destruction of illusions. It is now revealed, in a dialectical reversal, that the title of the film, which might be thought to refer to the SI or to the Lettrists, in fact refers to those who attempt to govern the society of the spectacle: “They turn in the night, consumed by fire.” Debord’s claim is that the spending of the SI in combat is an unreturnable *Potlatch*, and one that is dialectically reversed into the destruction of the existing order.

Of course, we might at this point note that we are in the most Bergsonian register. The flux of time, even if conceived of as negativity, appears to extinguish political agency and open to a disabused serenity that gazes over the passing of all things. The very images of Venice give us a sense of the “subterranean” effects of water “under our feet,” giving a rather different edge to the slogan ascribed to the SI: “*Sous les pavés la plage.*” The frenetic activism of the SI now appears to be doubled by an *attentisme* of duration. Even more problematic negativity here is figured as *la politique du pire*, in which the worst, self-destruction, evacuates the negativity of the
social order and so, the presumption goes, offers a new space of intervention and struggle. The difficulty lies, of course, in this actually happening. Again, a self-destructive strategy, the full inhabiting of negativity qua time, seems only to lead to auto-dissolution rather than the promised generalization and dispersal of radical energies into the whole of the social formation. The charges of lack of mediation, abstract negativity, and inattention to strategy and forms of organisation, would seem to vitiate Debord’s project.

Abstract Strategy

The crucial mediating image between “fire” and “water,” and between the abstract static temporality of the spectacle and the “flow” of time, is that of Debord’s *Kriegspiel* (Figure Five). Debord was particularly proud of his invention of this “game of war,” and he repeatedly invokes his strategic intentions and the classical authors of the art of warfare (Sun Tzu, Clausewitz, and Machiavelli) in *In Girum*. Of course, in terms of the abstract, the vertical views of the game, which again recur often in the film, redouble the vertical images we have already referred to – that of the living room, that of Paris, and others. In this way, I would argue, rather than promoting a simple dissolution into the flux of time we see the restaging of the abstract grids of contemporary life (the home, the city) as sites of war. We cannot simply secede from capitalist abstraction to another concrete life of vitality, play, and situations. Instead, any such activity will necessarily be in combat with the abstractions that form and constitute it. This suggests a complex mediation of the abstract through the “gridding” and strategic navigation of space, which the film itself encourages through our own navigation of its “movements”. The film constructs itself
as a series of “moves” in its own game of war, in which see strategic advance and retreat across the various “battlefields” that Debord experienced.

If we consider Debord’s filmmaking in dialectical terms, this means that any dialectical “supersession” cannot simply terminate in the movement towards “water,” or into “negativity” as such, as if we could live in duration unperturbed by history. The historical images on which the film meditates encode the “water” of history as a conflictual space of struggle and antagonism, as a game of war, that must constantly be played. In a way quite faithful to the actuality of Taoist texts, and contra their ideological image as texts of serene acceptance, what we find is a concern with the craft of politics as the experience of conflict and resistance. This means that dialectical “supersession,” or “immersion” in the negative, can only be held within antagonism.

![Figure Five – War of Maneuver](image-url)
The result is that the strategic reflections that Debord embarks on in the film are always concerned to stress the necessity of engagement and conflict on grounds not chosen and without the benefit of some total plan. The essential element of chance, constantly referenced through Debord and the SI’s interest in games (especially so-called games of chance), is the condition of a strategic thinking. Therefore, the reflections engage with historical choices that have their own necessity. For example, Debord argues that the actions of the Lettrists and the SI in Paris risked entrapment in “a static, purely defensive position.” The appropriate image used in the film is of Custer’s Last Stand, and this indicates again, I think, the failure of simply trying to inhabit negativity as a given. The encirclement indicates that this project is not just that of the avant-garde that wishes to burn itself out, to use an appropriate metaphor. Debord opposes to this entrapment the necessity to take to the offensive and make a breakout, although we know this will lead to another image of military defeat in the charge of the light brigade.

In this sense the film appears to offer a dialectic of defeat. Debord’s emphasis on strategy does not imply strategic success, but rather the negotiation of particular conditions and particular times, as he tries to negotiate the “assault” on the world as it is. This appears to be a truly negative dialectics in which, at best, we can merely expose what is, force it to instantiate itself, but not to truly actuate change. I would suggest that what we have here is the tension between a particular historical project, with its own limits and its own successes, and the tendency to try to absolutize such a project into recipe-books for revolution. If we take the second choice then we inscribe a dialectic of defeat. Debord’s own filmmaking strategy, a kind of meta-strategy, tries to resist the reification this project. Despite the appearance of what might be taken as self-congratulation, which may well be present, we can say also that the film mediates
its own failures as the condition for future action. Contrary the usual image, I would say, this means that *In Girum* is certainly not a film of nostalgia.

This is not to say that Debord’s strategy cannot be criticized. His use of classical war theory, and the *Kriegspiel* is based on Clauswitzian premises, opens him to the critique that he has made a fundamental strategic misunderstanding of the nature of conflict in contemporary society. It was Gramsci, another strategic Marxist, who argued that the open “war of maneuver” characterized struggle against dictatorial regimes, while struggle against democratic capitalist societies would be parallel to the trench warfare of the “war of position.” The error of Debord would then be to try to stage a “war of maneuver” that cannot negotiate the complexity of the strategic situation, and this would then be the cause of the defeat of the historical project of the SI. It would be an inattention to the abstractions of capitalist society that dooms us to a “negative dialectics.”

Certainly, we could counter, as McKenzie Wark does, that Gramsci’s conception rests on conceptions of the “modern Prince” – the party-form – and conceptions of hegemonic struggle that themselves have not proved unproblematic, and that Debord belongs to an alternative conception of strategy. This is certainly true, but it may be more worthwhile to offer a closer consideration of the terms in which Debord poses and confronts these strategic problems. I am suggesting that *In Girum* does not simply propose strategy as the means to escape questions of abstraction and the “field” of combat. Rather, if we take the images as our guide, we find a constant attention to the tension of particular forces and contradictions within and between images. To follow this path is to suggest that Debord does not condemn abstraction per se in favour of the flow of time or the heroics of strategic maneuver. It would be an error of ultra-left pessimism to suppose that the “grid” of capitalist
abstraction captures all life and existence inexorably, and that it can only be undone by a withdrawal into the *longue durée* that could contemplate the finitude of capitalism itself as mere “passing away.” Instead, abstraction may be “bad,” but again we can only proceed by the “bad side” – via a necessary transformation or expropriation of the abstract space into the space of strategy, war, and therefore of time.

‘Round and Round’

To watch *In Girum* now is, obviously, to watch it from an historical distance, although not necessarily to transform it into an “historical document.” The temporal dictates of the film indicate the finitude of Debord’s own project, and *In Girum* can be considered as the construction of that memory in the time of its potential disappearance – “writ in water,” to use the epitaph inscribed on Keats’s grave, that Debord misattributes to Shelley. The film also reflects on its own status as an “historical document,” as a record of the “passage” through time, and poses the necessity for us to pass through this particular and singular passage again. The film ends on the subtitle “To be gone through again from the beginning” – and this might alert us to the necessity of our own strategic labour, which it requires. This means that any desire to “historicize” the film has to engage with its own essential mediation of historicity as the condition of its politics of the “time-image.” The result is that, if we are to take the film on its own terms, we cannot treat such historicization as safely confining *In Girum* to history.

Therefore, as I have suggested, *In Girum* is a film that mediates the experience of Debord and the SI in such a way as to resist its reification and repetition. This was exactly the tendency of those elements that Debord expelled from the SI as “pro-Situ”
for taking up a *contemplative* position to the work of the SI itself. Our activity as viewers is conditioned by the demand that we engage with the failure and defeat of this historical project as the condition of our own history and experience. To go “round and round” is not to return to the project, but to engage with the limits of its own attempt to engage with the negativity encrypted in the capitalist spectacle, and within any form of historical action. In particular, this involves an understanding of the necessary process of mediation by and through negativity. What I have sketched here, certainly in academic form (by definition), is the reconstruction of a possible repetition that might pay attention to this terms. That would, of course, include the lessons of such failures as the very element of historical experience.

What we can see here, detached as we now are from the actual fate of Debord and the SI, is a more or less patient working on the image that does not simply posit the spectacle as static and abstract spatial category, or simply plunge into an immediacy of negativity that would transcend it, but tries to negotiate a necessarily fraught supersession through the imbrication of the abstract and the temporal. In this sense although capturing a particular historical sequence we can engage with the process of abstraction through a re-viewing of its historical mediation. Although seemingly merely a “cultural” strategy, I want to suggest a labour of mediation at work through the repetition and “overlapping” of images as they reinscribe each other. In this way, we could say, the risk of the “plunge” into negativity, or better the “charge” into negativity, is deferred by recognising that any “war of maneuver” also operates as a “war of position,” and vice versa. The drive for immediacy does not, then, preclude mediation and strategy that involves the inscription of time as a political activity.
To conclude I want to consider one final image. As I have already noted Debord’s images of water might seem to pose the corrosive flow of time as a given force requiring revelation or unveiling. And yet, we can also read the images in the other direction, as posing the necessary imbrication of this “flow” with abstraction, and in fact this is a condition of reading the true antagonism of negativity. “Supersession” is not the abolition of conflict and difference in some undifferentiated flow or pure transparency, and *In Girum* should not be read as the nostalgic invocation of the impossible search for a pure desire. For this reason I want to suggest that Debord’s “time-image” not be confined to the images taken from the boat travelling along the canals of Venice. We cannot read these images as the “true image” of time, as the inhabiting of historical negativity that gives us a “distance” on historical events. In this kind of image we seem to have the most obvious cliché of the moving image of water, of flux and flow, of a city built on water, of the erosion and disappearance of the city, i.e. the abstract space of capital, into the eternal flow of time, the image of a pure temporality without regard to humans as Badiou puts it. Instead I want to suggest that the true time-image of this film is one which shows the interlocking of water and abstract space, in this image of Paris (Figure Six).
Here, it might well appear that the flux of time is literally canalized by abstract space, and yet this rendering of the ‘flux’ into the abstract image of a ‘V’ turned on its side, interlocked with the bridge, suggests, to me, the inability to abstract abstraction away for an immersion into the flux of time as such. The necessity of a certain antagonism, the necessity for the continuing and perhaps continual working over of images, another form of the “labour of the negative,” becomes visible as an historical project. This, of course, seems to leave us again with the “bad infinite” of perpetual and ever-defeated struggle; we exchange elation for despair, in a trajectory that has often been mapped onto Debord and his works. Perhaps, however, it is these actual defeats that are our inheritance, our own siting as viewers of *In Girum*. In that sense we still turn round and round in the problem Debord has posed to us.
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