

DILEMMA OF BECOMING

Kira Carpelan

Geist no. 11, 12, 14, 2007-2008

There are things common to the scientific and the artistic. The first can appear similar to the other. The second might wish it were the first. We may think in analogous ways, work similarly, try to break down conventions to find something heretofore unnoticed. We share being unable to explain why. We perhaps share stubbornness. We share the balancing between the well-poised and the subversive. We share a concept of development in a direction not yet discovered. The direction may not even exist. Maybe it is the sixteenth dimension, or transparency. We share the wish to reevaluate forms, relations and conditions. But there are conflicts. What does the result mean? When does the result mean anything? If it means something. Is artistic research supposed to be implemented? How would that be done? And what to do about the eternal question of quality? It is once again actualized if one places art in a research context. The statement, the work, the gesture, the event that is art and the result of a risk-taking, cannot be appraised against any common standard as being right or wrong. Within the practice – the artist's own work. Later, when the practice is done or in a meta-practice, one can of course find rules of art in criticism, analysis, theory and history. But that is more like an antiquarian's work and a wholly different kind of research than the one I am thinking of. What happens if one practice is put into the value-system of the other practice? Will it at all be discernable? Can we talk about it? We can talk about methods. Let us begin there.

The Producer: I was thinking yesterday that if the character gets more emphasized in a scene, maybe you can make the rest of the film's material less certain.

Rosa: But that's only depending on what they believe they know about us. There is after all a small group of people who knows us.

The Producer: I'm not thinking about them. I'm thinking about someone who doesn't know who we are. That's who's watching the film.

Rosa: But then they must be rather unsure from the very beginning because they know nothing about us. I mean, there is nowhere we present ourselves as the ones we actually are and the kind of situation this is. So it's quite confusing as it is.

The Producer: You think so?

Rosa: Yes, I do.

The Producer: Well, then we have to make it even more so. This has to be, you know, really...

It turns out to be a film. The text's way of being has had to move over. It is now the way of being of film which directs and breaks up the text. It jumps between themes and persons, in a sharper way than would be expected in a text, but a way entirely normal in a film. I consider writing *cut, fade, voice-over, flashback* etc., but I decide to wait until a later version. This one is rough. There are still big chunks of text connected to one another as text, and the form of the film is weak. This is not a story. It is the parts that become a story. But I want to see how the choices are made. I have been here before. I know that I do not yet know what is essential, and that is why some things must be allowed, which under the present circumstances may not seem to have function or contain meaning. I wait.

Rosa: You have to build something for the projection to take place on. If it's something that keeps disappearing, if there is never a person saying "I am", you won't even know if you have met someone here. In that case there is no reason for a spectator to care about neither of us. We have no traits to appreciate or be provoked by, because we don't exist. I think it's important to decide, *once* in *one* scene, who you are and who I am. Later on, we can break with that and change it, but within the narrative we have to start somewhere and have something in relation to which to act, if you want to create a fiction.

The Producer: Yes. And that would be..?

Rosa: That would be if you are this authoritarian, unsympathetic person, you have to be it so much more. And I have to become either this naïve person who doesn't know anything and who the Coach is trying to straighten out in some way, or I have to become the person who is acting like a person the Coach is trying to straighten out.

Gallery: Rosa investigates positions. Lillith collects pictures and the Wizard guards the space of notions and imaginations. The Vampire shows up later on and proves to be the dark side of Madame Z. Marianne is in Bangkok. It is Lillith who meets her. As usual, the Wizard undergoes transformations, but he is at home in his apartment. He practises greetings, walks in and out through the door, enters, says hello, sits down, listens. Over and over again. He is trying to find new ways of moving. There are many worn-out ways and he is tired of them all. Lillith is away but she has sent a letter on Rosa's work. I am retouching pictures (believe it or not). It is pictures of the Wizard in his kitchen, Lillith in Bangkok and Rosa involved in various conversations. I don't know how it ends, so I begin somewhere in the background. I start all over again.

The Producer: If you'd describe yourself in let's say one or two or three sentences in relation to your character, and then I'd perhaps talk about... I might ask you questions or somewhere... either to you or when you're not there. "What are we not allowed to talk about? What questions am I not allowed to ask?" In order to... Yes, in order to point to a.. To me it's hard to know where the line is drawn. I mean, to me it's hard to know when... Ah, I can't put it in words, but I believe that thing is what's interesting.

Rosa: Speaking of what we talked about yesterday, that this would be about art, I was thinking, there we actually have some connections as well. Really, why do I need a character when I'm not an actor? Why does the artist need an alter ego?

The Producer: You'll have to ask the Coach about that.

Echoing. Each and every word I say or write is an echo so aggravating you will know it. There is nothing I can learn that is not a repetition, a reminder. *Madame Bovary, c'est moi!*

Rosa: I understand it like he was relating to the education and the professional role, that I should grow into it.

The Producer: I believe he's very much talking about himself.

Rosa: I'm sure he is, if you want to analyze what he's saying. But, what is he actually saying to me, in that situation? What will it look like in the film? If one doesn't know him, one can't understand what you know.

The Producer: No... But... I really like this scene because I feel that you already are what he sees, I mean, that you already are in charge of the character. I don't know if you are but in my imagination he's sitting there telling something which already exists, work you've already done.

Rosa is taking part in a sociological experiment. She makes an effort. Nothing happens. She tries not to care about it. Her mind is elsewhere. As often. I wonder where she is. A couple of months ago, we again had a problem with sounds. Disquieting dull and frighteningly sharp sounds were heard almost constantly. She is inquiring into naivety as a form of argumentation. She tried to strike up a conversation, starting from the constructivistic perspective she had learnt to take for granted. No-one was inclined to answer. She had to start all over again. Learn once more how to speak. She has practiced conversing in every way imaginable, exposed herself to the most banal and the most abstract of discussions, trying to understand their meaning. But now she is just even more confused. She has lost nearly all the words she once knew and stammers when trying to say something. She has become the image of no-one. It is very practical.

The Producer: But I was thinking, if we emphasize this character – your character – that we have been playing with and tossing around and that perhaps was formulated by the Coach... I

perceived it as also a way for you to protect yourself, to not be naïve. If you are playing the naïve one... Now that's the wrong word. But I'll use it as an example. If you're acting the naïve one, you're not naïve. In other words, you're conscious of what you're doing if you invest in and embrace it, I mean, if you take up a situation but yet maintain an overview.

Rosa: Ok, but that's not true when it comes to film, because the film really removes a layer. Because...

The Producer: Yes, but I mean from your perspective! From your... When you enter this project it is certainly... Like, it's an ambiguous situation for both you and me. That, in many ways, is really what the project is all about. And then I was thinking... after the talk with the Coach, *that* might be what he's trying to explain: to make you in some way find a means to look at yourself in this situation, this character can help you. And after that, I've been imagining away further, because the character is a fantasy. If you build something for yourself, can you hand it over to someone else? If you say that the project is about me, it in some way will be... You know, it's always possible to play with... Who then am I meeting? Who's that sitting there?

Rosa: It's you. But I was thinking the opposite. If you make yourself transparent in a situation, what then becomes visible is the setting. In other words, to be sure it's not a way for me to look at myself, but a way to look at what's around me, to see how it treats me if I only float along.

The Producer: OK, but you also observe yourself, I think.

Rosa: Yes, I suppose so. But not this character, I think.

The Producer: How do you mean?

Rosa: I mean, this character which all the time complies and that is this adaptable character, that's not much to look at.

The Producer: No, but do you feel that yours is *that* character?

Rosa: Yes, wasn't that the one we talked about, me and the Coach? That one he wanted me to be, I suppose.

The Producer: But you haven't really been that.

Rosa: No, but it's on film. That character can be found in the conversations and I think it's also to be found somewhere else. I don't remember. Anyway, you could continue working on it if you wanted to.

The Producer: Yeah... Well... No, I don't think you can. You won't allow yourself to. No-one can do whatever they want with you. I mean, you make boundaries all the time.

Rosa: Yes...?

The Producer: And you say "I will do what is credible for my character".

Rosa: Yes, but if my character is the material which is this immature person, then I am of course very scared. As the Coach said "You will play this insecure..."

The Producer: But he didn't say that, did he? "Insecure" – did he say that?

Naivety requires constant attention, a keen ear and humility to function as argument. Rosa is practicing hard, engages in conversations even though she doesn't know what her opinion is. She makes herself visible to those who cannot stand her. She is often told off. She is the youngest and least experienced. Her voice and her appearance provoke people. She tries to escape by becoming invisible and she is rather accomplished. In several experiments she has made herself so small that those present later forget she was there. She always extends her right hand and introduces herself, because no-one remembers having met her before.

The Producer: We could just start to focus on, if we are to talk about a character, which I think can be... It's easy, because you make up some object and then you need... It's a way of protecting oneself, I believe. It's a way for you to protect yourself. And it's a way for me to protect you.

Rosa: Yes, but that's the only way to do it. I mean, I would not be able to be myself in this project. That would of course be devastating, psychologically.

The Producer: Yes...

Rosa: So that would never work.

The Producer: Yes. But that is also a fantasy, which in a way is there. Most people believe you are yourself. One has to be oneself. And so on.

Can the writer see herself? I believe that may not be possible. I can describe someone, it could be me or someone else, and then I can see the one described. But how can you see the one describing? *Madame Bovary, c'est moi!* I can turn into mist. I can reveal them, mock them, betray them and save them by appearing in just the right moment. But I have to believe in them, and as long as I write them I have to love them. Later I can claim that I did not take a stand, but that is never true. However, it is true that I cannot be responsible for what they are doing. They are me, but they are also them and I am not them. We are living from and next to one another, I imagine. And I think it works. I can see that it does. Orlando is Virginia.¹ The fifteen-year-old girl who meets her lover on the Mekong River is Marguerite [M.Duras, *L'amant*]. But no, you are not gifted with memory [M.Duras, *Hiroshima mon amour*].

The Cinematographer: Now I ask you, as a person, how, you know, it felt to stand there? Was it like you were there playing a role or did you feel as if you were defending your own work?
Rosa: No, it didn't. Because that is what it's all about, me not believing that I'm able to be the artist.

Every person should be understood in light of the setting, and in particular in the light of descriptions by those close to her. Every person can change in a moment. She is precisely what she appears to be. Because the image is so easily presented. At the same time, an eternity separates what is visible and what is there. They are each parts of a whole person and are held together by a magnetic force – they are attracted to what they lack. The women have only one distinct quality and it emerges in their conversations among themselves and in relation to the men who mirror and describe them. The movements, the events and the conversations are sketches on transparent paper which, if you put them on top of one another, will suggest more or less complete pictures. Duras's readers make a tremendous amount of choices, are constantly making decisions. The gaps can be filled with a plenitude of meanings. Assembling her characters is complicated work.

The Producer: You know, I think she *is* the artist. Even if you say you aren't, I think so. I really do. I'm only a name.

Rosa: Yes.

The Producer: What we originally thought in the first conversations when we talked about the possibility of selling one's name. Then, we started out the other way round. Me borrowing her name. But I think it will end in me lending my name and her being... or whatever the piece is. I don't know. But that, I suppose, is one of the things that are... also a fantasy. I use this word only to say something that doesn't get answered, but stays as something you're curious about how it will end.

Rosa: Yes... But I also think it's interesting when people come to be manifest. And that's what happened yesterday. In that way I think it was really great and very useful for my work. Because my work is to find out what people's expectations of me are. And that's something the apprentice can do, that only the apprentice can do.

The Producer: No.

Rosa: No?

The Producer: No, I don't think the apprentice can see herself.

Rosa: Yes, but other people... You know, the apprentice is watching...

[Frédéric Chopin, *Waltz in D flat major, op.64 no.1 - 'Minute'*, Vladimir Ashkenazy]

There are those who need to articulate certain words over and over again. We have a way of talking in circles. We need an audience, either obedient or completely indifferent. Or, those who take us forward.

Rosa: But that's the brilliance of the apprentice, the way she's always underestimated and so gets to know everything. You know, it's like with children. You tell children all secrets because you don't think they're able to do anything with them. So, it's a really good position to observe from. And I don't think one will get that much out of watching oneself in that role. Because what you have done is making yourself very small. But on the other hand you get to see...

The Cinematographer: You have used the role to see something.

Rosa: To see the things around you, yes.

The Producer: But a funny thing is that it has been quite provoking, this role.

The Cinematographer: Who has it provoked, then?

The Producer: It has provoked me. It provoked the Coach. It became problematic during shooting. Because there the apprentice took a large part and became director.

A method of rewriting, possible change, destruction or deconstruction, is masochism. Lillith tells about the Vampire and when there lacks an author.

[the music fades out]

The Cinematographer: But the gap that was there. You said you find it interesting. Why is it interesting?

The Producer: Because to me it's dangerous. I conceive it as being dangerous. There's something obscure that the whole project... We're constantly moving through obscurity. But when you're editing a film, you *cannot* be unclear.

Rosa: No.

The Producer: Or when you make an exhibition, you can't be unclear. Because everything you work with are images and symbols and language. And standing there, not knowing what to say, or looking like you don't know what to say – that's not interesting. And that which is not interesting is... Then people leave. Then they don't watch this film. They take no interest in the exhibition. You know, it's one thing to be unclear here. This isn't a public situation, this room. I think it's much harder to be unclear in public space.

Rosa: I regard it also as a material. You know, the huge material which we have, that's the expectations of the audience. That's the only thing we can play with. And if you waste the confidence of or the connection to the audience, as you and the art gallery run the risk of doing by saying "You will see this" and then they get to see something completely different. If the audience doesn't accept this, being cheated or misled, at once you risk being rejected by the audience, and that, I suppose, is what the Curator indicates.

The first time I heard of the Vampire was when Rosa told me about one of her dreams. She rarely does. But this one is different. She's trying to work but there is someone who constantly wants to eat at her when she tries to concentrate. She tries everything. Just like Hansel and Gretel, she shows off her less attractive sides to gain time, to be left alone a short while to find time to think. Rosa's ability to invent herself is put to the test. She is reading her manuscripts which are rewritten over and over and she is always ready to improvise. But the atmosphere of experimentation has created its own logic and it gets harder and harder for her to be critical of it.

The Producer: OK. Are we wiser now?

Rosa: No.

The Producer: However, returning to the first discussion; we talked about how we must make our positions or starting points clearer, for the sake of the film.

Rosa: Yes, or at least starting to sketch this line of development for the characters.

The Producer: Much is... You know, it sounds like I want to make a music video, but that's not what I mean when I'm talking about fast-paced cuts and audio, unsecuring unexpected scenes, et cetera. But trying not to think in text maybe, but in music or dance. I mean, just as

another rhythm, another pace. And then yesterday when we were watching the material, we didn't see that. I saw only text. I saw a story.

Rosa: We're watching the conversations. They're heavy. For example, I think that we need a lot of establishing shots; however, it's very important which images we choose. Because it's possible to get nice images. Those you made [turning to the cinematographer] of the photo shoot are really incredible. We can get that kind of footage. But what it will mean and who's going to be *in* it plays an important part, you know.

The Producer: Yes, but I think that... I put a lot of trust in on the one hand our shots from the rooms here, the studio, the kitchen and the white room there, but then also those when you're doing stuff. I believe in them too.

Rosa: But will you be in the film any more?

The Producer: Nn...

Rosa: Because you aren't visible very often.

The Producer: Yes, but I like that. But no, I'm there a lot. Don't you think?

Rosa: No. I think you will be edited out in the final cut.

The Producer: Yes... But I... You know, there you got it... And the more we... Then we create this nice... You say that it's about me but then we only look at you. And there's something beautiful in this. I believe in it. I think if I'm included too much, the material isn't credible.

Rosa: But OK.

The Producer: Even though we look at you... hm...

Rosa: Then it becomes your gaze. What in this is it then that makes you unsympathetic?

The Producer: Well, I don't know. How can we make me unsympathetic? It's as I explained to her yesterday, that the other night it was so obvious that this project is about... as I have written here, that it's an illustration of art "This is what it's like to work with art". You don't know anything really, nor are you any wiser in the end. And I, I'm constantly repeating that I want to be unsympathetic but I don't succeed, or else I'm superunsympathetic all the time but just don't see it. However, that's how well-behaved art is right now.

The Cinematographer: Though, in a way it *is* unsympathetic to... When you put it like that, it's as if you were the Art here in this house.

The Producer: Yes, but I like that. I stand by that.

The Cinematographer: But that is downright unsympathetic.

The Producer: It is? Yes, but then we are close, it seems. That's great.

Rosa: But all this about being unsympathetic also depends on the situation, doesn't it? What would be unsympathetic in one situation might not be at all in another, where it instead is what's expected and vice versa. So again it's about what expectations you have when you enter into a situation.

The Producer: But how then can we bring out that side in the material or in a scene?

The Cinematographer [with irony]: I'm thinking of a scene where you're sitting there editing and is just all... You have lots of levers and smoke is puffing out, you know...

Rosa [laughing]: Doctor Mabuse.

The Cinematographer [in fake voice]: "What is art?" On the hunt for art.

Rosa: No, but there are of course these classical images that you make when you're going to portray powerful people. They might come off as awfully unsympathetic. People who are very busy or who are like, talking down to others. That is obviously a way of being unsympathetic.

The Producer: But that's just an image of "unsympathetic", not being unsympathetic.

Rosa: No, but I was wondering if it was that image you were referring to?

The Producer: No no no.

The Cinematographer: Why then is it so important that you are unsympathetic?

The Producer: Well, but that is my own, very personal question in this project. I don't know.

The Cinematographer: But in any case, you're sure about it?

The Producer: Yes. But I thought that one way of being unsympathetic is to say that you're a good person... Unsympathetic might be the wrong word... But that's a very simple trick in order to look at established forms and borders.

Rosa: And to question?

The Producer: Yes, exactly, by being unsympathetic. There are, you know, moral boundaries connected to the unsympathetic, I think.

Rosa: Yes, but also orderliness. It can be unsympathetic just to disturb the order. Or to enlarge yourself too much or not taking responsibility.

The Producer: But it might be enough that I call myself... I don't know... that I'm running this... I initiated the project. That alone might be what's unsympathetic. It might be enough.

The quietest parts are the most important ones. Then you are to be at your most attentive. It is the passages which mean something. In the space in-between – which emanates when one event is about to pass into the other – strange ambiances emerge. An uncertainty. As between nightfall and night, it goes very fast. The sky turns turquoise and the water looks like lead. And so the lights are turned on. They rise from the background which has become uniformly black and made out of cardboard. The whole line of houses along the embankment turns into a single roof ridge. The sounds are changing. Duller. You listen more intently. Now I have my working place on the second floor in a room with windows facing the water. The rest of the building is vacated. There are a few traces of those who are not here. Empty rooms awaiting their authors. Every time I come here, and sometimes during a break, I take a walk through the empty rooms. Trying to see if something has changed. Sometimes leaving traces of my own. One day I had lunch in the corner room. I have been thinking about sitting down and read a little in the small room which looks onto the roof. But no armchairs are there.

The Cinematographer: How did this start?

The Producer: The project?

The Cinematographer: Yes.

The Producer: It started with me getting invited to the art space and feeling that there is nothing I can do there. And that's something I haven't thought of actually, but maybe I should go over it with myself, why I felt like I can only make this project there.

Rosa: Well... I don't know. The art space has been quite exciting as a partner, I think, exactly because they've been just as erratic as the whole project. More coffee, anyone?

The Producer: No, I'm fine. Or yes, I always want coffee. But wait, there was something...

You asked the question, that's right, how it started. I thought I'd found an answer the other day but now I'm already somewhere else. There's this game. You know, we hold up mirrors to each other. It's very much like... instead of shooting at each other I hold up a mirror and so down she falls.

At night, time leaps. It doesn't make a difference if one tries to watch the pace. Suddenly an hour has passed in a minute. Such is night. To make the sleepless able to cope. And dawn is celebrated. Maybe one has already left home before it arrives, and it is welcome. In the summer, the break of day is not as welcome. It comes too early and lasts too long into the day. Summer mornings are hard as long as one stays in the city. They remind us of being forced to go to a work we never wanted. If I draw a line at midnight, which I think is common, and divide the night in two – the time before, the considerate part, and the time after, the ruthless one. Then I get a day and night which is too contracted. If I instead push the day ahead, look at night as being part of day, and day as a part of night, the line is erased and nothing is no longer obvious. The cruel part can become the friendly one.

The Producer: And then we talk some and then she holds up a mirror and then I fall. She makes me see things in myself I don't want to see.

The Cinematographer: Yes, that's right.

The Producer: And maybe the other way around, I hope.

The Cinematographer: Is that what's dangerous?

The Producer: Yes, of course it's dangerous. It is.

The Cinematographer: Hm...

The Producer: Or at least it's painful.

The Cinematographer: Well, to the two of you!

Rosa: Yes, exactly! That's it! You're really right about that. That's what we must think of all the time: what you and I are doing is therapy, but what we're going to show at the art space can't be our therapy but a story that can engage other people.

The Cinematographer: And it can still be about that?

Rosa: That, it might.

The Producer: That's one of the stories. Absolutely. It is. This project isn't about *one* thing.

The Cinematographer [with sarcasm]: That would be too simple.

Rosa [encouraging]: Now *you're* getting good!

I said that Marianne is in Bangkok but that was wrong. She is in Hong Kong. It seems to be hot. The city is located in cauldron-like surroundings. People have shiny faces. Marianne has had to change her leather pants to linen slacks. With this, she changed. She is not as anxious as before. She still works as a psychologist. In Hong Kong, people are smaller, taking up less room. In some way it makes her work different. She doesn't exactly know how or why. She meets the little girl who is fifteen who could be Marguerite. She is not fifteen anymore. Marianne deliberately forgets her mother tongue. She makes a mark in time, creating an abyss, as if time was a room. Between the Nordic light and the black night of the Southeast there is no stable ground.

The Producer: But now we have to look at the gaping relation to the film and see what needs doing today. And I think it's interesting with the character. This idea that you can create a character which later proceeds or develops is already established in art.

Rosa: A question I have, as we all know, is "Do you *have to* do that?"

The Producer: No, I don't think so.

Rosa: Are you sure about that? Are you able to stand up to being an artist today without wearing that mask? Because we were also talking about the mask, both you and I and the Coach.

The Producer: Mm... However, as I told you on the phone I often feel that I have become the character. I'm now pretending that you understand what I mean. I stage something, create a possibility which can be the Actress in my first film or Rosa in this film. I create something that doesn't exist in me. I create a possibility we can call a character, a fantasy, a fiction, a vision. And then we stage it and work with it and then almost always I later notice that I have become... I've come closer to that possibility. I start to use these words and that clothing and this attitude. So this character that you've worked more with than I in this project, I'm very curious about that one.

Rosa: The one I have made for myself?

The Producer: Yes. Because I feel involved in it. And well... I just want to know more about it. So I was thinking that if you describe yourself as a character, it might be such a scene in which something... your work in some way becomes possible to understand or see, or it becomes visible.

Rosa: Shall we start with that one?

Some time passes. This would have been a flashforward if the text shared the present time of the film. Now it is a flashback. We know the camera. How it watches. What it pretends not to see. What it excludes. Everything sensed in front of the camera that isn't visible behind it. Still, it sees more than we know there is. We are in close-up. Every twitch of the face is visible. We could look at her together and notice "There it is, that expression you were trying to avoid. It's there. Impossible to hide". At the same time, the camera's sight is so very bad. It believes in the makeup, painted views, cardboard walls, stucco made of polystyrene foam, gold and silver paint, and dulling spray. It is so stupid, and so are we. We believe our eyes and let ourselves be deceived because we want the camera to keep on describing. The illusion becomes reality. We, inebriated.

The Producer: Do you want to talk into the camera or do you want to be at some distance from it?

Rosa: It doesn't matter.

The Producer: I'm trying to imagine...

The Cinematographer: And this is you telling us about the character?

Rosa: Yes, isn't it?

The Producer: But that we don't know...

The Cinematographer: Or is it the character who's telling us about...

The Producer: That's what we are not to know, I think. I mean, it should not be made clear.

The Cinematographer: But then we have to think of how it looks when you're watching it. Is it the individual person who's talking about which role she has in this project? One can of course see that, I think, depending on what tone you use.

Rosa: I think that's the first interpretation you make, because the other one requires you to think it over once more.

The Cinematographer: Would it be silly to feel that you have a manuscript or some such? I mean, if you were to look down somewhere in the middle?

Rosa: No, I think it might almost be necessary, so you don't just immediately interpret it as what we got here is this "Making of..." scene.

The Cinematographer: Or else you take it a few times more, or...

Rosa: In the first film it's very clear, but yet in the end in the film it's very subtle and many ask, *Is she...? What is she saying?* I mean, you have made it so clear that she, using various facts, gets to present herself twice and still people are uncertain about if it's she or not.

The Producer: But I think that is because she's an actress.

Rosa: Well, then it's even stranger that people doesn't recognize that she's acting. Because she has the possibility to act.

The Producer: That's because she does it so well.

Rosa: Yes, but still. She has *the possibility* to act. In principle, I don't have the possibility to be an actress really, because I don't know how it's done.

The Producer: I don't think that's correct.

Rosa: But it's only if you know me that you know that I was acting when I was younger.

The Producer: I think you're a tremendously good actress.

Rosa: But I am not *introduced* as an actress.

The Cinematographer: But if you were acting yesterday, you did it extremely well.

The Producer: Yes, it's the same thing when you and the Coach are sitting there. It isn't, of course, you sitting there.

The Cinematographer: But to what extent are you thinking that you're acting a role? Or is that a natural defense for you?

Rosa: I think I do it rather instinctively in contexts where I notice that there are strong opinions about who I should be.

The Cinematographer: Are you thinking much about "now I should be standing in this way" and "that I will say that way"?

Rosa: Yes, I was thinking of that yesterday. Then, I was thinking that now I will place myself so as to look small at the side of the Manager of the art gallery. I crouched a bit, like... It was done on purpose.

The Cinematographer: I think you're a fuckin' pro, then.

The Producer: But that's provoking. I mean, you provoke a lot with this role.

Rosa: Yes, but I think I'm also very good at provoking men in that age of all people, I can get a kick from it.

The Producer: Yes but you get them in the trap. You make them act in a way that...

The Cinematographer: They make fools of themselves.

The Producer: Yes. They make themselves plain to see.

Rosa: That might be an unconscious mission of mine.

ⁱ It is commonly assumed that Orlando is Vita Sackville-West, but I believe Orlando have to be Virginia Woolf with the biographical attributes of Vita Sackville-West [V. Woolf, *Orlando*].