

Theresa L. Geller, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Film Theory and History
Department of English
Grinnell College

Paper delivered at Post/Autonomia Conference: “What is Post/Autonomia Today?”
Amsterdam, May 19-22, 2011
<http://postautonomia.wordpress.com/>

“Capitalism is a Fairy Story”: The Work of Love in *I Am Love*

Tilda Swinton, when asked about the film, *I Am Love* (Luca Guadagnino, 2009), which she produced and in which she stars (and for which she learned Italian and Russian), compared it to Michael Moore’s *Capitalism: A Love Story*, remarking that her film might well be titled, “Capitalism: A Fairy Story.”¹ Swinton, a former member of the Communist Party in Great Britain, draws this parallel to speak to her film’s critical interrogation of capitalism, both through its narrative and formal structures. *I Am Love* employs the tropes of melodrama to produce a nuanced critique of global capitalism, what Swinton herself calls “high bourgeois capitalism,” and its patriarchal foundations. In this paper, I want to outline some of the ways that this film represents the convergence of post/autonomia and cinematic representation, but does so, importantly, through a feminist and queer revolutionary desire. The film focuses on the story of three generations of Italian bourgeoisie—a wealthy industrialist family, avowedly patriarchal, and aloof to the systematic exploitation to which it owes its wealth and privilege. Nominally, the subject of the film is the private lives of the owners of a textile factory whose Fordist model of capital accumulation is out-of-date. One subplot of the film is the changes occurring to the family business, which is in the throes of deterritorialization by multinational, post-fordist financial capital. Indeed, at the center of the film is not just the effects of late capitalism but its *affective* impact on the lives of this “high bourgeois” family.

I Am Love symbolizes the dying out of nation-state based capitalist formations and its reconfiguration in contemporary systems of global capitalism through the symbolic death of the *paterfamilias* and the inheritance of the family business, passed on to the next generation, who in turn sell the “family” business to a multinational corporation, symbolically personified by a Sikh business man who speaks mostly in English and identifies as a truly cosmopolitan hybrid subject—both “Indian” and American. Yet, this rather minor plotline is critically interrogated through *mise-en-scène*, camerawork and editing to allegorize the structural effects of late capital. For example, the first scenes of the entire Recchi family gathering to celebrate the birthday of the grandfather, served by a regiment of household staff, are interrupted, jarringly, by a lengthy montage of textile factory machines continuously moving to the rhythms of capital production. This disruption of continuity editing makes the space for a dialectical montage in the tradition of Sergei Eisenstein. Although brief, it directly conveys the source of the Recchi family’s accumulation of wealth in the striking juxtaposition of the loud, rapidly moving, repetitive machinery, echoed in the fast, repetitive movements of the waitstaff, with still, silent images of an unmoving family, who appear to stand outside of History. Traditional Italian portraiture is hung on the walls of the Recchi’s home of thoroughly modernist architectural design. Indeed, many of the establishing shots of the house look like a designer catalog layout. The contrast of these decontextualized scenes of domestic luxury in relation to the machinery, which makes such accumulation of wealth possible, initiates a critical distance from the bourgeois family represented. To use Swinton’s words, it commences the interrogation and ultimate deconstruction of the capitalist fairy story which the film represents.

The central story in the film is quintessential women’s melodrama. The repressed wife of Tancredi, Emma Recchi, whose life is defined—and imprisoned—by her beautiful home, starts an affair with a younger man, which will forever change her and her family. Yet, the

beginning intercutting of the textile machines with the private celebration enjoyed by the patriarchal bourgeois family suggest a dialectic on several levels of interpretation, both materialist and cinematic, pointing to what Raymond Williams has called a “structure of feeling”. What I mean by this is that the film not only represents a dialectical critique of late capitalism but also is itself meta-dialectical, if you will, in its intertextual citational practices—practices that are notably anchored in the codes and affects of film genre. The title, *I Am Love*, refers to the Oscar-winning film, *Philadelphia*, which plays on the Recchi’s television in a scene after Emma has begun her affair. As an award-winning film, most people know that this 1993 courtroom melodrama starred Tom Hanks in his Oscar-winning role as a gay man dying of AIDS; yet, it is much less known that performance artists and political activists Karen Findlay, Ron Vawter and Anna Devere Smith all also appeared in the film. That *I Am Love* is named after a bit of dialog from *Philadelphia* is significant; certainly the fact that the latter film addressed the suffering and the humanity of people with AIDS is crucial to analyzing Luca Guadagnino’s postmodern melodrama, with its openly gay director and lead actor Pippo Delbono. *Philadelphia*, in that it represents queer affect, particularly grief and loss, is a compelling intertextual relay, and one to which I will want to return. However, the *philia* of *Philadelphia* is also crucial to the analysis of this film; its polyvalent connotations of passionate love, familial care, and platonic affection are key to the melodramatic modalities of the film. *I Am Love* turns on the profound ambivalences that affiliation entails—class, familial, erotic. While Emma’s affair leads her away from both her class and family affiliations, even her national affiliation (with Italy), the affair actually takes up very little screen time, and therefore provides only a limited interpretation. Rather, it is the focus on alienation and its structural origins—as the dialectical antipode to affiliation—that is at the center of this film’s particular critical and ideological intervention.

More than any other, the film genre associated with the figuration of alienation is the melodrama, particularly the domestic or women's melodrama. Film melodrama projects the repressed affect of its protagonists onto the diegetic film world, imbuing *mise-en-scène* with an affective, mostly unspoken, intensity. As many commentators on the genre have noted, melodrama mediates social critique precisely through the Freudian processes of displacement and condensation, in just this way, in order to indict the society that victimizes its protagonists. The genre articulates a critique of the social constraints produced by hetero-patriarchy and bourgeois culture (symbolized in the visual and aural codes of melodrama) in its affective eruptions of excess. The alienation of bourgeois, patriarchal culture is not verbalized; rather, as "an expressive code," melodrama makes use of "dramatic *mise-en-scène*, characterized by a dynamic use of spatial and musical categories, as opposed to intellectual or literary ones."² In *I Am Love*, the emphasis placed on John Adams' phenomenal score draws attention to these very melodramatic conventions. Adam's score underscores the *melos*, the musicality, of the drama, certainly, but also deepens the political critique leveled by the film in the choice of such a controversial composer (notorious for his opera, *The Death of Klinghoffer*, which was based on the actual killing of a Jewish American by the Palestinian Liberation Organization). It is this combination of aural and visual codes that, together, affect the ideological critique of melodrama, and begins to explain the filmmaker's oddly postmodern return to this otherwise outdated genre.

In many ways, *I Am Love* is an homage to the outmoded films of the women's melodrama cycle. As Thomas Elsaesser describes, "In melodrama, violence, the strong action, the dynamic movement, the full articulation and fleshed-out emotions...become the very signs of the characters' alienation, and thus serve to formulate a devastating critique of the ideology that supports it."³ Historians of melodrama have consistently remarked upon its origins as a

cultural form that explicitly critiqued the bourgeoisie, articulating class conflict. Later, film melodrama would rework and expand upon this set of antagonisms by narrowing the focus to the bourgeois home, with the claustrophobic space of the domestic household metonymically representing social tensions of class, gender and sexuality. This particular genre of filmmaking is exemplified by the films of Douglas Sirk and Luchino Visconti—directors much discussed by Swinton and Guadagnino in their eleven years working together on *I Am Love*. Indeed, the plot of the film mirrors that of Sirk's *All That Heaven Allows* (1955), with its story of an older woman falling in love with a younger man who works the land and reads Thoreau, against the wishes of her adult children, who prefer she stay home and watch her new television set. Yet, *I Am Love* is not a simple retread of generic formula. As Laura Mulvey remarks in her recent reconsideration of the genre, “Melodrama is the genre of displaced meanings in which the unsaid and the unspeakable find cinematic expression in the *mise-en-scène*. The melodrama demands a deciphering spectator who can be transformed into the interactive spectator of textual analysis or delayed cinema.”⁴ Guadagnino and Swinton’s film exploits the filmic properties of melodrama to invoke in the spectator what has been named, following Gilles Deleuze, “cinematic political thought.”⁵ I want to briefly sketch out how this thought is formally materialized before turning to the content or politics of the film more specifically.

In the melodramatic mode, narrative is at odds with action and affect. Melodrama, that genre Linda Williams has rightly named a body genre for its ability to draw out physical responses such as tears, creates meaning through formal rather than narrative strategies.⁶ According to Mulvey, “the process of repetition and return” central to the formal characteristics of film melodrama, “involves stretching out the cinematic image to allow space and time for associative thought, reflection on resonance and connotation, the identification of visual clues, the interpretation of cinematic form and style... Furthermore, by slowing down,

freezing or repeating images, key moments and meanings become visible.”⁷ In *I Am Love*’s postmodern refiguration of the genre, these formal practices are, on a certain level, citational, providing the in-the-know cinephile with intertextual citations of Hitchcock, Visconti and a compendium of cinematic forerunners; note, for example, the camera’s focus on Emma’s hairstyles, particularly the spiral bun she wears when she runs into Antonio—a direct visual citation of Hitchcock’s *Vertigo*. Yet, melodramatic *mise-en-scène* originally stood in place of narration, inscribing into the various scenes of a given film significance that goes beyond the inarticulate consciousness of the characters. The formal properties of *I Am Love* work along these very lines, as a sort of extra-diegetic address to the spectator to encourage an examination of style as meaning. For instance, the film works with varying speeds and rates of filming in order to catalyze the interactive spectator. Indeed, in its roaming, unanchored camerawork prone to crane shots and extreme vertical points of view, frequently angled from either far below or oppressively bearing down on Emma, the film demands an active viewer to decipher its breaks with typical filmic perspective. Moreover, the temporality of shots—some slowed down to near-still photos or freeze-frames, while others are edited rapidly as jump cuts, violating the 30-degree rule— suggests a film style that might be best described as an integration of Deleuze’s time-image and movement-image, and in doing so, following Deleuze, produces a range of new images of thought.⁸

In hyperbolizing and exaggerating the highly stylized rhetorical tropes of film melodrama, *I Am Love* points to an image of thought and an affective register informed by the ideals of the autonomist movement and its epigone: precarity, immaterial and affective labor, biopolitics, workers rights and a skepticism of hierarchy and ideological rigidity. Significantly, (post)autonomist thought is directly concerned with the crucial shifts in contemporary capitalism and its effects in both the social and cultural sphere. *I Am Love* translates the

concerns of (post)autonomia into film language, and through its employment of the codes of melodrama, extends its reach even further into the “private” sphere. The critical employment of rhetorical tropes are ubiquitous throughout the film; crane and aerial shots of church spires, the frozen cityscape of the industrialized Milan, the geometric repetition of windows in buildings, filmed most often from no particular point-of-view, are juxtaposed later with frequent close-ups of flowers, insects, artisanal food, and static shots of the Italian hillside. Notably, these images are constructed and arranged not so much dialectically as transversally. In other words, they are ordered as the outward expression of Emma’s *autocoscienza*, what Teresa de Lauretis translates, in her introduction to the writings produced by the Milan Women’s Bookstore Collective, as a “consciousness of self, but the Italian word suggests something of an auto-induced, self-determined, or self-directed process of achieving consciousness.”⁹

That the film focuses on a woman in a privileged women’s genre anchors the ideological critique that is the work of the film, which is to expose not simply the work that underlies capitalism, but more to the point, the work of love which capitalism demands of women. Notably, in her foundational book, *The Work of Love*, Giovanna Franca Dalla Costa cites a famous melodrama of the 1950s; she states: “Under capitalism, love, far from being ‘a many splendored thing,’ is the heaviest of ideological mystifications imposed on a labor relation, namely housework, in order to force women into performing this work without getting paid.”¹⁰ In her footnote to this, Dalla Costa explains that the ideology of love, “which has so permeated the culture of romance from films to songs [and one might add—fairytale], reveals through its permanence how profoundly capital’s ideological orchestration is rooted within housework.”¹¹ No wonder, then, director Guadagnino turns to film, and melodrama in particular, to undertake a demystification of what he himself identifies in the DVD commentary as the “patriarchal roots of capitalism.”¹²

The film opens with a roving shot of the cityscape, with an inter-title naming the location, “Milano,” to eventually pull focus into the window of the Recchi’s home. Not for nothing does the camerawork recall the beginning of Hitchcock’s *Psycho* (1960); it infuses the next scene—the household in preparation for the family party, particularly Emma’s labor as housewife—with an inherent violence. Thus begins the demystification of “the work of love” through the figuration of Emma: “such work is the work of the production and reproduction of labor-power, its fundamental site is the home, and the primary unit within which it is performed is the family.”¹³ Although Dalla Costa is speaking of the working class housewife, the film’s focus on the demise of nation-state Fordist industry and its reterritorialization by transnational formations of finance capital make the bourgeois housewife a central concern, that is, the role of women in the reproduction of post-Fordist economics. This is not to say that Emma is in the same position as the housemaid, Ida. However, her self-consciousness, in as much as a fictional film character can be said to have consciousness, is allegorized as a reclamation of a different, anti-bourgeois political history—that of Soviet Union. Here it is important to recall that for Italian feminism, class analysis was not supplanted by caste; that is, unlike much of American feminism, which appropriated the language of socialist critique to name women as a class, feminist thought in Italy kept class analysis alive in its politics, insisting that, as Selma James explains, “the transition to revolutionary feminism [is] based on a redefinition of class.”¹⁴ What James and Mariarosa Dalla Costa assert is that the struggle for women is inherently the struggle against capitalism.

In essence, the family is not an area “of freedom and leisure auxiliary to the factory where by chance there happen to be women who are degraded as the personal servants of men;” rather, as James goes on, the domicile is “the other half of capitalist organization, the other area of capitalist exploitation.”¹⁵ The intercutting of the operations of factory machinery with the

family scenario described above indexes this relationship of the family, identified as “the very pillar of capitalist production,” to the site of capitalist production, as a “natural” extension of the factory.¹⁶ In this way, the film situates Emma, at the outset, as profoundly unfree, identified with her home. In fact, in the very first scene of her preparing for the party, she is filmed wearing an entirely beige ensemble, one that perfectly matches the color of the walls of her home, signifying her utter integration, even merging with the structure of the house. This situation is the product of the ideology of love that makes women into housewives, as described in *The Power of Women*,

Housewives don't see beyond their own four walls. The housewife's situation as a pre-capitalist mode of labor and consequently this 'femininity' imposed on her, makes her see the world, the others and the entire organization of work as something which is obscure, essentially unknown and unknowable; not lived; perceived only as a shadow behind the shoulders of the husband who goes out each day and meets this something.¹⁷

No wonder, then, that the Italian feminists insist that it is impossible to have a feminist movement in Italy which does not base itself on the analysis of women's work in the home.

The feminist insight that “the housewife's position seems frozen” is articulated visually in the opening scenes of *I Am Love*.¹⁸ Emma is isolated, defined in relation to her husband, children and household; yet, the arc of the film is her increasing understanding of the world—seeing beyond her four walls. This knowledge literally transforms Emma's subjectivity; not only does she cut her hair off, she even begins to go by a different name. “Emma,” we learn, is the name given to her by her husband. He met her on a trip to the former Soviet Union to buy art, and she becomes another beautiful thing he collects to decorate his home. This backstory explains how she became the Milanese upper class wife she is at the start of the film. However,

as her love affair takes root, she tells her lover that she was called “Kitesh” as a child.¹⁹ The question at the center of my analysis of the film is: what transforms Emma into Kitesh? What catalyzes the change from object of the work of love to subject of love? Notably, it is *not* her love affair with Antonio. Indeed, the transformation must take place before the love affair can begin. Emma is introduced to Antonio early on, yet there is no sense of a change. In fact, she returns to her “path” through her household, turning back on to the yellow rug square in the middle of the hall at the front entrance that can either lead out, or back into the home.

It is not the introduction of her future lover, but rather her daughter’s awakening desires that are the catalyst of change in the Recchi home. Emma, on an errand to pick up the dry-cleaning, discovers a card meant for her son from Betta. On the front of the card, simply the printed word—in English—“LOVE.” Inside are the details of Betta’s love for another woman. Immediately we are clued in to the break this causes in Emma. The camera literally loses its axis, and begins to float unanchored to Emma’s body. Although Emma is standing and then sitting, not in her home but rather pointedly outside in the open spaces of the city, when the camera begins to move vertically, canted, and the editing becomes discontinuous. The mobile framing of the scene flies to the spires of the church at which Emma sits to contemplate her daughter’s revelation. The impact of Betta’s “love” is underscored by the non-diegetic voice of Betta reading the words written in the card. In this, we experience the visual and aural excess of melodrama that aims at a consciousness-raising by proxy in the spectator, ultimately symbolized in Betta’s direct address to the camera through an odd use of parallel editing, which intercuts Betta speaking the words of the card Emma is reading, breaking the fourth wall and speaking them directly to the spectator. What we see, hear, and participate in, is Emma’s transformation—wrought through the counterforce of queer desire. This desire is symbolized visually less through Betta’s unexpected direct address than in its effects—effects registered in

the filmic framing of Emma. It is through the unexpected rupture of the traveling camera, one that no longer frames or imprisons Emma as its object, that an affective discontinuity registers for the viewer. Robin Wood refers to such cinematic formal structures as “visual promiscuity,” which he argues, “break[s] down the traditional one-to-one relationship of spectator to protagonist to which cinema has habituated us.”²⁰ That this promiscuity of camera style is attributed to a film that “was initially received as a virulent attack on a decadent ruling class on the eve of its inevitable dissolution” marks Jean Renoir’s *La Règle du Jeu* (1939) as yet another cinematic citation in *I Am Love*.²¹ Wood’s proto-queer reading of Renoir’s film enables the analysis of I am suggesting here; if Renoir’s film stands as a critique of bourgeois “rules,” it enacts this critique through “a story of a woman trying desperately to understand what her role should be,” with the implied option of the refusal of roles altogether as a (unthinkable) counter to the “repressive notions of marital fidelity, the ownership of wife by husband.”²² Both films employ visual promiscuity on the formal level to refute the ideological traps such as marriage (and motherhood) at work in the narrative. In this way, as Wood asserts, *The Rules of the Game* “is at once an elegy to a lost society and one of the most progressive [films] ever made,” because, like *I Am Love*, it presents a worldview “in which love is recognized as a life-principle that transcends,” like the camerawork itself in this scene, “the exclusive romantic attachment,” enabling forms of desire at odds with heteronormative rules of the game.²³

“Love,” as it is (literally) envisioned in the film, is the expression of female desire outside the patriarchal family, which ultimately mobilizes Emma to abandon the domestic sphere. Revolutionary desire is pointedly queer desire; Betta’s lesbianism, portrayed in *I Am Love* as the central narrative rupture in the text, provides the subversive force that, to paraphrase Félix Guattari, puts “the revolutionary libido in motion.” Italian feminist Leopoldina Fortunati explains the deeper revolutionary work of sexual counter-formations for women:

...heterosexuality is more than just the product of ideological pressure, of many diverse controls, for heterosexuality is the concrete outcome of the capitalist organization of interpersonal relationships. It is the result of specific, precise material processes. The spread of open homosexuality and lesbianism...does not therefore signify a sudden, simultaneous change in the sexual tastes of millions of people, rather it is a reflection of a widespread revolt and refusal of the capitalist organization of interpersonal relationships. It represents a profound crisis within the organization of reproduction itself.²⁴

No wonder, then, Betta impels the listener to “be brave”; in fact, Swinton speaks of Betta’s rejection of her fiancé Gregorio as a profoundly subversive act—more so than her lesbianism—because it is a refusal of reproducing patriarchal inheritance.

In essence, Betta figures what the 1966 group, Demau (for Demystification of [Patriarchal] Authoritarianism) strived for: “the symbolic revolution—the process of critical understanding and sociocultural change whereby women come to occupy the position of subject.”²⁵ Through a relationship of entrustment, “a term proposed by the Milan’s Women’s Collective to designate a relationship between two women in which...one woman gives her trust or entrusts herself symbolically to another woman, who thus becomes her guide, mentor, or point of reference—in short, the figure of symbolic mediation between her and the world,” Emma sees the world anew, “within a frame of reference no longer patriarchal or male-designed, but made up of perceptions, knowledges, attitudes, values, and modes of relating historically expressed by women for women—creating a female genealogy or a female symbolic.”²⁶ In a notable reversal of the mother-daughter structure, Betta becomes Emma’s point of reference, freeing Emma from the patriarchal institutions that imprison her. Thus, when Emma reads/hears/sees Betta’s confession of ‘love’, the camera flies up to the sky,

escaping the ancient patriarchal church walls that close in upon her where she sits. The verticality of the camera seems to be released from gravity at the very moment that Betta provides Emma another sort of model of love, one she will pursue with Antonio. Indeed, her affair begins with Emma's redefinition of love, which, in turn, leads to Emma's escape from the home, but one, in the final instance, blessed by the approving Betta, who condones Emma's final flight from the patriarchal home in the penultimate scene of the film.

In this way, *I Am Love* translates the central argument of feminist scholars Dalla Costa and James, when they assert: "women must...destroy the role of housewife...because *every sphere of capitalist organization presupposes the home.*"²⁷ Importantly, once Emma destroys this role within the film—her role within the bourgeois family—the family, and the reproduction of capital it represents, comes crashing down; the bourgeois family comes to an end, symbolically represented in the death of eldest son, Edo, and the miscarriage of the next generation—daughter-in-law Eva's fetus. Anti-social queer theorists have made similar arguments in that queerness figures antagonistically to the reproductive family and evokes the constitutive outside to heteropatriarchy, suggesting that it may have, as Lee Edelman has famously asserted, "no future." However, *I Am Love* takes this anti-reproductive thesis a step further—towards the opening up of dimensions of care and affect. To this extent, the film envisions the goals of the post-Operaismo movement through the erotic, inter-subjective relationship of Antonio and Emma/Kitesh. In their relationship, the film orchestrates the interrelated concepts of the earth, the world, and materiality that found the political issues of finitude and the possibility for the invention of (rather than the reproduction of) life. In their relationship is the figuration of the biopolitical—the adjoining of the peasant, agricultural movement, which dismantles the myth of the productivity of capitalist agriculture and the struggle of women against the unpaid, isolating "work of love". In Emma's melodramatic refusal to remain mother

and wife within the patriarchal family, a refusal developed out of a relationship of entrustment with Betta, there is hope. The rebirth of Kitesh and Antonio in the cave, which accompanies the end credits, insinuates an altogether different set of conditions of life and work; as Dalla Costa describes it, these conditions require “building networks of cooperation among subjects ethically determined to refuse any false solutions...the great battle for a different agriculture unites in the same struggle women—who are historically responsible for human reproduction—and peasants.”²⁸ In the words of *I Am Love*, these should not be envisioned as separate struggles but rather, to borrow, as the film does, from color theory’s notion of *ton sur ton*, they embody different shades and tones, but are indeed the same struggle.

¹ See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MwnBw2wJVAw>

² Thomas Elsaesser, “Tales of Sound and Fury: Observations on the Family Melodrama.” In *Movies and Methods, Vol. II*, Bill Nichols, ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985): 173.

³ Elsaesser 183.

⁴ Laura Mulvey, *Death at 24x A Second: Stillness and the Moving Image* (UK: Reaktion Books, 2006): 146.

⁵ See Michael Shapiro, *Cinematic Political Thought: Narrating Race, Nation and Gender* (New York: NYU Press, 1999).

⁶ Linda Williams, “Body Genres: Melodrama, Horror, Porn.” *Film Quarterly* 4 (Summer 1991): 2-13.

⁷ Mulvey 147.

⁸ See Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image* and *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986, 1989).

⁹ Teresa de Lauretis, *Sexual Difference: A Theory of Social Symbolic Practice* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990): 6.

¹⁰ Giovanna Franca Dalla Costa, *The Work of Love: The Role of Unpaid Housework as a Condition of Poverty and Violence at the Dawn of the 21st Century* (New York: Autonomedia, 2008): 43.

¹¹ Dalla Costa, 46

¹² Luca Guadagnino, dir. *I Am Love (Io Sono l'amour)*. Perf. Tilda Swinton. DVD. First Sun, 2009.

¹³ Dalla Costa, 34.

¹⁴ Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James. *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community* (Bristol: Falling Wall Press, 1975): 8.

¹⁵ Dalla Costa and James, 11.

¹⁶ Dalla Costa and James, 35.

¹⁷ Dalla Costa and James, 37-8.

¹⁸ Dalla Costa and James, 14.

¹⁹ Tilda Swinton, in an interview, tells of the origin of this name: "Kitesh is a legendary Russian village that was being ransacked by – I don't know who, the barbarians, of some kind – and the idea was that the village, when the marauders were coming, sank down into this lake. The village was located next to this very beautiful, clear lake. The idea is that it sank down into the lake to protect itself from the marauders, and you can go there now, and go see it in the lake, because it's so clear you can see the reflection. But that's what Kitesh is, and we called her Kitesh because of the idea that she would be submerged. She's not suppressed, oppressed, or repressed, in any way, but she is submerged. It's like she's waiting to come up, which she does, of course, at a point in the film. That's all we know." From "Interview: Tilda Swinton Talks *I Am Love*," with Mali Elfman. *Screen Crave*.

<http://screencrave.com/2010-06-18/interview-tilda-swinton-talks-i-am-love/> Accessed 5/15/2011.

²⁰ Robin Wood, *Personal Views: Explorations in Film*, Revised Edition (Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 2006), 398.

²¹ Wood 395.

²² Wood 396.

²³ Wood 398, 395.

²⁴ Leopoldina Fortunati, *The Arcane of Reproduction: Housework, Prostitution, Labor and Capital* (New York: Autonomedia, 1995): 24.

²⁵ de Lauretis, 5.

²⁶ de Lauretis, 8-10.

²⁷ Dalla Costa and James, 38.

²⁸ Mariarosa Dalla Costa, "Rustic and Ethical." *Ephemera*. 7.1 (2007): 114.