Screening Rooms: The Movie Theatre in/and the Gallery

Erika Balsom

JANET CARDIFF & GEORGE BURES MILLER *The Paradise Institute*, 2001. Interior view. Photo: Federico del Prete

The space looks as if it were still in the process of installation. Unused video monitors lay stacked in a corner, while elsewhere wires hang exposed and a clip of a "No Trespassing" sign from *Citizen Kane* (1941) impedes the viewer from obtaining a clear view of a video screening behind a metal fence. Three rooms have been transformed into a sort of necropolis of cinema, with a proliferation of tiny, LCD screens showing Bresson, Ray, and Rossellini like so many gravestones. A small train shuttles between two spaces named "Yesterday" and "The Day Before Yesterday," making its way through a hole that seems to have been haphazardly punched through the gallery wall. Is it a return to the playfulness of childhood, to the innocence of lost origins, to the 1895 screening of the Lumières? Does it look back at a mechanical age from within the electronic, or does it reference the deportations and mass death of the last century? Stripped of its monumentality and place in the public sphere, the big screen now appears small-scale, in an "exploded apartment,"[1] complete with an unmade bed. Screens appear everywhere, in various sizes and aspect ratios, to be encountered by a viewer who meanders through space. In the third room, titled "Today" and in which the toy locomotive tellingly does not travel, a makeshift kitchen entertains Ridley Scott's *Black Hawk Down* (2001) as a metonymic stand-in for the entire media-industrial complex of Hollywood alongside pornography, simulcast television (ESPN and TF1), and clippings from interior design magazines. It is this space of war, porn, and merchandise that most fiercely indicts the contemporary intersection of consumerism, the media, and the private domain. Here, the glittering surface of the commodity emits a blinding glare, which transforms one's perception of all objects it encounters, including, of course, art and cinema. Where and what is this garbage heap of culture? It is, in fact, Jean-Luc Godard's installation, *Voyage(s) en utopie, JLG, 1946-2006: à la recherche d'un théorème perdu (Voyage(s) in Utopia, JLG, 1946-2006: In Search of a Lost Theorem),* on view between 11 May and 14 August 2006 at the Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris.

The exhibition made use of the filmmaker's trademark temperament of equal parts humour, melancholy, and sangfroid to stage a major interrogation into the status of the moving image in contemporary culture. The single illuminated rectangle of the movie theatre has fractured into a proliferation of tiny screens of various sizes, dispersed across the entire cultural field. Many discussions of the transformations affecting contemporary media have focused on the analogue/digital distinction, primarily through recourse to the category of indexicality.[2] However, in addition to considerations of the image's material substrate, it is important to interrogate the new locations of the moving image and the new screens it occupies. For Godard, this means interrogating the privatization of cinema, as the collective experience of the movie theatre gives way to atomization of individual image consumption. Today, as Francesco Casetti suggests, the question must be not only the Bazinian "What is cinema?" but also the radically anti-essentialist "*Where* is cinema?"[3] An attention to the specificity of exhibition situation is necessary if we are to come to terms with expansions and mutations of moving images today. For the movie theatre is no longer the default site of cinematic spectatorship; far from it. Rather, the cinema has migrated to numerous new exhibition situations, changing these sites by its presence and, in turn, being changed by them. This means that movies are now viewed on airplanes, iPods, and laptops—all platforms geared towards an audience of one.

But, in addition to these private sites of spectatorship, cinema also finds new publics. Foremost among these are the art gallery and the museum. As much as the iPod-sized screens of *Voyage(s)* indicate an interest in the privatization of cinema, one must take note of the institutional site within which the installation is located, as well as the numerous references made throughout to the history of art and cinema in relation to it. Godard has long been interested in the position of cinema amongst the fine arts, from the presence of Élie Faure in the bathtub of *Pierrot le fou* (1965), through the tableaux of *Passion* (1982) and beyond. But although sections

of *Histoire(s) du cinéma* (1989-1998) were exhibited at Documenta 10 in 1997, and he was, with Anne-Marie Miéville, commissioned by the Museum of Modern Art, New York, to produce a documentary entitled *The Old Place* in 1998, this project marked the first time that the filmmaker had produced a work expressly for an installation context. In asserting cinema's presence in the contemporary museum, Godard is far from alone, as the gallery and the museum now constitute important spaces of cinema. Throughout the 1990s, one finds a multi-faceted cinematic invasion of the spaces of contemporary art: the most prominent artists—such as Matthew Barney, Tacita Dean, Douglas Gordon, or Pierre Huyghe—are no longer painters or sculptors but work in the medium of the moving image, while filmmakers such as Chantal Akerman, Atom Egoyan, Peter Greenaway, Abbas Kiarostami, and Chris Marker have made installation works. International exhibitions such as the Venice Biennale are filled with moving images. The products of the movie theatre are increasingly shown in gallery settings, and thematically curated group exhibitions on the notion of cinema, such as *Le Mouvement des images* (which shared space with *Voyage(s)* at the Pompidou in the summer of 2006) and *The Cinema Effect: Illusion, Reality, and the Moving Image* (Hirshhorn Museum, Washington, D.C., 2008), proliferate. This situation led Ursula Frohne to remark, "The museum itself is undergoing a metamorphosis, and is becoming a cinema in-process,"[4] while Hal Foster proclaimed film and video to be the "default media" of contemporary art.[5]

How might one describe the complex position occupied by the screens of cinema within the spaces of contemporary art? Cinema resides in the peculiar niche of being older than new (digital) media, but newer than old media, such as painting or sculpture. As much as cinema engages in a technologization of the museum, so too does it take refuge in that space at a time when its mass cultural position has been put in jeopardy by networked electronic media. As such, the integration of cinema into a gallery context is marked by a bidirectional movement between the spectacle of novelty and the quietness of obsolescence: cinema provides a guarantee of accessibility and a promise of entertainment through an availability of spectacular forms, but seen as an "old medium," it also appears as a lost object to be commemorated. In this sense, cinema in the gallery may be seen as both a *part of* and a *reaction to* the increased mobility of images stemming from convergence. It is a *part of* digital convergence, as it is representative of the shattering of cinema across the cultural field, with the gallery as one of the new locations it inhabits. The new presence of cinema in the gallery extends cinema beyond itself, subjecting it to new economic and institutional determinations. And yet, it *reacts to* this situation by providing a space to comment on the dissolution of cinema as an entity discernibly from image culture at large and by possibly guarding against this dispersion. The cinema-beyond-cinema of the gallery can offer a way of interrogating film history and medium specificity precisely as the medium undergoes significant transformations. Within the gallery walls, cinema is not only a machine of spectacle, but also a loved entity in danger of disappearance. The white cube serves as a tomb that might house an embalmed cinema, newly minted as a precious and highly cathected object.

In the words of Antoine de Baecque, "A mystery constructs itself before our eyes: the *gift of aura*, a way, perhaps, of thinking about the *museification* of cinema."[6] This occurs in the work of Tacita Dean, an artist who makes use of 16mm film to privilege ruined and disappearing subjects. But one might also find this "gift of aura" in another tendency of contemporary art that deals with cinema: a retrospective valorisation of the traditional site of cinematic spectatorship, the movie theatre. For Godard, the many miniature screens of *Voyage(s) en utopie* emerge as so many tombstones standing in for the absent majesty of the cinema hall, calling attention to the ramifications of the changing exhibition situations that mark the early twenty-first century. The presence of the atomized screens of private, digital-image consumption bitterly comments on the current state of the cinema, as its fate as a public institution lies in jeopardy. For other artists, there is an attempt to

recover the space of the movie theatre as a site of inter-subjective, public experience. Tinged with nostalgia, many of these projects reflect on the movie theatre as a lost site of relationality.

While acts of mourning for the lost space of the movie theatre are visible in contemporary feature films such as Lisandro Alonso's *Fantasma* (2006), Tsai Ming-Liang's *Goodbye, Dragon Inn* (*Bu San*, 2003) and Brillante Mendoza's *Serbis* (2008), the interest in commemorating cinema necessarily takes on an altered valence when it stems from a different institutional site, the art gallery. In an exhibition such as *Hall of Mirrors: Art and Film Since 1945*, curated by Kerry Brougher for the Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles, in 1996, one has the sense that art provides a locus from which to reflect on the history of cinema as a completed enterprise. Similarly, Mark Lewis' *Cinema Museum* (2008), a 36-minute video made for a gallery context, guides its viewer through the collections of film memorabilia, ephemera, and technology housed at the Cinema Museum in London. As Lewis winds through the cluttered and deteriorating collections into the room that houses the museum's film canisters, the manager leading the walk-through makes a crucial slip of the tongue that betrays the investment of the whole enterprise: "Most of the film, professional film, is—*was* 35mm…" It is, however, not merely a matter of material substrate. Throughout the video, this woman makes reference to the "sensuousness" of the movie theatre experience, guiding Lewis through lobby cards, projectors, hand-painted signs advertising De Palma's *Dressed to Kill* (1980), and even ushers' uniforms—all recalling a lost era now memorialized within the spaces of contemporary art.

This may be dismissed as "nothing but nostalgia," or as the product of a dangerous romanticization, but the mere prevalence of such a position demands that it be taken seriously and then interrogated to determine the desires and anxieties to which it responds. At stake is not merely an anxiety over the loss of analogue film, but equally a fear about the lack of sitedness of today's mobile screens. In the face of such nomadism, one finds meditations on the traditional architectural situation of cinema coming from within the gallery walls. Through an examination of several artworks that explicitly take up the "where" of the moving image, this essay will open a larger problematic concerning the relationship between two of cinema's screening rooms—the movie theatre and the gallery. For as cinema moves to numerous new spaces, it becomes important to think about the sitedness of screens. Far more than just a support for an incandescent image, the screen is a nucleus around which a complex aggregate of practices, affects, and relations condense. As screen culture changes, so do these notions, making their examination all the more vital.

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

In his essay, "Leaving the Movie Theatre," Roland Barthes writes, "Whenever I hear the word *cinema*, I can't help thinking *hall*, rather than *film*."[7] Though sometimes forgotten, the architectural specificity of the movie theatre has long been an important component of the cinema, contributing to the particularity of the mode of spectatorship it elicits, as much as do shot-reverse shot structures, eye-line matches, or whether a movie being watched is on film or on video. The exhibition situation of the moving image has profound implications for spectatorial experience: does one sit immobile or walk about? Watch from start-to-finish or view a snippet and move along? Is the room dark or well-lit? Does the screen dwarf the spectator's body, or is it smaller and more easily apprehendable in its totality? Does one have to give oneself over to the temporality of the film or is there a possibility of rewinding, pausing, and fast-forwarding? These questions point to some of the many variables of exhibition that influence the reception of the moving image. Throughout film history, the movie theatre has been much more than a mere spatial container for the products of film industries worldwide.

HIROSHI SUGIMOTO *Orinda Theater, Orinda,* 1992, gelatin silver print, 119.4 x 149.2 cm (47 x 58.75 inches). ©Hiroshi Sugimoto. Courtesy Gagosian Gallery

Rather, it is a highly cathected space with a ritualistic value, which has led to its characterization as a kind of secular cathedral imbued with an eroticism missing from today's culture of DVDs and downloading. Today, as what was once the default situation of cinematic spectatorship becomes increasingly rarefied, one finds a marked interest in excavating the specificity of this mode of exhibition, the affects and experiences it elicits.

The photographs comprising Hiroshi Sugimoto's *Theaters* series (1978-present) have attained an iconic status in recent years, as the instantly recognizable long exposures of movie theatres function almost as melancholic love letters written to a lost experience. Sugimoto's theatres are invariably devoid of people, vacated spaces displaced into a frozen timelessness so as to hypostatize their mortification. The long exposure, taken over the duration of the projection of a film, results in the screen appearing as a blinding white rectangle, as the seriality of the *défilement* turns into a superimposition, which produces an image that is at once the totality of the projected film and its negation. The photographic series shows many different cinemas from all over the world, each with its own architectural characteristics. But all share two commonalities: they are all empty and their films may no longer be seen. As the movie theatre is vacated, its architectural specificity and its function as an important site of public experience and sociality throughout the twentieth century are left behind.

Meanwhile, Zubin Pastakia's *The Cinemas Project* (2006-2008) opposes Sugimoto in its employment of rich colour and of inhabited spaces, but shares with the *Theaters* series a threnodic tenor. *The Cinemas Project*

documents run-down, single-screen theatres in Mumbai, many of which have closed or are in financial jeopardy due to the wave of multiplexes that is sweeping the country. If the Art Deco pastiche familiar from multiplex architecture engages in a postmodernist nostalgia symptomatic of a waning of history, Pastakia's investigation of these cinemas takes up another nostalgia, one with a very different temporality. Here, we encounter the pathos of the ruin, the palimpsestic inscription of these spaces, as they descend throughout time, marked by decades of functioning as a horizon of public experience.

Before the availability of home-viewing technologies, the allure of the movie theatre was such an integral part of film-going that studio head Marcus Loew had cause to remark, "We sell tickets to theatres, not movies."[8] Barthes describes the experience of the movie theatre as inextricably bound to the eroticism of the big city, as a somehow intimate experience of public space that stands over and above the domestication of cinema to be found in small-scale television viewing:

> In this darkness of the cinema (anonymous, populated, numerous—oh, the boredom, the frustration of so-called private showings!) lies the very fascination of the film (any film). Think of the contrary experience: on television, where films are also shown, no fascination; here darkness is erased, anonymity repressed; space is familiar, articulated (by furniture, known objects), tamed...the *eroticisation* of the place is foreclosed...[9]

Along with the images, the spectator sees on the screen the experience of the dark room, where the immobile viewer is paradoxically alone in a crowd, contributes to the specificity of cinema spectatorship. The darkened theatre is a site of erotic possibility and clandestine encounter, whose pleasures redouble those culled from the entertainment onscreen. The anonymous relationality activated by this space, the darkness, the giganticism of the screen, the imperceptible rhythms of the flicker emanating from the projector—all these elements contribute to the particularity of the mode of spectatorship elicited by the traditional architectural situation of cinema. These attributes serve to buttress the powers of the film itself, consolidating the spectator's attentive fascination and engrossment.

While Godard's *Voyage(s) en utopie* hyperbolically performs the contemporary domestication of cinema, elsewhere in contemporary art, the move away from the movie theatre has prompted a retrospective consideration of the affective economy of this architecture of exhibition. A little like love at *last* sight, there is a fascination with the black box of cinema stemming from within the white cube of the gallery that seizes on the movie theatre's function as a horizon of public experience. In *The Paradise Institute* (2001), produced for the Canadian Pavilion at the Venice Biennale, Janet Cardiff and George Bures Miller fabricated a plywood replica of a cinema, measuring 168.3 cubic metres. The viewer steps out of the white cube of the gallery and into another realm, up a few stairs and into a dimly lit interior, furnished with two rows of recognizable red velvet seats, sixteen in total. Taking a seat and donning the headphones provided, the viewer is transported into a classic movie palace. The perspectival model in front of the viewer makes it appear as though he or she is seated in the movie theatre's mezzanine, overlooking snippets of a noir-horror playing to an empty house. As the "film" begins, the visitor is advised that he or she is expected to stay for the duration of the programme—13 minutes—thus aligning the spectatorial practice of *The Paradise Institute* more with the start-to-finish viewing of the cinema than with the passing glance of the gallery. Just as the viewer settles in to watch the movie, a cell phone rings, someone coughs, a woman wonders aloud if she left the stove on when leaving the house. But where are these sounds coming from? The use of binaural audio contributes to a sense of surround sound that blurs distinctions between sound coming from the headphones and sound of one's own physical space. As such, the viewer's

experience splinters into three: there is the diegetic world onscreen; the simulated surroundings of the movie theatre delivered via headphones; and, of course, the space of the gallery itself. While, certainly, after the initial surprise, it becomes possible to disentangle the three regimes, the fiction-effect of *The Paradise Institute* is powerful. Throughout the piece, these conflicting spatial determinations confront one another, explicitly engineering a meeting between black box and white cube. As Andrew Uroskie has written, "The word 'paradise' stems from the Ancient Persian for 'walled-off space,' and *The Paradise Institute* stages what is ultimately a crisis of boundaries…. *The Paradise Institute*…in its very name conflates fantasy with containment, ancient myth with modern medicalization…."[10] The connotations of containment and scientific experimentation bear clear likenesses to the pristine white cube, while fantasy and the otherworldly are linked to the ability of cinema to transport its viewer into other spaces and other times. As such, Cardiff and Miller's installation is a kind of laboratory that dissects the affective economies of cinema-going and holds them up for examination next to those of the gallery.

In this respect, it is markedly different than an earlier model cinema drawn from art history: Robert Smithson's *Towards the Development of a "Cinema Cavern" or the Movie Goer as Spelunker* (1971). Smithson's project played on the term "underground cinema" and the proto-cinematic resonances of Plato's myth of the cave by proposing a cinema located literally below ground.[11] The spelunking moviegoer would travel down a passage to reach a projection booth constructed of rough wood, with rocks to sit on. This cave theatre would show only one movie: a documentary called *The Making of Cinema Cavern*, thereby closing off the cinematic experience into a solipsistic loop a little like the Ouroboros, the snake that swallows its own tail. The *Cinema Cavern* is very much in line with the thoughts concerning cinematic spectatorship that Smithson advances in "A Cinematic Atopia," a text from 1971: "The ultimate film goer would be a captive of sloth. Sitting constantly in a movie house, among the flickering shadows, his perception would take on a kind of sluggishness, he would be the hermit dwelling amongst the elsewheres, forgoing the salvation of reality."[12] The torpor Smithson describes results in a blurring of perception and a "dozing consciousness."[13] In conceiving of filmic spectatorship in this way, Smithson is very much in line with the mainstream of 1970s film theory. Figures such as Christian Metz and Jean-Louis Baudry linked the darkness of the theatre, the immobility of the spectator, and the hypertrophy of vision at the expense of decreased motor capacity to a regressive state, which enables identificatory processes and sets up a transcendental subjection position, shot through with idealism.[14] Working thus to achieve the spectator's uncritical absorption in the fiction, the *dispositif* of cinematic spectatorship was seen as an agent of profound ideological mystification. While surely these accounts are invaluable contributions to an understanding of spectatorship, it is important to see them as located within the development of film theory, and its interest in both psychoanalysis and ideology critique, as well as to place them in relation to historical changes in the institution of cinema and the image-regimes that form a part of our daily lives.

By 1975, Barthes had already fastened on to the centrality of publicity in the cinema experience; now, when images are increasingly consumed individually and/or in private settings, such a characteristic comes to greater importance when considering the specificity of the space of the movie theatre. Equally important within the frenetic montage aesthetics of contemporary media, with its regime of the glance replacing that of the gaze, is the temporal relation enabled by the cinema hall. The immobile spectator is party to an implicit contract to give him or herself over to the temporality of film, to confront whatever may come. Of course, one is always free to look away or to get up and leave; but the power of the movie theatre is precisely this ability to harness the spectator's attention through a relinquishing of the ability to change the channel, fast-forward, or skip a

page. While in the 1970s this was seen as a dangerous passivity, the act of looking long and hard can in fact be an important and politically invested gesture in today's visual culture. One might think here of the insistence of Dutch artists Willem de Rijke and Jeroen de Rooij that their gallery-based films be shown at scheduled screening times, with the viewer expected to stay for the duration, or James Benning's refusal to issue his intensely duration-based works, such as *TEN SKIES* (2004), on DVD or to exhibit them in a gallery setting. As T.J. Clark has put it, "[O]ne kind of corrective to dogma is looking itself, pursued long enough."[15] If absorption was once a quality of bourgeois aesthetics to be overthrown in the name of distanciation, in the contemporary media environment, its valence has changed. A chronopolitics of the image for a digital age imparts a changed value to the cinema spectator's concentration, very far from the mystified dupe of 1970s film theory.

Typically, the spectator of moving images within the gallery moves throughout space, consuming at his or her own pace images that are (for the most part) not meant for start-to-finish viewing. This constitutes a remarkable difference from the spectator of the movie theatre, who sits immobile in a crowd throughout a given duration. Dominique Païni has likened gallery spectatorship to the Baudelairean *flâneur* due to the spectator's desultory movement through space. While the concept of the *flâneur* has been invoked so frequently and loosely within the discipline of film studies so as to render it little more than a petrified *cliché*, its suitability for the gallery spectator rests not only in the emphasis on perambulation, but also on the comparison between gallery spectatorship and window shopping. For within what Rosalind Krauss has called the "late capitalist museum," the prevalence of large-scale moving images contributes greatly to a new spectacularization of art marked by qualities of commodification and fragmentation. In Krauss' view, this new technologized museum will have more in common with Disneyland than with its previous incarnation:

> Thus it will be dealing with mass markets, rather than art markets, and with simulacral experience rather than aesthetic immediacy….The industrialized museum has a need for the technologized subject, the subject in search not of affect but intensities, the subject who experiences its fragmentation as euphoria, the subject whose field of experience is no longer history, but space itself…[16]

In a similar vein, Païni writes that, "*Flâneurie* arises from this sort of deception in regard to images that simultaneously offer themselves up spectacularly while receding semantically, according to the model of objects of consumption in shop windows that attract aesthetically but economically remain unavailable."[17] The spectacularly immersive experience of large-scale moving image installations, such as Doug Aitken's *Sleepwalkers*, commissioned by the MoMA and Creative Time in 2007, or Matthew Barney's *Cremaster Cycle* (1994–2002), cannot be far behind.[18] Such a state of affairs makes it all the more surprising that throughout art-related critical literature concerning the spectatorial position created by moving image installations, one finds a comparison between the "passive" spectator of the movie theatre and the "active" spectator of the gallery, as if physical mobility functions as a guarantee of criticality.[19] Very often, cinematic spectatorship functions as a kind of straw-man against which the inherent critical value of gallery spectatorship is asserted, with film spectatorship swiftly reduced to nothing but a duped infantilization. As Liz Kotz remarks, "[R]ecent art-critical accounts employ emphatically reductive understandings of the filmic apparatus…."[20] It is merely fact that the film spectator sits immobile in the red velvet seat, whereas the gallery spectator wanders through space. However, the comparisons between the cinema hall and the gallery rest on a spurious mapping of passive/active binaries onto this architectural difference, as if to conflate physical stasis with regressive mystification and physical ambulation with clear-sighted, intellectual engagement.

This, of course, recalls the link between spectatorial immobility and the impression of reality put forth in Jean-Louis Baudry's "The Apparatus: Metapsychological Approaches to the Impression of Reality in the Cinema," a text taken as doxa in many art critical accounts. Unfortunately, this text not only fails to interrogate the ideological determinations of the gallery space, but also ignores the decades of work on film spectatorship that has taken place since the canonical accounts of the 1970s,[21] as well as the enormous changes in the institution of cinema and its exhibition practices since that time. As Mark Nash cautions, "there can be no necessary connection between a particular formal approach to the conditions in which a work is experienced (e.g., in creating a mobile spectator) and a presumed radicality."[22] How might one diagnose this obsessive return to the denigration of the movie theatre? Might there be a symptomatic repression at play here? As previously noted, the positing of a strict determinism between the architecture of exhibition and a critical spectator disallows any questioning into the ideological determinations of the gallery space, which is seen as inherently demystifying. When one examines the presence of the moving image in contemporary art and the status of the museum today, there emerges an unmistakable relationship to spectacular immersion that the focus on the inherent critical activity of the gallery spectator might seek to mask. Thankfully, the spurious account of movie theatre spectatorship that is perpetuated by curators and art critics is refuted from within the domain of artistic practice: it is here, in works such as *The Paradise Institute*, that one finds a reflection on the temporal and experiential specificities of the movie theatre as a historical institution.

Rather than the analgesic haze described by Smithson, Baudry, and some contemporary curators and art critics, the conception of filmic spectatorship put forth by *The Paradise Institute* more closely resembles the crystalline refractions of yet another artist's model for an unbuilt cinema, Dan Graham's *Cinema* (1981). Graham's *Cinema* occupies (in theory, at least—it was never built) the corner of a ground floor of a Miesian office building. The screen is placed across the corner, with the two adjacent walls made of a kind of glass that is transparent from the side of lesser illumination and a mirror from the side of greater illumination. The projected film is visible to passers-by outside, albeit silent and reversed. When the cinema is darker than the street outside (as would most likely be the case during the projection of a film), passing pedestrians are not able to see the spectators seated inside; from the outside the glass will appear as a mirror. While the film plays, the spectators will also be able to see what takes place outside, introducing a permeability of spaces that blends the experience of the film with the experience of the city.

When the house lights are up, though, the walls resume their mirror-function to reflect back the mass of people surrounding one in the audience, resulting in an increased consciousness of the composition of the crowd. What may be seen from a given perspective will shift with changing states of light, setting up a play between the structures of voyeurism commonly said to be central to the affective economy of film spectatorship and the voyeurism of city dweller who glances furtively at strangers and peeps through illuminated windows. As Thomas Keenan has noted, the window is not only "the opening in the wall constitutive of the distinction between public and private, it is also the breaching of that distinction itself."[23] Graham's *Cinema* plays on this function of the window as both barrier and transgression, using this architectural confusion as a way to conceptualize how relationships between public and private are negotiated in the movie theatre. For it is surely a space of the narcissistic screen-mirror, but not always. It equally offers a location where individual boundaries are compromised in a public experience of collectivity. Splintering into oneiric languor, intellectual engagement, phantasmatic mobility, and public intimacy, the multiple facets of the spectatorship elicited by the movie theatre are held up as conflicting but coexistent elements of a specific aesthetic experience that is at once personal and intersubjective. In short, the interest of *The Paradise Institute* and *Cinema* lies in seeing the cinema

situation as one that is inherently social and public, in some sense as the antithesis of Peter Kubelka's *Invisible Cinema* project, which operated at the Lafayette Street location of Anthology Film Archives between 1970 and 1974.

Kubelka, for the *Invisible Cinema* project, erected a barrier between each spectator so as to block peripheral vision and "make the screen [the viewer's] whole world, by eliminating all aural and visual impressions extraneous to film."[24] By contrast, in *The Paradise Institute*, one's experience is always divided between an interest in what takes place on screen and one's bodily location within the theatre as a part of the provisional collectivity of the audience. This double consciousness is not merely a curious fascination with one's cinema neighbour; it can also prompt a critical awareness of the conditions in which images are consumed. In "Leaving the Movie Theatre," Barthes writes,

> But there is another way of going to the movies (besides being armed by the discourse of counter-ideology); by letting oneself be fascinated *twice over*, by the image and its surroundings—as if I had two bodies at the same time: a narcissistic body which gazes, lost, into the engulfing mirror, and a perverse body, ready to fetishize not the image but precisely what exceeds it: the texture of the sound, the hall, the darkness, the obscure mass of other bodies…in short, in order to distance, in order to "take off," I complicate a "relation" by a "situation."[25]

Instead of calling for "the destruction of pleasure as a radical weapon,"[26] Barthes advocates a kind of double consciousness that investigates the fascination of the cinema by examining the larger institutional *dispositif* of which it is a part. The "perverse body," literally, the body that faces the wrong way (from the Latin *perversus*), turns away from the screen to also fetishize a public ritual. Going against Baudry's prescription for Brechtian strategies of distanciation effected through textual mechanisms,[27] Barthes suggests another way of "getting to the bottom" of cinema's fascination. Barthes makes use of a third term that would rupture the spectator-screen dyad by introducing an attention to that which exceeds the image. It is this method of replacing a "relation" by a "situation" that is staged by *The Paradise Institute*. The film onscreen is in fragments at best: a nurse, a burning house, and a sleeping man appear but are never sutured into a legible narrative. Instead, the real interest here is in who may be sitting next to you. The work mobilizes the cinema situation to stage a relationality normally missing from the spaces of art. Is art, then, the institute that studies cinema as a paradise lost? Perhaps. When compared to the atomization of individual viewing typical of moving image consumption on the Internet, or the autonomous visitor wandering through the gallery space,[28] *The Paradise Institute* asserts the movie theatre as a site where one is proximate with strangers throughout a given duration, thereby reflecting on an experience other than that most often encountered in contemporary life, both within and without the gallery.

This particular form of public intimacy is also present in Douglas Gordon's film programming works. Gordon has, along with his many video installations made using recycled footage from classical Hollywood, engaged in several projects in which the artist takes on the role of film programmer. Perhaps the most significant is his *Cinéma Liberté Bar Lounge,* made in collaboration with Rikrit Tiravanija. First installed at the FRAC Languedoc-Roussillon in Montpellier, the work consisted of two components: Gordon's *Cinéma Liberté,* a screening space, and Tiravanija's *Bar Lounge,* where visitors could enjoy coffee, wine, popcorn, and fruit. Reconstructed in Rotterdam in 1996 for Manifesta 1 and in New York City in 2008 as a part of the *anyspacewhatever* exhibition at the Guggenheim Museum, the films programmed for this project vary according to the location of installation, as they are chosen from a list of movies that had been banned or censored in the region.[29] Whereas *The Paradise Institute* makes use of fiction to interrogate the public experience of the movie theatre, *Cinéma Liberté,* linked as it is to the tendency of what Nicolas Bourriaud named "relational

aesthetics," attempts to resurrect such conditions by staging them within the gallery space. Gordon and Tiravanija's installations are less interested in asserting the gallery as a new site of film exhibition as they are in investigating how to make use of cinema's status as a reservoir of public desires and anxieties to activate the gallery as a space in which these investments might be negotiated. By showing films that were once banned or censored, the installation leads its viewer to reflect on the historicity of social mores (for a film such as Lang's *Scarlet Street* hardly seems controversial today, as an example), as well as the power structures that continue to legislate what gets seen and what does not. The concept of relational aesthetics, which Bourriaud has explicitly described as arising in contrast to the image of sociality put forth by the Internet age,[30] posits the artwork as a "social interstice"; accordingly, a relational art would take "as its theoretical horizon the realm of human interactions and its social context rather than the assertion of an independent and *private* symbolic space."[31] *Cinéma Liberté Bar Lounge* calls upon cinema as a way of reviving a "lost horizon" of public experience wherein temporary and provisional collectivities might be formed through the face-to-face encounter. While electronic media without doubt generate new public spheres, these differ drastically in character from that of the movie theatre before them, particularly with respect to a networked commons being formed at the expense of physical togetherness. As Miriam Hansen has shown, in its early decades, the cinema functioned as an important public sphere, with its practices of collective reception allowing audiences to negotiate the desires and anxieties, which stemmed from an experience of technologized modernity.[32] Now, however, the movie theatre functions as a form of counter-publicity, standing against the dominant practices of individual reception common to wireless and electronic media. Hansen is clear about the role digital convergence plays in her emphasis on the cinema as public sphere: she writes that her work is "motivated by an awareness that the cinema, as a public institution, is vanishing fast, and with it the unfulfilled promises of film history."[33] While it may be "vanishing fast" from most sectors of culture, it is appearing with an increasing frequency in the spaces of contemporary art, which take up the task of forging a "politics of relationality [*Zusammenhang*]."[34]

What happens to the experience of the movie theatre when cinema is transported into the white cube? *The Paradise Institute* successfully uses fiction to posit the relationality of cinema as standing against that of the gallery, while *Cinéma Liberté Bar Lounge* attempts to transport one into the other. Most visitors to this latter installation, however, simply walk by, glance at the film, and maybe drink a quick espresso (the Guggenheim's *anyspacewhatever* exhibition was conveniently sponsored by *Illy*). A sense of public debate or collective experience can never quite break through the austere protocols of the white cube, with the result that visitors wander past just long enough to "get it" and then move on. Where is the relationality? Nothing "hangs together," as little more is seen than a snippet of old film, if that. As Sven Lütticken has put it, such works "seem to produce little more than PR for the art work itself, which is posited as a harmonious sociopolitical enclave set apart from the big bad world."[35] In this sense, *Cinéma Liberté*, far from contesting the autonomy of the white cube by insisting on the production of a social relation, as it purports to do, in fact reinforces the separateness of art and life. *Cinéma Liberté Bar Lounge* is exemplary of the problematic that emerges when the gallery becomes the site of a new, displaced cinema. Though it is an increasingly frequent exhibition site for historical products of the movie theatre, as well as the location of important new filmmaking practices, the gallery possesses its own rules of conduct and architectural determinations with which one must grapple. One must interrogate how the exhibition of cinema interacts with what the gallery needs, limits, and affords.

And so we return again to Godard's *Voyage(s) en utopie*. Having questioned the status of the museum throughout his career, it comes as little surprise that for his first installation work, Godard would take up an investigation into the contemporary status of the institution. If, nearly a century ago, Walter Benjamin hoped

that mechanical reproduction would liquidate the categories of bourgeois aesthetics and make way for a politicization of the aesthetic, today it is clear that the threat posed by media, such as photography and film—thought to rupture the autonomy of art through their inherent reproducibility and their necessary reference to something other than themselves (i.e., the world)—has been thoroughly recuperated. The economy of reproducibility inherent to film and video has been "reined in" by the purposeful scarcity of collectible limited editions, in which a film print can easily sell for six figures.[36] Meanwhile, on the terrain of exhibition, film and video are marshalled for their ability to provide spectacular entertainment appealing to the broadest possible audience. As Alexander Horwath, head of the Austrian Film Museum put it,

> this critical idea of exploding cinema or expanding cinema in the 1960s and 1970s has now turned into another connotation of the word "expansion." Now it's about expanding with cinema. By that, I mean museums and the museum structure using moving imagery as a part of their shopping mall.[37]

As much as Godard satirizes the proliferation of tiny screens that is the hallmark of digital image consumption, he also calls attention to the crisis of the contemporary museum, suggesting that the very same factors causing alarms to sound about the "death of cinema" have an equal impact on the museum, for both institutions are implicated in the predicament of what happens to the public culture of the twentieth century within the digital mobility of the twenty-first. He patently denies the white cube's mythic status as an "expensive" and "timeless" space,[38] abiding instead by a statement he made in *The Old Place*: "Art is not sheltered from time, it is the place where time resides." This is to refuse the spurious eternity conferred upon art by its institutional frame, instead seeing it as constantly in dialogue with the contingencies of culture at large and as a privileged site where the movements of history become visible. It is this understanding of the relationship between art, cinema, the museum, and history that *Voyage(s) en utopie* takes as its central concern. Today, this means confronting the possibility that cinema's entry into the museum is as much a matter of that institution's desire to (post)modernize by providing an experience of technological seduction that would guarantee box office revenues, as it is of benevolently providing a tomb for a "dead" medium. The museum, too, is a branch of the culture industries, and, at present, cinema offers itself as a valuable resource to be tapped in the endless drive for new products and expanding markets.

Serge Daney has written in a very different context of a "Godardian pedagogy,"[39] but one might say that here, as well, Godard has much to teach. For, in large part, the discipline of film studies has been noticeably silent on this new sector of film practice and the relationships between art, cinema, digital convergence, and the museum that are activated within it. Jean-Christophe Royoux calls it the "cinema of exhibition," while Raymond Bellour and Jacques Rancière refer to an "other cinema."[40] But one might best speak of an "*othered* cinema," a hybrid cinema that has become other to itself—at once a part of and differing from the cinema as traditionally conceived. Certainly, the structures of distribution (the limited edition as collectible *objet d'art*) and exhibition (the gallery space) are markedly different from the classical cinema. But at a time when the movie theatre has become only one of a multitude of sites for the consumption of moving images and cinema finds itself dispersed beyond recognition, one must relinquish the old fiction of the purity of media to interrogate the new aggregates cinema enters into today. Amidst widespread fears concerning the "death of cinema," digitization is most often seen as a supreme villain that will wipe out "our dear cinema." However, as Bellour has emphasized, technological convergence is not just a homogenizing motion; rather, it is a dialectical movement that compromises boundaries between media at the same time as it allows new considerations of medium

specificity to come to the fore under the spectre of obsolescence.[41] In this respect, rather than simply participating in the dissolution of cinema, contemporary art—by interrogating film history and providing a space for new filmmaking practices—can be said to produce a reflection on what the cinema has been and might still be. One might venture that these works *exhibit cinema* in a double sense: they move it out of the movie theatre into the space of exhibition, surely, but they also exhibit it in the sense of holding it up for view, subjecting it to examination.[42] They do so, however, within a space that has its own ideological and architectural determinations that must always be taken into account—foremost among them, the increasing spectacularization of the museum. The task today is to examine the multiple and contradictory readings produced by such practices, so as to both produce a *compte rendu* of an important new branch of moving image production and to trace the contemporary contours of an increasingly elusive object, the cinema.

ENDNOTES

1 Bamchade Pourvali, *Voyage(s) en utopie, Jean-Luc Godard, 1946-2006: à la recherche d'un théorème perdu* exhibition pamphlet (Paris: Centre Georges Pompidou, 2006)

2 See, for example: Laura Mulvey, "The Index and the Uncanny," *Death 24x a Second: Stillness and the Moving Image* (London: Reaktion, 2006), 54-66

3 Francesco Casetti, "The Filmic Experience: An Introduction," 14; available online:
<http://www.francescocasetti.net/saggi/FilmicExperience.pdf>

4 Ursula Frohne, "Dissolution of the Frame: Immersion and Participation in Video Installations," *The Moving Image and Art: A Critical Reader,* ed. Tanya Leighton (London: Tate Publishing, 2008), 357

5 Hal Foster, "Roundtable: The Projected Image In Contemporary Art," *October,* no. 104 (Spring 2003): 93

6 Antoine de Baecque, "*Passages de l'image*: Iconoclastes, iconolâtres," *Cahiers du cinéma,* no. 435 (September 1990): 59; translation mine.

7 Roland Barthes, "Leaving the Movie Theatre," *The Rustle of Language,* trans. Richard Howard (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd), 346

8 Quoted in: John Margolies and Emily Gwathmey, *Ticket to Paradise: American Movie Theaters and How We Had Fun,* (Boston: Bulfinch Press, 1992), 14

9 Barthes, 346

10 Andrew Uroskie, "Siting Cinema," *Art and the Moving Image: A Critical Reader,* ed. Tanya Leighton (London: Tate Publishing, 2008), 389

11 Interestingly, in the same year as his plan for the *Cinema Cavern*, Smithson also made sketches of an underground museum to be located near the Golden Spike National Historic Site in Utah, close to but more accessible than his *Spiral Jetty*. This museum was to include an underground projection room to show Smithson's film, *Spiral Jetty,* which the viewer would reach via a spiral staircase. See: George Baker, "The Cinema Model," *Robert Smithson: Spiral Jetty,* ed. Lynne Cooke and Karen Kelly (Berkeley and New York: University of California Press and Dia Art Foundation, 2005), 79-81

12 Robert Smithson, "A Cinematic Atopia," *Robert Smithson: The Collected Writings,* ed. Jack Flan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 141

13 Ibid., 142

14 See: Jean-Louis Baudry, "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus," trans. Alan Williams, *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader,* ed. Philip Rosen (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 286-298; Jean-Louis Baudry, "The Apparatus: Metapsychological Approaches to the Impression of Reality in the Cinema," trans. Jean Andrews and Bertrand Augst, *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader,* ed. Philip Rosen (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 299-318; and Christian Metz, "Identification, Mirror," *The Imaginary Signifier: Psychoanalysis and the Cinema,* trans. Celia Britton, Annwyl Williams, Ben Brewster, and Alfred Guzzetti (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1982), 42-57

15 Later in *The Sight of Death: An Experiment in Art Writing,* Clark expands on this idea: "[O]ur present means of image production strike me as…an instrumentation of a certain kind of language use: their notions of image clarity, image flow, image depth, and image density are all determined by the parallel (unimpeded) movement of the logo, the brand name, the product slogan, the compressed pseudo-narrative of the TV commercial, the sound bite, the T-shirt confession, the chat show Q & A. Billboards, web pages, and video games are just projections—perfections, perfected banalizations—of this half-verbal exchange. They are truly (as their intellectual groupies go on claiming) a 'discourse'—read a sealed echo-chamber of lies." See: T.J. Clark, *The Sight of Death: An Experiment in Art Writing* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 12 and 176

16 Rosalind Krauss, "The Cultural Logic of the Late Capitalist Museum," *October,* no. 54 (Autumn 1990): 17

17 Dominique Païni, *Le Temps exposé: le cinéma de la salle au musée* (Paris: Cahiers du cinéma, 2002), 71; translation mine.

18 In a roundtable entitled "The Predicament of Contemporary Art," Benjamin Buchloh has pointedly defined Barney as "proto-totalitarian artist…a small-time American Richard Wagner who mythifies the catastrophic conditions of existence under late capital." For Alexandra Keller and Frazer Ward, *The Cremaster Cycle* engages in a spectacularization of performance, which neutralizes the political critique that has historically resided in that genre of artistic production, instead taking up the double model of the blockbuster film (*Star Wars*) and the blockbuster exhibition (King Tut at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, in 1976). See: Benjamin Buchloh, "Roundtable: The Predicament of Contemporary Art," *Art Since 1900: Modernism, Antimodernism, Postmodernism* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2004), 673; Alexandra Keller and Frazer Ward,

"Matthew Barney and the Paradox of the Neo-Avant-Garde Blockbuster," *Cinema Journal,* vol. 45, no. 2 (Winter 2006): 11

19 This is so commonly proclaimed so as to become a familiar refrain. For several examples, see: Catherine Fowler, "Room for Experiment: Gallery Films and Vertical Time from Maya Deren to Eija–Liisa Ahtila," *Screen,* vol. 45, no. 4 (Winter 2004): 343; Chrissie Iles, *Into the Light: The Projected Image in American Art, 1964-1977* (New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 2001), 34-35; Tanya Leighton, "Introduction," *Art and the Moving Image: A Critical Reader* (London: Tate Publishing, 2008), 29; and Andrew Uroskie, *Between the Black Box and the White Cube: Warhol, Expanded Cinema, and the Emergence of the Moving Image in Art, 1963-1965,* unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Department of Rhetoric, University of California at Berkeley (2005), 17.

20 Liz Kotz, "Video Projection: The Space Between Spaces" *Art and the Moving Image: A Critical Reader,* ed. Tanya Leighton (London: Tate Publishing, 2008), 380

21 To encapsulate the bibliography of challenges to *Screen* theory's model of spectatorship would take volumes, as the diverse positions stem from feminism, cognitivism, phenomenology, postcolonial theory, queer theory, cultural studies, and new historiography. However, for an overview of the impasses of psychoanalytic film theory's model of spectatorship and some responses to it, see: Linda Williams, "Introduction," *Viewing Positions: Ways of Seeing Film,* ed. Linda Williams (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997), 1-20

22 Mark Nash, "Art and Cinema: Some Critical Reflections," *Art and the Moving Image: A Critical Reader,* ed. Tanya Leighton (London: Tate Publishing, 2008), 447

23 Thomas Kennan, "Windows: of vulnerability," *The Phantom Public Sphere,* ed. Bruce Robins (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 132

24 Anthology Committee, "Anthology Film Archives," *Filmmakers Newsletter* (February 1972); quoted in: Sky Sitney, "The Search for the Invisible Cinema," *grey room,* no. 19 (Spring 2005): 103

25 Barthes, 349. Here, though this is lost in the English translation, Barthes is playing on the multiple senses of the French *décoller,* which literally means "unstick" or "unglue" (in this case, from the screen-mirror), but can also mean to "take off," as in a plane, as well as to "get high," as in drug use. Breaking the mirror suggests a critical relation, but this last sense of *décoller* indicates the centrality of pleasure and intoxication. These seemingly contradictory meanings are key to Barthes' text, but make translation difficult, perhaps leading to the unfortunate "take off."

26 This, of course, was the rallying cry of Laura Mulvey's watershed article, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," published in the same year as "Leaving the Movie Theatre." See: Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," *Screen,* vol. 16, no. 3 (Autumn 1975): 3-18

27 Interestingly, Barthes' "Leaving the Movie Theatre" was originally published in 1975 in issue 23 of the French journal *Communications,* a volume that also included the first appearance of Baudry's discussion of the cinema-cave, "The Apparatus: Metapsychological Approaches to the Impression of Reality in the Cinema."

28 The "autonomy" of this spectator is by no means free of ideological determination. Roger Buergel, director of Documenta 12 (2007), has likened the administration of power in the gallery space to a Foucauldian concept of governmentality, wherein the apparent permissiveness of neo-liberalism masks power structures that are now internalized, rather than forcibly administered through enclosure and segmentation, as they were within the regime of disciplinary power. Foucault perhaps offers the best analogy for the gentle "art of government": it is like the king of the bumblebees, who rules the hive without a sting. Similar to Deleuze's notion of the "control societies," circulation rather than confinement becomes the *de facto* spatial operation of this regime. Buergel writes that, "The ethical concept of redefining individual behaviour follows the ethics of neoliberal politics: individual choice, autonomous acting, governance of your own fate, self-initiative and self-determined living. The museum seems to be designed to provide this framework." See: Roger M. Buergel, "Arbeit an den Grenzen des Realen," *Texte zur Kunst,* 11. Jahrgang, *Heft* 43 (September 2001): 68; quoted and translated in: Volker Pantenburg, "'Post-Cinema?' Movies, Museums, Mutations," *SITE Magazine,* no. 24 (2008): 5; Michel Foucault, "Governmentality" *The Essential Foucault: Selections from the Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984,* ed. Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (New York: The New Press, 2003), 237; Gilles Deleuze, "Postscript on the Societies of Control," *October,* no. 59 (Winter 1992): 6

29 The list of films shown as a part of Manifesta was unavailable, but in Montpellier, the first iteration of the project included: *To Be Twenty in the Aurès* (*Avoir vingt ans dans les Aurès,* René Vautier, 1972); *Hands off the Loot* (*Touchez pas au grisbi,* Jacques Becker, 1954); *The Green Mare* (*La Jument verte,* Claude Autant Lara, 1959); *The Game of Love* (*Le Blé en herbe,* Claude Autant Lara, 1953); *The Meeting on the Quai* (*Le Rendez-vous des quai,* Paul Carpita, 1955); *Bel ami* (Lois Daquin, 1954); *The Nun* (*La Religieuse,* Jacques Rivette, 1967); *Night and Fog* (*Nuit et brouillard,* Alain Resnais,1959); *Stain on the Snow* (*La Neige était*

sale, Luis Saslavski, 1953); *...And God Created Woman* (*Et Dieu...créa la femme,* Roger Vadim, 1956). In New York, the project included: *The Red Kimona* (Walter Lang, 1925); *Freaks* (Tod Browning, 1932); *Scarlet Street* (Fritz Lang, 1945); *Pinky* (Elia Kazan, 1949); *A Streetcar Named Desire* (Elia Kazan, 1951); *Salt of the Earth* (Herbert J. Biberman, 1954); *Victim* (Basil Dearden, 1961); *Titicut Follies* (Frederic Wiseman, 1967); *I am Curious (Yellow)* (*Jag är nyfiken—en film i gult,* Vilgot Sjöman, 1967); *The Last Picture Show* (Peter Bogdanovich, 1971); *The Tin Drum* (*Die Blechtrommel,* Volker Schlöndorff, 1979); *The Last Temptation of Christ* (Martin Scorsese, 1988).

30 In *Postproduction,* Bourriaud writes, "*Relational Aesthetics,* of which this book is a continuation, described the collective sensibility within which new forms of art have been inscribed. Both take their point of departure in the changing mental space that has been opened for thought by the Internet, the central tool of the information age we have entered." See: Nicolas Bourriaud, *Postproduction, Culture as Screenplay: How Art Reprograms the World,* trans. Jeanine Herman (New York: Lucas and Sternberg, 2002), 13-14

31 Nicolas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics,* trans. Simon Pleasance and Fronza Woods (Paris: les presses du réel, 2002), 14; emphasis in original.

32 See: Miriam Hansen, "Reinventing the Nickelodeon: Notes on Kluge and Early Cinema," *October,* no. 46 (Autumn 1988): 178-198 and "Early Cinema, Late Cinema: Transformations of the Public Sphere," *Viewing Positions: Ways of Seeing Film,* ed. Linda Williams (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997), 134-152.

33 Hansen, "Reinventing the Nickelodeon," 184

34 Hansen, "Early Cinema, Late Cinema: Transformation of the Public Sphere," 143

35 Sven Lütticken, "Black Bloc, White Penguin: Reconsidering Representation Critique," *Artforum,* vol. 45, no. 7 (March 2007): 301

36 The contemporary situation sees an inversion of the manner in which the limited-edition film print was used by the Fluxus group in the 1960s. For Fluxus, the use of film was a way to bring art to the level of the quotidian and the reproducible, to defeat its autonomy and uniqueness. Now, however, the limited edition is used to elevate the film print to the status of an *objet d'art,* recuperating it into the economy that it once compromised. This becomes possible at this historical juncture in large part due to the increasing obsolescence of the medium. As Whitney Museum curators Chrissie Iles and Henriette Huldisch put it, while the use of the limited edition film is not new, "...it is significant that many younger artists choose to work in a mode that treats film as object. This trend has everything to do with the ready availability on the consumer market of digital recording and editing devices that assert the medium of film as a precious, non-commercial material." For example, Sharon Lockhart's *Pine Flat* (2006), a 138-minute 16mm film exhibited both as a looped installation on multiple 16mm projectors and in a traditional theatrical setting, was issued by Lockhart's Los Angeles-based gallery Blum and Poe in an boxed edition of six, comprised of 19 photographic prints and each of the film's twelve shots on a different reel. Though the prices of such editions are not made public by the gallery, *Art and Auction* magazine reported that the object was priced in the six figures. See: Chrissie Iles and Henriette Huldisch, "Keeping Time: On Collecting Film and Video Art in the Museum," *Collecting the New: Museums and Contemporary Art,* ed. Bruce Altshuler (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 81; Paul Young, "Black Box White Cube," Art and Auction (February 2008); available online: <http://www.artinfo.com/news/story/26655/black-box-white-cube/>

37 Quoted in: "Does the Museum Fail? Podium Discussion at the 53rd International Short Film Festival Oberhausen," *Kinomuseum: Towards an Artists' Cinema,* ed. Mike Sperlinger and Ian White (Köln: Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther König, 2008), 153

38 See Brian O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 76 and 15

39 Serge Daney, "Le therrorisé (Pédagogie godardienne)," *La rampe: Cahier critique, 1970-1982* (Paris: Cahiers du cinéma/Gallimard, 1996), 85-95

40 Jean-Christophe Royoux, "Remaking Cinema," *Cinéma, Cinéma: Contemporary Art and the Cinematic Experience* (Rotterdam: NAi Publishers, 1999), 21; Raymond Bellour, "Of An Other Cinema," *Art and the Moving Image: A Critical Reader,* ed. Tanya Leighton (London: Tate Publishing, 2008), 406-422; Jacques Rancière, "Le cinéma dans le 'fin' de l'art," *Cahiers du cinéma,* no. 552 (December 2000): 51

41 As Bellour has put it, "The most twentieth-century form of art, [the cinema] is at once more crowded-in now than ever and more alone in its splendour." See: Raymond Bellour, "Battle of the Images," eds. Jeffery Shaw and Peter Weibel, *Future Cinema: The Cinematic Imaginary After Film* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), 59

42 This sense of "exhibition" goes back to its Latin root, *ex* (out) + *habere* (to hold).