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Locating the Cinematic

Walking into a modern museum exhibition, if there is a show where many sounds and images are projected, can now be an overwhelming experience. This is particularly the case when these sounds and images are not separated but overlap, so that they comment on, contrast with, and contaminate each other. We might experience a similar set of sensations in a contemporary multi-media cityscape, especially in the event of an unusual media intervention such as an outdoor film festival (see fig. 1.1), a series of projections on the interior or exterior walls of a public building (see fig. 1.2 & 1.3), or an interactive media installation occupying an otherwise empty square (see fig. 3.1, chapter 3). Upon entering such an environment, the visitor – or rather, temporary dweller – is likely to pause for a moment, affectively charged, and scan the space in search of a protocol to navigate it. All we know is that we are in a certain space, an intensified “here.” The question is not so much how we might, literally, navigate these multi-media environments, but rather how our navigation will affect our encounter with their particular orchestration, of which the visitor becomes, upon entering, a constitutive part. For even if we suspect, or even if we recognize how to move through these spaces, we are unlikely to know in advance how we will be moved by doing so. We are caught in what I will call a “hereness,” a strong sense of being somewhere that we don’t necessarily feel in more ordinary spaces.

Fig. 1.1 (left): Doek! Schiedam, The Netherlands, 2001; Fig. 1.2 (middle): Machteld Aardse & Anne Verhoijsen’s Iran en Route (2006). Video projections at Club 11 Post CS Amsterdam; Fig. 1.3 (right): Doug Aitken’s Sleepwalkers (2007). MoMA, New York. View from 54th Street.
In this chapter, I will explore the sense of “hereness” that such encounters foster in the participating viewer, the “me” of the encounter. In particular, I will focus on the multi-media exhibition *Andy Warhol: Other Voices, Other Rooms*, which took place in a temporary location of the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam, Post CS, in 2007. I treat the Warhol retrospective as an exemplary case of the multi-media exhibition. Yet the arguments I put forward in this chapter, I contend in its concluding section, also bear on the more general expansion of the cinematic within our everyday life and urban environments, in which exhibitions like this one often take place.

In what follows, I will first situate the 2007 Warhol exhibition against the backdrop of discussions of Warhol’s early films. Although such discussions largely focus on the films’ peculiar relation to time and temporality, they also testify to a developing notion of the “here” of our encounter with the cinematic that pertains first and foremost to the viewer’s body within the physical space of the encounter.

In the chapter’s second part I will turn to the 2007 Warhol exhibition and argue that in the multi-media exhibition this notion of “hereness” is at once augmented, punctuated, and rescaled through mediation. I argue that the sense of “here” invoked in the participating viewer pertains at once to his or her body within the space of the encounter and to the way that body relates to and intersects with the mixed reality of the multi-media environment. In the chapter’s final part, I will once more turn to the “subject,” or rather “subjects,” of and in the exhibition, i.e., to Warhol and his “sitters” as well as to the “me” within the encounter – the viewer, visitor, city-dweller – and make a case for a seemingly opposed development. That is, I will make a case for the extension of the cinematic into our everyday physical environment by suggesting that what was once considered to be “there,” on screen, in the image, is increasingly already giving shape to the “here” of the encounter prior to mediation while being nonetheless shaped by its potential.

These three discussions – first, on time and temporality in Warhol; second, on the augmentation and punctuation of place in the multi-media exhibition; and third, on the extension of the cinematic within our everyday environments – converge in their bringing to light a conception of the space and place of the encounter that I see in terms of a thickness, or a thickening of the “here” (as well as of the “now”) through mediation. In this thickened “here,” I will demonstrate, neither viewer nor representation is held in place. Nor is it necessarily possible, at least within our everyday media-infused urban environments, to occupy a place outside of this thick “here” that is the cinematic. Although I will point to some significant differences between our encounter with the films as discrete cinematic
chronotopes as compared to the chronotope of their simultaneous projection in the exhibition space in the second part of the chapter, I maintain that Warhol’s own early cinematic endeavors and the critical reflections prompted by them are to some extent already suggestive of this thickening.

Expanded Cinema: Proliferating Screens

The simultaneous use of numerous projections and various media in one exhibition space is hardly a new phenomenon; nor, for that matter, was the 2007 *Andy Warhol: Other Voices, Other Rooms* the first occasion on which Warhol’s films were presented in such a way. In the 2004 exhibition *Andy Warhol: Motion Pictures* in Berlin, for example, a selection of Warhol’s films consisting mainly of the *Screen Tests* (1964–66) and several early black-and-white films, were also “shown simultaneously, all presented side by side in a generous installation space.” In fact, Warhol often presented his films next to or even overlapping each other; he experimented quite vigorously with proliferating media-use and display. This becomes particularly clear from Branden J. Joseph’s descriptions of Warhol’s *Exploding Plastic Inevitable* (EPI), a series of multi-media events promoting the Velvet Underground in 1966 and 1967. Joseph writes:

At the height of its development, the *Exploding Plastic Inevitable* included three to five film projectors, often showing different reels of the same film simultaneously; a similar number of slide projectors, movable by hand so that their images swept the auditorium; four variable-speed strobe lights; three moving spots with an assortment of colored gels; several pistol lights, a mirror ball hung from the ceiling and another on the floor; as many as three loudspeakers blaring different pop-records at once; one or two sets by the Velvet Underground and Nico; and the dancing of Gerard Malaga and Mary Woronov or Sigrid Superstar, complete with props and lights that projected their shadows high onto the wall. (2002a: 71)

In his 1967 book *American Underground Cinema*, Sheldon Renan was already speculating on the emergence of a “film as environment” conception based on the “expanded cinema” of his contemporaries, including Warhol’s *EPI*. To a certain extent, then, the origins of the contemporary multi-media exhibition can be traced
here. There are, however, also some significant differences between today’s multi-
media exhibitions and the expanded cinema of the 60s. For, as the title of EPI’s forerunner – Up-Tight – already suggests, the experiments with participatory media
environments in the 60s were efforts in a more general trend aimed at disrupt-
ing the contemplative viewing position of the bourgeois art audience. Excessive
media-use and participatory challenges had a clear de-disciplining intent, geared
towards provoking new modes of viewing and participating that were often expe-
rienced as disruptive or offensive, and addressing topics often considered taboo.
By mobilizing observer, recording camera, and projective surface (which in the
EPI was no longer necessarily a screen), moreover, the expanded cinema of the
60s took a rather antagonistic stance towards mainstream (Hollywood), which
required a darkened auditorium and immobilized observers who remained at a
safe distance from the world observed.25

By now, however, the multi-media environment has lost some, if not all, of
its initial disruptive potential, especially in terms of the modes of viewing it af-
fores. The simultaneous presentation of multiple audiovisual works from different
periods of time and on different platforms in the 2007 Warhol exhibition intersects
with another development: a more general proliferation of urban screens, per-
sonal communication devices, and image-capturing technologies within our every-
day (urban) environment. If the multi-media environment is no longer necessarily
perceived as shocking or offensive, it can still affect the visitor-viewer in significant
ways. In this chapter I will discuss the multi-media exhibition Andy Warhol: Other
Voices, Other Rooms as a case in point for analyzing how the dynamic site of the
cinematic affects our sense of “here.” The exhibition is typical of a present-day
multi-media environment in that it offers a condensed version of the multi-media
environment of the city at large, with the various audiovisual works of Warhol
presented simultaneously in two spacious, formerly industrial lofts aptly labeled
“Filmscape” and “TV-Scape.” The case is also exemplary because it revisits some of
the concerns of the 1960s avant-garde that are relevant for our purpose here. In the
next section I will briefly address these concerns, in part by placing them against
the backdrop of some recent discussions of the technological mediation of time.
It’s About Time (Or Is It?): Situating

From the outset, Warhol’s films received much critical attention, and interest was reinvigorated after their restoration and re-distribution by the Whitney Museum following Warhol’s death in 1987, allowing scholars to finally have full access to works that most of them had only been able to read about (the films were pulled out of circulation in 1972). Although the topics within the debate vary greatly – ranging from reflections on the films’ significance within Warhol’s oeuvre and the 1960s avant-garde in general, to ruminations on their conceptions of stardom, or their negotiation of taboo topics like homosexuality and deviant sexual behavior – there is one topic in particular that resurfaces in the debate, and that is their peculiar relation to time, which is of particular relevance for our purposes here.²⁶

In what follows I will first briefly look at this artistic and critical preoccupation with time and temporality. While acknowledging the importance of the debate on time and the “now” of the encounter to my overall argument in this study, my main aim here is to demonstrate how these reflections on time and temporality rest on particular assumptions about our encounter with the cinematic in terms of a “hereness.” This occurs especially when the reflections touch on the films’ materiality, their tension between motion and stillness, and the physical discomfort of their viewers when watching the films in the auditorium.

Warhol’s films give off an air of technical illiteracy and feign the withdrawal of the artist’s hand, as on the occasions when Warhol simply switched on the camera and walked out of the room (the most radical example in this vein is Henry Geldzahler’s film portrait from 1964, which lasts for more than 90 minutes). As the late Callie Angell, curator of the Warhol Film Project at the Whitney Museum, wrote, Warhol’s early film production reduced the medium to its basic elements; a single shot, a stationary camera mounted on a tripod, and a single, preconceived action.²⁷ In more recent discussions this has led several scholars, in a kind of mise-en-abyme of remediations, to ruminate on Warhol’s audio-visual productions in terms of the real-time logic of video and surveillance.²⁸ Graig Uhlin, for example, has recently argued that Warhol’s films abide by the logic of what he refers to as a televisual temporality. (2010) The films’ extraordinarily long duration, Uhlin maintains, especially when seen in combination with their resistance to narrative and their lack of a clear beginning, middle, and end, is suggestive of the flow of television as theorized by Raymond Williams.²⁹ Even though the films are not live, as television can be (and paradigmatically is), they are built around a set of aesthetic strategies that evoke such liveness: their open-ended nature, amateur cast,
dependence on improvisation, and openness to risk and unforeseen events. (2010: 14) Moreover, as with television, the films instigate the temporality of waiting, an arguably low-affect state that Anna McCarthy in *Ambient Television* associates with the containment of the anxiety of wasting time at home or in places of transit.\(^{30}\)

Yet we know the suggestion of real-time, as well as Warhol’s seeming technical illiteracy, was in fact deceptive. He did control his images, and to a large extent did so precisely through a manipulation of cinematic time. In *Sleep* (1963, 5’21” at 16fps), for example, the “real-time” recording of his (ex-)lover John Giorno’s sleeping body, lasting for over five hours, is actually faked, as “only half a dozen shots are seen for over six hours.” (Sitney, 2002: 350) Each new cartridge was shot from a different static position and then used twice in a serial composition “that consolidates its quiet, implosive strength by numbing itself in the paradoxes of movement and stillness.”\(^{31}\) Furthermore, even though the film seems to frame “time as it passes,” Amy Taubin stresses that real time is actually cancelled out on the level of projection. Not only was it customary to project several sequential reels simultaneously or even to superimpose them on each other, but the speed of projection was also significantly slowed down, by approximately one-third, as the films, though shot at 24 frames per second, were shown at 16 frames per second. (1994, 1997) The result is a barely perceptible slow motion, as the film “unwinds at a pace that’s out of sync with the rhythms of the viewer,” a disjunction also manifest in the film’s topic, sleep.\(^{32}\)

*Empire* (1964, 8’05” at 16 fps), described by Angell as “an investigation into the perception of duration,” conceals a similar manipulation of “real time” by both the film track and projection speed. (2004: 30) In running a static image of a building for more than eight hours, the film displays an odd tension between mobility and immobility, as the subject of *Empire*, the Empire State Building, contrary to the film itself, does not move. Time in *Empire*, critic Gregory Battcock observes, “is distorted, perhaps, simply by its not being distorted when one would reasonably expect it to be.” (quoted in Lee, 2004: 263) We are left not so much watching ourselves watch, but rather sensing ourselves “watching” while enduring the film’s capture of tedium.\(^{33}\) This sensation ultimately alternates or intertwines with another, as we are confronted, not so much with what the image represents, but rather, with the filmic materiality that presents us the image. As Roy Grundman puts it:

> the viewer's observation of the profilmic object is gradually supplemented, perhaps even largely replaced, by an exploration of the material property of the filmstrip itself with its chemi-
Pamala Lee comes to a similar conclusion in her 2004 book *Chronophobia*, whose title refers to the more general agitated obsession with time and its measures among artists and critics in the sixties. According to Lee, Warhol's ambiguous relationship to time, ranging from his fifteen-minutes-of-fame conviction to his cinematic endurance (con)test suggests a kind of irresolvable grappling with finitude and the infinite, the push pull tension between the utterly mundane gestures of daily life set against the blank expanse of something yet to come. (2004: 279)

To rethink the art-and-technology nexus of the sixties, Lee takes up Hegel's warnings, expressed in *The Encyclopedia Logic* (1991), against a “bad infinity,” the endless repetition within critical reasoning, which he regarded as negative, “since it is nothing but the negation of the finite.” (Lee, 2004: 277) This notion of a “bad infinity,” Lee writes, also surfaces in concerns about the question of history among critics, historians, philosophers, and artists since the 1960s. In *The Postmodern Condition*, Jean-Francois Lyotard (1984) for example, challenged the determinism that underwrote the grand narratives of the time. His notion of history facilitated a relationship to time that presaged a notion of infinite potentiality typical of postmodernism. (Lee, 2004: 261–262) Similarly, in *Futures Past*, philosopher of history Reinhardt Koselleck (1985) foresaw the rise of what he called a “futureless future” with the secularization of time: a conception of the future as no more than an endless variation on the present. In terms of history, Lee contends, the notion of a bad infinity first and foremost “represents a failure to transcend the immanence of one’s own historical moment” (2004: 277). Traces of this can also be found in Paul Virilio’s dystopian reflections on liveness as a substitute horizon and real-time as the compulsion to repeat (Virilio, 2006; also see: Cook, 2003).

Yet what happens in the films of Andy Warhol, Lee suggests, is that this “bad infinity” is reworked into a critical comment on coeval questions concerning time and technology. It epitomizes what Manuel Castells has referred to as the “timeless time” of capital and labour within network societies. (1996) The uneventfulness of the films, with their endless repetitions and “too much presentness,” Lee argues, comments on what it is like to work with and within the conditions of a perpetual “now,” while at the same time thrusting the viewer forward, challenging him or
her to anticipate on what is yet to come. (2004: 277–278) This anticipation is physically anchored in the materiality of the filmstrip, which deteriorates with each successive screening, as well as in the affective engagement of the viewer’s body, uncomfortably awaiting the film’s end. For that time, Annette Michelson writes, “punctuated only by the flares of successive reel endings, [there] is also time to wonder: ‘What’s going to happen? Do I have time to go and buy some popcorn? [...] how long, oh Lord, how long?’” (2001: 105) The films, Lee states, stand as an “allegory for time located elsewhere: not only the time of its audience, engaged in business other than that of watching, but the future, anticipated in making one’s escape from the theatre.” (2004: 287)

In this recurring notion of anticipation, grounded in the celebrated excess of presentness in Warhol’s films, we see delineated the first allusions towards a critical conception of our encounter with the cinematic in terms of a “here.” For what the accounts cited above all point out is that, rather than suturing the viewer through narrative, as classical narrative cinema and the majority of film theory would have it, Warhol’s films, with their exaggerated duration, suggested liveness, and uneventful nature, redirect the viewers’ attention towards the sheer passage of time that “weighs on the body.” (Uhlin, 2010: 21) Any understanding of the “here” of the encounter therefore starts with the acknowledgement of the viewer’s body within the space of the encounter, rather than the ignoring or negation of it, as is the tendency of traditional film theory.

This becomes even more pertinent within the 2007 multi-media exhibition, which differs from the films’ theatrical presentation (the basis for most of the accounts cited above) in a number of significant ways. Not only were the films shown simultaneously in one space of reception, but the visitor did not have to occupy a fixed position in an auditorium. As a result, the inevitable boredom with what was being shown was partially overcome within the exhibition space, as it was now possible to move around, to redirect one’s attention from one image to another, or to see multiple images at the same time. The visitor, free to wander the exhibition space, was unlikely to endure the physical discomfort that would accompany the films’ overarching tedium if viewed in the manner of a traditional movie. Moreover, the films, as well as Warhol’s television programs (to which I will return briefly below), had been digitised and transferred to DVD for the exhibition, at once arresting and interrupting the films’ gradual deterioration. Due to the conversion to DVD the particularity attributed to the viewers’ confrontation with the physical movement of the projected film was more or less neutralized within the exhibition. Instead, the visitor was confronted with the films’ digitized compres-
sion algorithm, which every now and then manifested itself in block-like glitches, generating an experience reminiscent of watching Nam June Paik’s empty white “film” screen *Zen for Film* (1962–64) rendered digitally on YouTube.\(^3\)

In terms of the cinematic venture of the Warhol exhibition, then, the difference between the time of the screen and that of the audience collapses in the iteration and prolongation of almost-identical images in time, as well as their simultaneous presentation within the exhibition’s scripted space.\(^4\) Pulled together by their likeness and pushed apart by their differences, the space “between” the images is opened up. In the exhibition this was further accentuated by the fact that, in addition to the temporal structure of the traditional archive, it had adopted one of the most basic mechanisms of cinematic narrative time, known as the deadline structure.

Below each screen a digital clock – reminiscent of a digital alarm clock – displayed the time remaining before the projection was completed. Some promised a quick resolution, a liberation from the tedium that characterizes so many of the films. Others proclaimed a duration that extended far beyond closing hours, circumventing the institutional limits of the exhibition itself.\(^5\) The clocks announce both the film’s anticipated ending, as well as the installation’s restarting of the film. And yet it heralded neither beginning nor end at all, but instead stipulated a situatedness in time – a temporal demarcation that does not need a beginning nor an end, but equally refuses to collapse past and future into an eternal present. The clocks provide the participating viewer with yet another map of temporalities, a multiple timetable that accords with a rationalized, standardized time. Yet the countdown clocks also give the visitor the opportunity to look away, even to walk away, and to return, linger, and anticipate. Here, precisely, we can teleport through time, remembering earlier points in time and speculating about the possibility of change over time when watching, for example, *Sleep* or *Empire*.

The resulting confusion of the traditional temporal frame of reference pulls the visitor/dweller into what Deleuze and Guatarri have called a “non-pulsed time” (or *aion*), a sense of time that oscillates between *chronos* (consecutive time) and *kairos* (sense of closure, resolution), a pulse without beginning or end. For in the endless repetition, circulation, and duration of the moment, the ephemeral is reworked into timelessness, in the sense of both *chronos* and *kairos*, that is also a thickening, in view of *aion*. Conversely, it brings to the fore a conception of the “here” of our encounter with the cinematic that, as I argue in the following section, pertains not only to the “now” of the ambulant body of the visitor whose physical situatedness turns space into a place, but also to that place as being aug-
mented, punctuated, and rescaled through mediation. Both the temporal and the spatial aspects are important, as human beings need time (in the sense of both *chronos* and *kairos*) and place to constitute a sense of coherence and identity.

**Other Rooms: Re-scaling**

As exhibited in Amsterdam in 2007, *Andy Warhol: Other Voices, Other Rooms* contained three sections, “Filmscape,” “Cosmos,” and “TV-Scape,” which were disposed around the adjacent main entry hall, “About Andy.” The latter comprised a red carpet, stroboscopic flashlight, a recording of The Velvet Underground & Nico’s song “I’ll Be Your Mirror,” many photographs and clips arranged chronologically and thematically, four documentaries on Warhol, and two gigantic mirrors, behind which I expected to see anything – another room, another space, another film, or even another time – but certainly not myself standing right there, right then, at odds with my surroundings. (*I’ll be your mirror indeed...*). The gallery called “Cosmos,” described as “the heart of the exhibition” on the museum’s website, consisted of Warhol’s famous icons, Factory Diaries, and objects from his Time Capsules, a serial work made up of drawings, photos, newspaper clippings and magazines, source images for art-works, exhibition catalogues, correspondences, rare archive material and audio fragments that were originally stored in sealed cardboard boxes but were now put on display. The result was an eclectic bricolage of a specific era that, according to the curators, “highlights the master’s thinking and way of working.”

“TV-Scape” (see fig. 1.4) was made up of an elevated platform surrounded by a curtain of colored strings on which Warhol’s television productions from the 80s, mainly of interviews with the famous and the unknown, were simultaneously presented on several television sets. I visited the exhibition on two or three different occasions. Wandering through the exhibition the first time, the room initially made me resist investing much time in it – I was not compelled to sit down, stay put, and confront, for example, Fran Lebowitz’s cynicism, a male model’s life story, or even Warhol’s own boredom with his subjects. When I entered the room a second time, however, “TV-Scape” called for an extended investment of time, of quite a different sort from the one required by “Filmscape” (to which I will turn shortly), as it was impossible to get an impression of what was going on without actually sitting down, uncomfortably on pillar-chairs with headphones, facing a flat screen that on the flipside faced yet another visitor. Instead of allowing the
Fig. 1.4 (above): “TV-Scape”, Fig. 1.5 (bottom): “Filmscape.” At Andy Warhol: Other Voices, Other Rooms. Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam 12.10.07 - 13.01.08.
visitor the distracted, fragmented viewing position (or, if you will, the *flânerie*) of the living room, the makeup of the room was such that, despite the multitude of televisions, each single screen held its viewer in place, demobilized the visitor. Each television set had its own chair and pair of headphones, inviting the visitor to sit down and watch a clip, fragment, or slot of television in isolation amid the crowd, as if the curators thought television a less wearisome medium than cinema (and the programs less boring than the films).

Conversely, the “Filmscape” (see fig. 1.5) encouraged anything but the one-on-one viewing that characterized the “TV-Scape.” The section featured films like Warhol’s *Screen Tests* (1964-1966), *Blow Job* (1963), *Sleep* (1963), *Empire* (1964), *Henry Geldzahler* (1964), *Outer and Inner Space* (1965), *Mario Banana* (1964 & 1965), *Kitchen* (1965), *Chelsea Girls* (1966), and *Mrs. Warhol* (1966). Of these films, only the *Screen Tests* were projected in a separate room, one on each of the four walls of the square space. (see fig. 1.6) The other films were projected on a vast number of screens in a large, open space, arranged in such a way that one could hardly watch a film without simultaneously seeing another, either out of the corner of one’s eye or in the reflection of – or even through – the partially transparent silver screens (see fig. 1.7 & 1.8). As such, the “Filmscape” resisted isolated viewing, in the double sense of an experience that would be private (being alone when watching something) and single (watching a single film/clip on its own). The very fact that the museum had organized an alternate, marathon theatrical screening of the films in succession stipulates the relevance of this different way of presenting the films.

The interrupted viewer position often associated with television’s flow, and its repetitive, fragmentary, and redundant mode of address, in the exhibition, were thus retained for “Filmscape” rather than for “TV-Scape.” While the configuration of the two media spaces on the one hand upheld and even accentuated the opposition between television’s individual and cinema’s collective mode of address, it reversed the conventional opposition between the television viewer’s potential itinerancy and the cinema spectator’s typical immobility. Whereas “TV-Scape” made the visitor sit down, the flow of images in “Filmscape” – due to their composition, and the films’ extended duration and eventless character – invigorated the viewer’s wandering and distracted glance. The result was as affecting as it was ungraspable, and thus anything but the low-affect state McCarthy associates with televisual waiting and the proliferation of tv screens in contemporary life.

Weighed down by the high contrast of the black-and-white imagery and multiple screen projections, I sit down on one of the odd-shaped uncomfortable couches somewhere in the middle of the room. On my far right I see the once
famous but now camera-shy artist Paul Swan dancing, rehearsing, hiding, dancing again, performing (Paul Swan, 1965). Close to me on my left, a campy lady swings as the camera zealously zooms in and out. Behind it somewhat to the right, a man dressed like a woman is peeling, eating and mock-fellating a banana, as if in slow motion, alternately in black-and-white and in color (Mario Banana, 1964 & 1965). On the far left wall, Edie Sedgwick’s androgynous being is flirting with the camera in multiple iterations (Outer and Inner Space). I get up and walk around. I witness curator Henry Geldzahler looking straight into the camera, stubborn, bored, self-conscious, uncomfortably awaiting the film’s end (Henry Geldzahler). Geldzahler faces the unchanging and motionless hour-long image of the Empire State Building
seemingly shot in real-time (*Empire*). To his right, my left, John Giorno is sound asleep (*Sleep*). A bit further on, Andy’s mother is ironing, her chattering voice reaching me from above, where apparently a speaker is located (*Mrs. Warhol*). The sounds of the various films were projected via a sound-beaming system, which relayed the sound of each film to the predicted position of the visitor when watching that particular film, generating the sensation of walking in and out of reach. Yet despite this high-tech sound-system, the multiple audio-projections in the open space resulted above all in a cacophony of sounds, in which it was hard to hear what the various people in the separate films were saying. As a consequence, the individual films were rendered illegible, words and sounds became noise, and the images were of interest only in their confrontation with each other. Detail was subordinated to as well as magnified through scale.

This situation invoked, by contrast, the question of the status of the detail. In her article on detail and scale in the cinematic close-up, Mary Ann Doane argues that “[T]he semiotic status of the close-up seems to bear within itself a structuring contradiction, [...] between detail and totality, part and whole, microcosm and macrocosm, the miniature and the gigantic.” (2003: 107–108) On the one hand, the legibility of the close-up, she claims, is intimately linked with its lack of autonomy: the pressure of narrative, of the look, culminating in the close-up, forces the close-up into decipherability. On the other hand, the close-up foregrounds details, contingencies, and idiosyncrasies as it expands the time of the moment at the expense of linear, narrative time, transforming the screen, momentarily, into a surface, a mere image. The hyperbolic nature of the close-up abstracts its subject from its surroundings, the face from the body, the object from the mise-en-scène. In a sense, Doane writes, a close-up is always “an autonomous entity, a fragment, a ‘for-itself.’” (2003: 90)

This confusion between detail and totality, according to Doane, reveals a theoretically maintained division between two spaces: the space of narrative, and the space of the audience. Seen from the perspective of the narrative space, the status of the image is one of detail. Seen from the space of the spectator, however, the close-up constitutes itself as a momentary totality, an autonomous entity. Traditional film theory has insisted on classical cinema’s tendency to work towards the annihilation of spectatorial space, putting forth the narrative world as the only world. Conversely, the celebrations of the close-up as an entity “for itself” by theorists such as Béla Balázs, Gilles Deleuze, and Jean Epstein, Doane contends, must be read as attempts to reaffirm the spectatorial space, to break open the seemingly self-enclosed space of the diegesis of traditional film theory. By explicitly linking...
the close-up to both detail and scale, then, Doane draws attention to the interlacing of ideologies of interiority and public space, as well as to the desire to develop a theory of cinema that can account for cinema’s transmission of affect. For, Doane argues, the “celebration of the close-up is also an attempt to reassert the corporeality of the classically disembodied spectator.” (2003: 108) This is so because scale can be understood only in relation to the human body.

In the case at hand, it can be argued that it is in the out-of-the-corner-of-one’s-eye perception of either a detail of an image or an entire other screen pulls the visitor’s perception out of the perspectival grid, as it enhances the tension between scale and detail, between spectatorial and narrative space as theorized by Doane. Closing in on the pro-filmic real and slowing it down, the camera’s gaze forces the viewer to the image surface, complicating the double spatiality of the close-up. Slow-down is, in this sense, the exact temporal equivalent of the close-up. As I will argue in the next chapter, this has consequences for the temporal aspect of affect. Moreover, in the conversion to digital technology the spatial analogy between the represented world and pro-filmic real is broken and replaced by a form of temporal analogy whereby the image first and foremost refers to the “here” and “now” of its ongoing emergence, which is suggestive of the conversion of the space of the encounter into a “place.” The result is a mixed reality, in which the physical “here” of the encounter is augmented, i.e., complemented by virtual spaces that are by definition fragmented and reconstructed pixel by pixel, each time anew. As such, the films do not open up an unknown world for us, but rather refocus or “re-scale” our own familiar, but paradoxically unrecognized one.

The “here” thus negotiated in our encounter with the multi-media environment pertains not only to the place and corporeality of the human body, but also to the punctuation of that place though mediation. In her book *The West in Early Cinema*, Nanna Verhoeff uses the term “punctuated places” in reference to panoramic stereo cards and what she refers to as filmic postcards, static shots of moving images, e.g., a waterfall, that “depict geographically significant locations, meaningful for their capacity to offer a point of view.” (2006: 264) Verhoeff thus illuminates the subtlety of what she is looking at by means of a temporal term, associated with the interval between events or the rhythms of language, applied to a spatial issue. Punctuated places, she writes, are

places with a name that signifies the direction of a look to other places. It is punctuated because it is a “starting point” of
In the case at hand, the terminological crossover leads to the following insight. Our place, our position in the exhibition room is always punctuated in the triple sense of the word: first, as the place from which we look (“here”) is punctuated by the screens – some nearby, others more remote – we are, second, punctuated, interrupted, by the rhythms of the films, which, third, emphasize, punctuate their own specific temporality and the latter’s inherent relationship to the viewer. Furthermore, our vantage point is mobile, despite being momentarily suspended when we stand still or sit down, as we (are likely to) wander around in the room full of projections. The section’s title suggests as much. As we physically or virtually navigate the filmscape, the images contaminate each other, in part sequentially, yet quite differently than they would in the case of a successive screening. For, unlike the traditional experience where the order of the images is predetermined by the film itself, here it is the visitors who “sequence” them. Moreover, what our view brings to each projected image is contingent, random within the parameters of the space, as our view oscillates between the various screens. The passage of the void between the screens by the “thinking eye” with which we add up the images, pricks – punctuates – the visitor like the Barthesian punctum, “at once brief and active, [...] by chance and for nothing.” (1982: 49, 42) This punctum can expand a tiny shock into a timeless time, generating an intense immobility in (and not necessarily of) the visitor.

This leads me to posit the following generalization regarding the specificity of the “here” within installations of moving images in exhibitions. Neither representation nor spectator is held in place by a fixed vantage point. It is in this sense that the parameters of the multi-media exhibition differ from those of the traditional museum, with its still images and moving spectator, as well as of those of classical cinema, characterized by its moving images and the stillness or immobility of the spectator. With its combination of moving images and moving viewers – a multiplied variation on the dynamic of domestic television – the multi-media installation resembles the modern cityscape primed with media façades and mobile screens.

What the images in their joint projection reveal to the “me” in the exhibition is that within the multi-media environment it is no longer possible to occupy a space outside of images. Embedded in, situated by, and constitutive of the cinematic encounter, the multi-media exhibition’s viewer is punctuated in three
additional ways: first, by what he or she adds to the image; second, by the way he or she is affected by the image-as-totality; and third, by the (image-as-totality)-as-detail of a space-time continuum that encompasses both images and “world.”

When it comes to our understanding of the relation between images and world, this view of the cinematic is closer to Bazin’s celebration of mainstream cinema’s potential to achieve an “integral realism” than the view of his materialist opponents. (1960, 1967) Such a difference is relevant because it brings home to us what the current rescaling and punctuation of the place of our encounter with the cinematic amounts to. It goes beyond the scope of this study to go into a detailed discussion of Bazin’s ideas on cinema and those of his opponents. Suffice it to say that for Bazin, the ontology of the photographic and by extension the cinematic image was identical to the ontology of the pro-filmic image. In his view the natural process of registration transferred the being of the pro-filmic event to the being of film, canceling out the irreversibility of time along its way.

Historically as well as theoretically, Peter Wollen asserts in his seminal essay “‘Ontology’ and ‘Materialism’ in Film,” the aesthetic and theoretical concern for cinema’s ontology passed from Bazin’s belief in the possibility of an “objective” reproduction of a pro-filmic object or event to a reflexive exploration and demonstration of the material properties, processes, and structures of the filmic support that challenged its reproductive and illusionistic potential. (1982: 193) According to Wollen, there are two versions of this materialist critique of Bazin’s ontology that are often juxtaposed. First, the modernist current of the American avant-garde aimed to negate reproduction by reducing non-cinematic codes “to their material – optical, photo-chemical – substrate (‘material support’) to the exclusion of any semantic dimension other than reference-back to the material of any signifier itself.” (1982: 197) Ontology here is reintroduced through the self-referentiality of the film-object, so that film is about its own material or structure. A second, post-Brechtian form of materialism, associated mainly with French auteurs such as Godard, is concerned with the subversion of the conventional codes of cinema and the “de-structuration” of the viewer. (1982: 196) According to this view it is not the intentional subject but the ordering of the signifiers, or style, in the film-text that determines the production of meaning. Signifiers are thus privileged over signifieds.

The shift in focus from the ontology to the material of film, as discerned by Wollen, reveals a shift from what I would like to call an outside-in view towards an inside-outside view of the relation between cinema and world. Whereas in Bazin’s
reflections film is considered to be an integral representation of the pro-filmic real, suggesting that what is captured on film is identical to the world outside (the outside world is in the film), materialist critics and filmmakers regarded their meta-cinema as a “self-enclosed world” while upholding a clear distinction between what is inside film and what belongs to the world outside (hence: inside-outside). To these two visions of the linkage between cinema and world, I contend, we must add a third, inside-out view that partially returns to Bazin’s outside-in view, if we want to account for the ontological (con)fusion of the contested categories of “cinema” and “world” within the multi-media exhibition under scrutiny. I therefore adopt Bazin’s view of the ontology of the moving image, which resides in the conflation of the filmic and pro-filmic real instead of in the objecthood or language of the film-object or film-text alone. I depart from Bazin, however, in maintaining that in the media-saturated world we inhabit today, media and reality have merged so completely that the cinematic no longer solely mediates reality, but now makes up a “first reality” in itself. That is to say: what is inside the image is now also already out-there in the world.45

It becomes clear that this simultaneous extrusion and implosion of the cinematic is not merely a contemporary phenomenon, and can, with hindsight, be traced back to Warhol’s cinematic productions of the 60s, when we consider Annette Michelson’s musings on the dissimilarity between Warhol’s long takes (inside-out), and the assertive editing of Stan Brakhage’s modernist films (inside-outside). What the discrepancy reveals, Michelson suggests, is a difference between a cinema that presupposes the predominance of subjectivity and a cinema postulated on its dissipation.46 This is significant because it underscores the distinct deictic markers that in part make up the particular chronotope of Warhol’s films, especially (though not exclusively) as staged within the design of the multimedia museum. On the one hand, Brakhage’s films are characterized by a rapid and hyperbolic fluidity of images that disclose to the spectator something relating to his being or world, by transforming the spatio-temporality on which their subjectivity is built. On the other hand, Warhol’s extended portrait films foster a different kind of temporality that eliminates subjectivity altogether. It is a carnivalistic time, states Michelson making reference to Bakhtin, in that it

abolishes the dividing line between performer and spectator, since everyone becomes an active participant and everyone communes in the carnival act, which is neither contemplated nor, strictly speaking performed by it; it is lived.47
More than a momentary state-of-being, this interchangeability of positions – in the case at hand among “making a movie,” “being in a movie,” and “watching a movie” – in my view hints at a more general disintegration of the border between an inner and an outer perspective on the cinematic that has significant implications for our understanding of the “here” of our encounter with it. In the following section I will therefore turn, once more, to the “subject” of the exhibition (Warhol), and the “subject” in the exhibition (both the sitters and the visitor/”me”), and suggest that the “here” that is negotiated not only pertains to the physical place of the encounter and the augmentation, punctuation, and rescaling of that place through mediation, but is also suggestive of a further extension of the cinematic into the multiple spaces of everyday life.

Outer and Inner Space: Expanding

In several recent publications that explicitly take up Warhol’s audio-visual productions – including his films, television programs, and the EPI performances – a recurring theme is precisely this confusion between lived and mediated experience, between images and world. Writing on Warhol’s Screen Tests, for example, Ursula Frohne has argued that Warhol’s suggestion of real-time, his use of amateurs, and his preference for the absolutely unspectacular, in retrospect “marks the beginning of an era in which media attention became the focus of social identification, the new mirror for the individual self-perception,” to the extent that in her view nowadays non-mediated threatens to become synonymous with non-person. (Frohne, 2002: 254) Of particular relevance to this development, Frohne writes, is the incarnation of the camera gaze, “the all seeing, seemingly omnipresent ‘eye of God’ […] in the presence of the observer.” (2002: 256) For the internalized camera gaze turns every “subject” into a potential actor and transforms our daily environment into a stage. Along similar lines, David Joselit has suggested that the power of Warhol’s EPI promotional performances for the Velvet Underground lies in their destabilization and reinvention of the figure-ground relationship between image and world within the rapidly ascendant media saturation of the everyday. As becomes clear from the lengthy quote by Joseph cited earlier in this chapter, it was typical during the EPI to project several films and stills simultaneously on the Velvet Underground as they played, including footage of the band itself. In addition, the use of stroboscopic lighting cut the audience up into frames, creating a
complex circuit of media feedback in which “the line between performing oneself and becoming an image was perpetually crossed and recrossed.” (Joselit, 2002: 71)

Although the 2007 Warhol exhibition was not as radically nor as deliberately confrontational in its collision of images and world as the 1960s EPI performances had been, the exhibition nonetheless offers an exemplary case for analyzing the implications of the extension of the cinematic into the various realms of public and private life. The most explicit articulation of this performative cross-over between images and world occurs in the shattered selves of the various “subjects” in the 2007 exhibition: first, the filmmaker, who claimed to be nothing but image; second, the films’ “real-life” characters, whose unremitting poses are entirely produced for the camera; and third, the participating viewer, for whom the extension of the cinematic manifests itself in a tension between observing and being observed. Whereas in the first part of this chapter I examined the developing sense of “here” through various reflections on time and temporality in Warhol’s films, in this section I will address the further thickening of this “here” through the destabilization of various forms of subjectivity in a complex circuit of media feedback in which images and world continuously de-realize and reconfirm each other.49

Ultimately, the multi-media installation as articulated through this Warhol exhibition plots subjectivity on the dialectic of presence and absence. Within this dialectic, the medium’s ontology writes itself upon the human being that we can no longer regard as a “subject.” This dialectic is first articulated in Warhol’s projected persona. In her essay “Warhol as dandy and flâneur,” Patrizia Lombardo argues that certain classical themes link Warhol to Baudelaire. Both emphasize the importance of technique for a theory of art. Both foreground the role of fashion and approach the artist as being part of, as well as different from, the masses. And both aspire to “capture the rhythm of the world.” (1997: 33–34) The way this aspiration translates itself into a reflector of a mediated reality can be understood in terms of Warhol’s paradoxical persona. He appears on the one hand as a man who wanted to be all surface, an image or even, as he famously said, a machine; and on the other hand, he was a man pathologically inclined to withdrawal from the world and emotionally preoccupied with violence and death.50 This paradox, Lombardo argues, “is the result of the interplay between the dandy and the flâneur, between the impersonal and the emotional.” (1997: 35) Whereas the flâneur embraces the ephemeral, the surprises of life, nothing surprises the dandy, because a relentless, cool-headed anticipation based on past observations orients his perception. In the work of Warhol, Lombardo argues:
Dandy and flâneur fuse in the artist, dandy and flâneur fuse in the spectator. The timing of the event is double; double that of the artistic object; double that of the artistic perception. We realize that we are confronted simultaneously with a piercing image, the aesthetic of mass consumer production and also with some inevitable nostalgia for the past. (1997: 39)

This view helps account for the “Filmscape” of the exhibition, which resembles the metropolis of the flâneur in its vitality and intangibility. It is an immense non-stop happening, “a series of events, in which different images come together, jam together, break up, vanish from site.” (Lombardo, 1997: 35) Yet whereas the flânerie of Baudelaire was practiced by only a few, the tension between involvement and detachment, between looking and idling, has become for the visitor-viewer within the contemporary multi-media environment a common practice, a form of urban literacy lived out by a growing number of media-savvy city-dwellers. This is the sort of visitor-dweller posited by the exhibition.51

Morover, in creating his own version of a cool Baudelairean “elsewhere,” states Stephen Koch, Warhol “lived out an obsession with withdrawal’s opposite: Immediacy.” (1974: 28) Yet, this immediacy is found in distance: in the voyeur’s gaze that obliterates social hierarchies between whomever and whatever is observed. Warhol relentlessly employed self-protective evasions, or what Henry Geldzahler has called his “baffles,” ranging from the technological interventions of a telephone, tape recorder, Polaroid or film camera, to mental or physical withdrawal, witty evasions, lack of commitment, or even dishonesty. (Koch, 1974: 25) Rather than an obsession with recording, capturing, and observing, what these interventions reveal is an incessant attempt to give form to the present. In this sense the claim to be all surface, all image, must be seen as an attempt to maintain a presence within absence, to substitute an image of his “presence” for his actual presence, to celebrate pure style over substance, surface over depth, while suggesting a witty merging of the two categories, as in his famous aphorism, “I’m a deeply superficial person.” Similarly, Warhol’s transformation into a persona – the embodiment of both a witness (mass-subject) and icon (mass-object) – can be seen as a means of surviving a threatened sense of self by reinserting the “self” in the “world” as an image. (Foster, 2001: 81) The “hereness” I have been focusing on serves this purpose. As Erika Billeter put it: “Warhol creates a world of absolute sameness in terms of both content and value, a world in which the individual withers and ceases to exist.”52
Warhol’s famous motto “I want to be a machine,” therefore, Hal Foster argues, can be regarded as a mimetic defense against the shock of modern-day serial production and consumption. By taking on the form of what most shocks him, Warhol exposes capitalist nihilism through an ambiguous and excessive performance of it. (2001: 71) Read against the backdrop of this “break of subjectivity, [...] a disorientation of time and space” in an era of increasing media-saturation, the compulsive repetition in the work and persona of Warhol, Foster contends, must be read as both a defense against traumatic affect, as well as a production of it. A multiplicity of repetition facilitates the Warholian paradox, Foster writes, not only of images that are both affective and affectless, but also of viewers that are neither integrated (which is the ideal of most modern aesthetics: the subject composed in contemplation) nor dissolved (which is the effect of much popular culture: the subject given over to the schizo intensities of the commodity sign). (2001: 75)

I will return to this transition of affect understood as traumatic in the following chapter.

Arguably located in the “aesthetical distance of immediacy” (Koch, 1974: 29), the early portrait films such as the Screen Tests, but also some of the longer films, equally display a tension between presence and absence, in this case in particular between the presence/absence of the human body and that of the camera. These stillies (as opposed to movies), as Warhol tended to call them, each last approximately three minutes and feature static portrait performances of Factory visitors with “star-potential.” Like the serial photo-booth photographs Warhol began making in 1963, the film-portraits are records of change over time. Apart from requiring the visitor to simply “be there,” the Screen Tests followed a basic set of rules: the camera had to be static and the background plain; the subject was to be well-lit and centered, and was also instructed to face forward and to remain as still as possible, as when sitting for a portrait photograph.53 “By transporting the conventions of the formal or institutional photographic portrait into the time-based medium of film,” Callie Angell writes in her introduction to Andy Warhol Screen Tests, “Warhol pushed the tension between stillness and duration to the extreme.” (Angell 2006, 14) Yet the Screen Tests, more than adopting the conventions of still photography, can be said to remediate one of the oldest of photographic processes, namely that of the daguerreotype. Walter Benjamin, writing at length about the protracted pose necessitated by the daguerreotype’s long exposure time, celebrated the medi-
um for its potential to expose “a human nature settling into its own specificity.”

Something different transpires in the Screen Tests, however.

Notorious for the habit of walking away during a shoot, leaving the “sitter” alone with the camera, Warhol subverted reality, transformed his subjects, tore them apart. Facing Warhol’s Bolex, the sitters struggle “to hold a pose, while their brief moment of exposure was prolonged into a nearly unendurable three minutes.” (Angell 2006, 14) Unlike in the daguerreotype, movement in the Screen Tests is not lost, swallowed up by the long exposure time required for the image. On the contrary, every miniscule gestural movement is blown out of proportion, both spatially, in its larger-than-life appearance in the close-up, as well as temporally, in its eventfulness amid eventlessness. Moreover, while we may scrutinize the image in search of involuntary gestures in hopes of glimpsing the “real” person “behind” the pose, this “realness” has become part of the pose, just as the pose is already part of the pro-filmic, the “real.” What any one of the Screen Tests thus reveals to us is neither the “real” person “behind” the pose, nor merely an “image” of that person, but rather an ongoing oscillation between the two in which neither one is privileged over the other. And this, in turn, demonstrates what a post-subjective human existence amounts to. It also demonstrates the importance not of subjectivity, but of an intensified and above all thickened sense of “here.”

Whereas in the manifestations of Warhol’s projected persona the camera functioned as a way to give shape to the present, in the Screen Tests the presence of the camera punctuates the space of its attention, transforming that space into a stage for self-presentation built around the logic of the pose. This has direct consequences for the space and place of the encounter. For, as Kaja Silverman convincingly argues in The Threshold of the Visible World, “the pose always involves both the positioning of a representationally inflected body in space, and the consequent conversion of that space into a ‘place.’” (1996: 203) While the place in question is, technically speaking, not the same as the place where the viewer resides and around which my conception of the “here” of the encounter revolves, what the Screen Tests bring to light is a more general tendency, whereby anyone, in the face of the camera, projects an image for the camera and often plays directly to it, with an intensity that mirrors the viewer’s “investment in the image on the screen.” (Taubin, 1997: 27) In the anticipation of being recorded, that is: in the pro-filmic, projected self-image that the cinematic folds back upon its “subject” and thickens the “here” of the encounter.

This thickened here, in turn, calls attention to the subject in the exhibition, the participating viewer’s “me.” In its 2007 Amsterdam installation, the Screen...
Screen Tests, by being projected on the four walls of a square room, transformed the place into a multifarious surveillance space. Due to the frontality of filming and the sitters’ direct address of the camera, the viewer of the Screen Tests was performatively put in the position of the seemingly absent observer, the director or camera, filling that absence with a presence of his or her own. To engage with the films in the exhibition, moreover, the visitor had to occupy the space between them, so that looking at one or more of the sitters automatically meant turning one’s back on the relentless stare of at least one of the other (pseudo-)subjects on display. The place from which the visitor-viewer observed the portraits was thus punctuated both by what he or she was looking at, i.e., the image of the sitters, as well as by the latter’s mediated glares that implicated him or her in the act of looking. To the extent that the films produce discomfort in the viewer, I believe this has less to do with the portraits’ extended duration and more with what is exposed by the camera: the sitter’s struggle with the merciless mechanical eye of a camera that refuses to look away; the internalized gaze through which the sitters project their self-images to the screen; and the viewer’s own desire to see while knowing that within our media-saturated world this desire to see is precisely what puts him or her in the position of being observed. To look away means to step out of the equation, to move away from the “here” of the encounter, only to realize that – especially within the contemporary multi-media environment, pervaded by multiple and mobile screens and image-capturing technologies – the “here” moves along with you, is where you are, and continues to affect the “here,” “now,” and “me” of our encounter with the cinematic in locally specific ways.

This brings me to another example that clarifies the ways the cinematic extends into the pro-filmic real. It concerns the ontological uncertainty brought about by the use of video in the seminal multiple-screen film Outer and Inner Space, to which I kept returning during my various visits to the exhibition. (see fig. 1.7) What drew me to the film repeatedly was its offering of a miniaturized version of what I found captivating in the exhibition as a whole: its multiple screens, its mixed reality, and its self-reflexive staging of the encounter between viewer and image, between sitter and her projected self-image, and finally between two media, in this case film and television. The film consists of two reels, projected side by side. Each reel ends twice, first, after 30 minutes, on video, then, after 33 minutes, on film. The result is a panoramic image of four talking heads alternating video-film-video-film, accompanied by a soundtrack that remains cacophonous due to the four clashing reverberations.36
*Outer and Inner Space* is the only film in Warhol’s oeuvre to incorporate videotape and is arguably the first documented artistic use of home video equipment. (Angell, 2002) The film features “poor little rich girl” Edie Sedgwick who is filmed as, on a monitor to her right (our left), a videotape plays back an earlier recorded interview with her. The film is comparable to the *Screen Tests* in that it foregrounds the act of portraiture as a performance. But here Sedgwick not only faces up to her anticipated filmed portrait, but she is also engaged in a “live” struggle with her own pre-recorded image. For as the video-Edie almost faces the film-Edie on the right, the latter occupies the same space and time as her earlier recorded self, seemingly “listening to her own voice whispering into her ear like a ghost from the past, while facing down the movie camera that is recording every moment of her existential ordeal in the present.” (Angell, 2002) The issue of this work, in other words, is the intensification and thickening of the “here.”

![Fig. 1.7: Warhol’s Outer and Inner Space (1965). At “Filmscape,” Andy Warhol: Other Voices, Other Rooms, Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam, 2008.](image)

The presence of the video display monitor, transmitting an uninterrupted video-record of an earlier taped video-portrait of Sedgwick in real-time, introduces an element of immediacy to the filmed image, so that the film-Edie appears to be more live, more real than the video-Edie. Yet, while the film-image seems to preserve Sedgwick in her specificity, the television-image flattens her appearance into a shallow phantom. In addition, in contrast to the deep-space of the filmic image, the monologue of the film-Edie appears to be much more superficial than that of the video-Edie in the flat image. Though clearly a played-back recording, nonetheless the video-image is seemingly transmitted live on film, while the filmed image
clearly remains an instance of frozen and captured time (despite the suggested liveness of the film-Edie’s appearance). An irony here is that the film Outer and Inner Space actually preserved the video images by reshooting them on film, as the Norelco’s “slant scan video”-technology Warhol used soon became obsolete and additional recorded tapes can no longer be screened.  

In Audiovisions, Siegfried Zielinski states that the video recorder – when it became established as a widespread technology in the seventies – was one of the first technologies that made it possible for the average user to easily manipulate audiovisual time structures. As a replaying tool it intervened with the filmic syntax, which could be sped up, slowed down, skipped, or frozen to a virtual standstill. As a (television) recording device it enabled the viewer to deconstruct standardized television time, which figured as a tool for standardizing social time. In combination with a camera, it provided the user with the possibility of preserving, processing, and reviewing life-events. In the mid-sixties, however, video’s technological development was still rudimentary. The fact that it was virtually impossible to edit drove many artists away from filmic conventions towards experimentations with the medium’s specific qualities. Pioneer Nam June Paik’s single-channel video installation 9/23/69 for example remediated several television streams on multiple monitors, thereby exposing and overlaying the multiple occasions of its production (broadcast, recording, distortion, live-performance) and reception (real-time, (re)mediated, replayed). Likewise, the instant playback of Sedgwick’s pre-recorded portrait; the experimentation with the medium’s performative potential; the lack of editing and the intervention into the process of transmitting by filming a replayed recording; and finally the play with notions of immediacy and liveness – all articulate artistic interests in what critics today often regard as the intrinsic properties of the medium.

Yet if video’s specificity lies in its handling and re/production of (audiovisual) time, when considered as a theoretical object Outer and Inner Space takes an a-teleological stance on the (features of the) “thing” it investigates. By foregrounding the medium’s specific characteristics, it turns video’s hypothesized idiosyncrasy into its performative potential. The film thus reveals for us, retrospectively, Warhol’s recognition of the creative potential of video’s technology. This suggests that a medium’s materiality is not fixed or pre-given, nor integral to the object or technology, as the notion of “intrinsic properties” suggests. Rather, the material characteristics must first be recognized, explored, and made perceptible as performative potential, before they can be fully developed into or further evolve as an audiovisual practice. I will return to this notion of performative potential and
the notion of materiality it implies in the third chapter of this study. Suffice it to say for now that in destabilizing the stable figure-ground relationships between image and world, mediated and live, *Outer and Inner Space*, like the EPI of Joselit’s reflections, embodies a “model of media spectatorship in which television, film, and kinesthetic experience mutually derealize one another” in a media fission in which, “bombarded by its multiple representations, the self is fatally undermined.” (2002: 74)

For the exhibition visitor the camera’s presence played a less significant role, if only because filming and photography were strictly prohibited. Surely cameras were there, either in the pockets of the wandering visitors or in the surveillance devices that scrutinized the rooms, but, strictly speaking, within the exhibition’s specific locale the extension of the cinematic took the form of neither a “baffle” nor of a pose. This is not to say, however, that for the exhibition visitor (me), the cinematic does not extend into our daily lives in similar ways. In fact, it can be argued that the exhibition offers a model-world through which the viewer can observe our own world, in which the cinematic practices mentioned above have become ubiquitous. Because of the tremendous proliferation of affordable, easy-to-use handheld recording devices among an ever-expanding group of amateur users, for the “me” within the encounter with the cinematic today the distinction between “making a movie,” “being in a movie,” and “watching a movie” has become increasingly blurred. This may well be because all three engage the necessary deictic placement: “here.”

What the exhibition also makes clear is that our encounter with the cinematic today is always already tightly tied to a larger media-saturated cinematic environment, in this case of the city at large, with its pervasive urban screens and incessant surveillance cameras, its endless flow of streaming images on television and the internet in the homes of its inhabitants, and the ever-present mobile communication and recording device in the hands and pockets of its dwellers. In the 2007 Warhol exhibition, this larger environment incidentally also comprised the Post-CS building itself, which – besides housing a number of other media companies and another multi-media exhibition – also was home to *Club 11* on the building’s upper floor, the restaurant in *fig. 1.2*, famous for its panoramic view of the city, as well as for its ongoing live-stream of images on its immense interior walls. Although this larger multi-media environment does not directly concern the “here” of the exhibition’s viewer (unless he or she had a coffee there before or after visiting the show), it does point to the paradox of a “here” that is very concrete, physical, and localized, even as it is also peripatetic, transportable, and mobile.
The “impression of the Warhol exhibition” provided by the museum’s website suggests as much. A camcorder speedily navigates the exhibition, turning it into an almost impressionistic blur, though recording some recognizable details. The camera does not hold, it never reveals, it only moves from one screen to the next, from one room to the next. It never fixes its position, its gaze, except for rare occasions at the end of the clip when the camera does not pan or tilt, but zooms in and out of details. It conveys the feel of navigating a present-day media-soaked landscape equipped with one’s own handheld camera.

The clip highlights another aspect of the tension between localization and displacement when it comes to our encounter with the cinematic today. The clip’s vivid impression of navigating a cityscape notwithstanding, we would most likely encounter these particular images neither in the exhibition, nor on a portable display while walking through the city, but rather at home, behind a computer, perhaps in anticipation of or after a trip to the exhibition itself. Physically detached from the exhibition and temporarily immobilized behind the computer (though laptops, notebooks and tablet computers such as iPads most certainly allow for mobility within the home), this viewer too is engaged in a cinematic “here” that comprises both the physical space of the encounter as well as the various media with which or through which that space is augmented. The “here” encompasses the “there” where the viewer may imagine himself or herself to be, even as he or she remains at all times firmly grounded in the intensified “here” and a thickened yet unattainable “now” – in this case, behind the computer.

Locating the Cinematic: Here

This chapter has aimed to locate the cinematic in the dynamic and changing sites where we encounter audiovisual images today. Looking into the discussions of time and temporality in the films of Andy Warhol in the first part of this chapter, I have argued that any conception of the “here” of our encounter with the cinematic today must start by acknowledging the physical place of the encounter, which includes the viewer’s body, as well as the particular orchestration of cinematic images and media technologies within that space. Time, in other words, makes sense only in a “here.” Ruminating on the 2007 Warhol exhibition in the second part of this chapter, I have then suggested that this “here” is rescaled, augmented, and punctuated through mediation, so that the virtual and physical space collide into one thickened “here,” where neither the wandering visitor nor the moving images
are held in place by a fixed vantage point. Situated in a world increasingly made up of images, we relate to and engage with these images in different ways than would an outside observer. The “here” of the encounter is therefore never fixed, but rather punctuated, governed by a logic of layering and contamination, guided by the physical and optical traversals of the viewer-visitor through the space of the encounter that turns that space into a place. The “here” negotiated in the encounter is set apart by the pointed accumulation of the virtual and the physical, organized around the mobile though situated body of the participating viewer for whom the distinction between kinetic and mediated experiences is increasingly blurred.

In more general terms, I have sought to historicise this “hereness.” What the multi-media exhibition makes explicitly clear is that to fully grasp the sense of “here” that emerges from our encounter with the cinematic today, what is needed is a functional conception of space and place. Such a conception surpasses the notions of objective and subjective space as well as their binary opposition. The “here” of the encounter with the cinematic is explicitly double: it refers at once to the physical space occupied by the “me” within the encounter and to how that me relates to other spaces and places, real and imagined, yet neither concrete nor referential but constantly emerging within the here and now. There is no outside of this “here” within today’s media-saturated world, because for as long as we are in contact with cinematic technologies (and arguably even when we are not) the “here” of our encounter with the cinematic is where we are. For this reason our relation to the place of the encounter not only can but must be at once mobile and localized, and at once virtual or distributed, and physical.