

Conceptual Cinephilia

On Jon Routson's Bootlegs

Lucas Hilderbrand

From the releases of George Lucas's blockbuster disappointment *STAR WARS, EPISODE I: THE PHANTOM MENACE* (USA: 1999) to acting twin Mary-Kate and Ashley Olsen's feature film flop *NEW YORK MINUTE* (USA: Danny Gordon, 2004), Baltimore-based conceptual artist Jon Routson (1969) recorded cinema screenings with his digital video camera. Routson would merely turn on his camera when the feature began, often cutting off the opening credits and jostling the image as he settled into his seat. He would rest the camera low on his chest or stomach to be inconspicuous and record without looking through the viewfinder in order to preserve the camera's batteries and to avoid attracting the theater ushers' attention. The footage often wandered out of focus, cropped the films, and reduced the big screens' grandeur to murky colors, low-resolution details, and harsh flickers. Occasionally elliptical jump-cuts interrupted the middle of recordings and end credits went missing, though all "editing" was done in-camera during the screening. Routson then burned the footage to DVD-R without any post-production alteration or creating menus or chapter settings. He has stated that he often didn't even watch his recordings before sending them to his gallery for instant exhibition. As an automated creative practice, these documents entailed no craftsmanship and only minimal technical proficiency, yet their imperfections allow us to reconsider the way we see films. In essence, these are reproductions of film exhibitions that stress the space of the cinema, the noise of the audience, and the grain and flicker of the films – showing us what spectators are supposedly perceptually ignoring.

Critical analysis of Routson's work has focused primarily on its novel challenge to traditional notions of authorship and its tenuous legality.¹ Despite prominent press attention, however, Routson has never faced litigation or received cease-and-desist orders. This, even though piracy paranoia has made the work timely and relevant – former Motion Picture Association of America President Jack Valenti's infamous campaign against piracy and the failed Academy Award video screener ban hit a fever pitch in fall 2003, exactly between Routson's two spring shows at Team Gallery in New York. Unlike European copyright laws, which privilege authors' moral rights, the US copyright code was conceived to promote the public interest by providing only temporary control and economic benefit to creators as an incentive to create, after which works would enter the public domain. The US "fair use" provision, amended in 1976,

permits non-commercial reproduction of excerpts from copyrighted works for news reporting, critical, or scholarly purposes. European creators have more control over others' uses of their works, but in the US (in theory, at least) the public has more freedom to use and build from others' creations. In the past several years, however, US copyright codes have been expanded in the rights owners' favor with the 1998 Copyright Term Extension Act (aka the Sonny Bono Act) and the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, which governs not only uses of content but also reproduction technology itself.

Reeling from the rise of online music file sharing and the threat of increased moving image downloading, the entertainment industry has pushed for even more restrictive laws; these shifts not only threaten commercial piracy but also previously "fair" uses by artists and private consumers. Additionally, laws rendering uses of recording devices inside cinemas illegal have prompted the artist to stop making this series of bootlegs. Pirate tapes and DVDs have become increasingly scarce on the streets of New York, particularly along the formerly reliable and infamous Canal Street, as a result of police crackdowns. Simultaneously, more and more pirated copies are being accessed directly from industry insiders who leak near-final cuts out of post-production houses, as opposed to the old fashioned method of taking a camcorder into a theater and taping the screen.² Through Routson's work, these shoddy sorts of documents have migrated from Chinatown to Chelsea, from the black market to the white-walled art space. And, like pirated copies, Routson's recordings are often produced and reproduced on each film's opening day.

Contemporary fanatical attempts to prevent mass copyright infringement does not single-handedly make Routson's work interesting as art and only incidentally makes it political. These digital recordings in no way function as viable substitutes for the films; rather, they remediate the cinema as a whole – the exhibition space and its viewers, as well as the films. Significantly, the two terms used by Routson and his gallery are "recordings" (the title for both exhibitions at Team) and "bootleg" (the official title of each work). With a more neutral connotation, the term "recording" suggests both historical documentation and the materiality of the reproduction format. Yet, as Clinton Heylin argues, "An essential element of creativity separates the bootleggers from their piratical cousins – those who copy material but make no attempt to pass their product off as the original..."³

In a study of the underground music recording culture, he defines bootlegs as productive documents recorded by the fan/user of a live performance, in contrast to piracy, which entails the illegal duplication and sale of copies that compete with legitimate commercial releases.⁴ Routson's recordings are not available for sale or distribution, so they pose no market competition to theatrical or home video releases. Additionally, their low-fidelity aesthetics give them little

commercial value as pirate copies. In effect, the recordings' conceptual status and gallery context make them "art" rather than their contents (though they still operate as texts).

Routson's work is conceptual in the sense that it emphasizes process over product, jackass stunt over aesthetic achievement. In its seminal period from 1968-77 (also the first decade of video art), conceptual art challenged the authority, mastery, and commercialism of the art world through self-reflexivity and dematerialization: a work could just as sufficiently be described as created or seen, and as ephemeral or visually unremarkable "works," there was often no art object to sell.⁵ Although emerging in a time of political upheaval, conceptual art did not necessarily possess Dada's satirical edge or total embrace of nonsense. Perhaps post-post-modern, Routson's latter-day recordings are conceptual works without ideas or politics. He challenges conceptions of authorship and artistic integrity as he does not "create" any of his images but steals or purchases them.⁶ Like so much early conceptual art, these spectacles of spectatorship are presented as ephemeral installations that cannot be bought or owned.

In cutting films up or slowing them down, video artists have picked up where "classical" conceptual artists left off – though much early video art was rooted in conceptualism – by repurposing preexisting images and sounds for formal and discursive examination of perception, media, cultural practices, and (personal) histories. Coincidentally, the American fair use copyright provision does not protect *artistic* appropriation but does protect critical or transformative reuse – thereby necessitating a political edge or formal reinvention. Experiments in "found footage" began through reworking early, industrial, and educational films, but as video has made more content and technology accessible, popular cinema and television have become increasingly frequent resources and these practices have become exponentially more common. Routson's work was distinguished by his process of reshooting the content with a camera rather than merely duplicating it from deck to deck. Recording videos of film projections (almost) in their entirety, Routson's feature bootlegs are apparently devoid of the meaning, ideology, or political critique that marks much of this prior appropriation video work.⁷ Instead, Routson's videos have elicited comparisons to Marcel Duchamp's readymades, Andy Warhol's affectless reproductions, and Douglas Gordon's video installations, which likewise appropriate whole Hollywood films but render them impossible to see in full.⁸

By seeing and recording films nearly indiscriminately – seeming to disregard canons or personal taste – Routson could be seen as either the ultimate cinephile or as altogether indifferent to the films. His exhibitions turned the Team Gallery space into an ad-hoc multiplex where three screens presented daily programming changes, with new works arriving as he produced them. Occasionally the

three films on view during simultaneous screenings were thematically linked, at other times not. The low resolution videos on view for his first *Recordings* exhibition (22 March-26 April 2003) defaced aesthetically pristine pictures in BOOTLEG (FAR FROM HEAVEN) and BOOTLEG (CREMASTER 3), action spectacles in BOOTLEG (SPIDER-MAN) and BOOTLEG (FINAL DESTINATION II), and low-brow fair in BOOTLEG (PHONE BOOTH) and BOOTLEG (BOAT TRIP), which was recorded following the opening after-party at McDonald's. His second show (3 April-8 May 2004) featured a repertory screening in BOOTLEG (SUNRISE), as well as a range of recent releases in BOOTLEG (ELEPHANT), BOOTLEG (ELF), BOOTLEG (MONSTER), and BOOTLEG (MEAN GIRLS).

At the opening for *Recordings II*, the gallery screened BOOTLEG (THE FOG OF WAR), BOOTLEG (THE PASSION OF THE CHRIST [SECOND RECORDING]), and BOOTLEG (KILL BILL, VOLUME 1). Each screening space was painted black with large-scale video projection against a white wall and a different seating configuration: a bench in the front and largest room, a leather couch in the intimate middle screening room, and metal folding chairs in the back gallery. Spatially, these layouts maintained a distance between the audience and the image; typically, viewers entering the galleries would not cross in front of seated viewers, nor would they approach the screen unless they kept close to the side walls. Keeping with a current trend in video art, these digital video recordings of theatrical screenings presented the work through projection configurations rather than on monitors – neither fully replicating the cinema experience nor home video viewing on television. Among the gallery's openings, *Recordings II* seemed sparsely attended, and as audio-visual art, discouraged the chatter and social scene typical of strictly visual art events. Screened as loops without predetermined start times, the bootlegs were nearly impossible to see from the beginning, and devoting the feature-length running time to each viewing would border on loitering. This is a problem for much looped video work installed in galleries, but these bootlegs do not seem intended to be viewed in their entirety. As they deny most of the pleasures of an evening at the movies, the videos are frankly too tedious to watch all the way through in the gallery, anyway. Instead, the recordings make the spectatorial disparity between cinematic film screenings and video installations resoundingly apparent. In contrast to the cinema, the video gallery does not presume an interpolated viewer who follows a linear plot; though the high art milieu might seem to demand more refined attention to the work, it instead allows the viewer a more casual and transient relation to the moving image and soundtrack – a brief aesthetic or theoretical encounter compared to a feature-length commitment. Like so much digital or conceptual art, these recordings are appreciated as experiences or as meta-texts. Liberated from any necessity of narrative cognition, the video bootleg viewer can instead

ponder the theater's off-screen space or intertextual connections between simultaneous screenings.

Contingency played a role in both the bootlegs' production and, to a lesser extent, their exhibition. According to the gallery owner Jose Friere, the opening's three videos were not chosen for thematic reasons but for the more pragmatic one that only these DVD-Rs played back without skipping. Even though curated by chance, each recording offered a different perspective on film viewing. *BOOTLEG (THE FOG OF WAR)*, shot from a distance, in focus and unobstructed, seems most blatantly a statement of copyright infringement – and perhaps even of respect; it does not work to destroy Errol Morris's political documentary. By comparison, the other two works on view were more successful in challenging classical cinematic spectatorship. Screening in the cozy video room, *BOOTLEG (THE PASSION OF THE CHRIST, [SECOND RECORDING])* was shot with obscure framing that clearly interfered with any comprehension of Mel Gibson's film, and *BOOTLEG (KILL BILL, VOLUME 1)* similarly abstracts Quentin Tarantino's auteurist homage to genre films. The pleasures of these recordings are found in their details – in the specific ways they attract our attention away from the cinema screen or undermine the films' auteurist or narrative intentions.

During its first half-hour, Routson's *BOOTLEG (KILL BILL, VOLUME 1)* was shot in extreme close-up, showing only a small portion of the screen and none of the auditorium architecture. Save occasional glimpses of Uma Thurman's face, this film comprised of referential pastiche has itself been rendered almost unrecognizable, and it's through sound cues that viewers would most likely be able to place the film. Despite being mesmerized by *KILL BILL* upon seeing it in the theater months earlier, when I saw the bootleg at the opening, I couldn't identify it until I recognized the cue of Elle Driver's (Daryl Hannah) whistling. This portion of the recording allows us to really look at the texture of the film image in a way that we could never see it ourselves. In Routson's recording the pronounced celluloid grain has been punctuated by the projector's flicker, which produces an eye-straining strobe effect. A visually gorgeous and arrestingly violent film becomes painful to watch, while the graphic violence is abstracted, as is the game of intertextual citation. The extreme close-up framing, however, is only a temporary reconfiguration. When the camera zooms out, at the beginning of the anime section portraying O-ren Ishii's (Lucy Liu) back story, Routson's position in the auditorium is revealed. He apparently sat in the front row of raised stadium seating; a balcony bar splits the screen horizontally for the remainder of the recording. The bar so perfectly slashes across the screen's torso that it at first seems that the frame lines are simply out of register on the projector. In this second portion of the recording, featuring the majority of the film, the audio also marks the artist's and the audiences' presence. Now less sub-

sumed in the film text, we begin to notice snuffles, mutterings about Japanese girls, laughs at the bloody stunts, and even a yawn during the drawn-out battle at the House of Blue Leaves.

In a series of correspondences about contemporary world cinephilia, Kent Jones comments that Tarantino, whose film knowledge is largely founded upon home video viewing rather than cinemathèque attendance, would qualify as the “wrong kind of cinephile” according to Susan Sontag. Raymond Bellour concurs with the video-bashing charge, saying that Tarantino doesn’t understand “the real weight of an image, which explains [his work’s] ethical irresponsibility.”⁹ If Tarantino’s love for cinema is perverse, one can only imagine what sort of heathen he would label Routson. He may or may not understand the “ethics” or the “real weight” of images, but in stealing and disfiguring Tarantino’s, he allows us to ponder our perceptions of them. Both the extreme close-up and the far balcony bar framings function to disrupt a “perfect” perspective, but the effect differs: the former makes us see the film as something new and different, whereas the latter functions as an obstruction that merely frustrates the spectatorial experience.

Mediating both the religious message and the violence of Gibson’s blockbuster religious biopic, *BOOTLEG (THE PASSION OF THE CHRIST, [SECOND RECORDING])* was shot from a low angle behind a seat that cuts into the image and obscures its subtitles. (The dialogue was performed entirely in the dead languages of Latin and Aramaic.) By dramatizing explicit images of whipping, grueling cross bearing, and painful impaling on the cross, the film makes Jesus’ sacrifice – for a religious audience – seem more profound and viscerally immediate. Any missionary potential the film may possess, however, has been bled from Routson’s second bootleg. (Routson recorded three versions of the film, creating a video trinity that filled each of the gallery’s screening rooms on three dates.) It performs an act of blasphemy by rendering Jesus’ story incomprehensible and effectively censors much of the visual and verbal information. When the Jews first bring Jesus (Jim Caviezel) to be tried by Pontius Pilate (Hristo Naumov Shopov) – one of the few dialogue-intensive scenes – Routson shifted slightly in his seat so that fragments of the subtitles become visible on the right edge of the screen. This repositioning only proves more distracting as the viewer may engage in unsolvable puzzles of mentally filling in the missing words. With little visual stimulation keeping our attention on the screen image, we begin to look elsewhere and contemplate the theater space Routson documents. The auditorium’s black, tile-drop ceiling reflects the screen during the film’s brighter moments, and a red emergency exit sign glows like a beacon. The sound recording remarkably captures a flattened yet sensitive approximation of cinema acoustics, so that the effect of surround sound are still audible, even if the video is screened in standard stereo.

In the U.S., *THE PASSION* became a religious phenomenon, making ungodly sums of money during its sustained theatrical run when it became part of audiences' Sunday rituals: church groups would attend en masse repeatedly, week after week as an extension of religious services. As Routson reshot the film, it officially lost its ritual function or visceral-spiritual aura, and the framing behind an empty chair also made the theater space seem vacant. Only through audio disruption and inappropriate responses do we know that anyone was watching the film. At one point a cell phone rang, and the camera shifted as if it was Routson's own, which he had to maneuver to silence. Later, when the first establishing shot of crosses on a hilltop appeared an hour and a half into the film, someone near the camera muttered, "It's about time," expressing boredom and excitement for the crucifixion. We hear a loud belch at the moment Jesus' cross has been erected and a sarcastic, celebratory "yeh!" quietly cheered when Christ arose from the dead. It's ambiguous if the praise was for the resurrection or for the film's end.

Routson's bootleg not only presents a travesty of Gibson's film, but it also documented a singular screening performance, complete with audience commentary. Projection defects and audience responses are ephemeral, live events, and these bootlegs become video archives of historical reception. These bootlegs may be categorized as conceptual art because they are acts of appropriation, but as meta-cinema,¹⁰ Routson's work provides an opportunity to interrogate how we watch films. The digital video camera's latter-day kino eye perceives the cinema differently than human spectators would – with zooms, out of focus, in close-up, and from uncomfortable angles. But by essentially shifting our points of view and the objects of our attention, these recordings refocus our gaze upon those elements of the cinema we are not supposed to see: the chairs, the ceilings, the illuminated exit signs, the bodies of other viewers, the projector's flicker, and even the grain of the celluloid. In the auditorium, all these aspects are present before us, but we are conditioned to ignore them. Like the rattle of the projector or the dust in the projected beam of light (which do not register in Routson's recordings), we only consciously consider the off-screen space when it either interferes as a distraction or when the film ceases to engross the viewer – that is, at moments when the apparatus has failed.

And yet, essential to cinema as a physical and social institution, the off-screen space must also be part of our apperception. Though exterior to the film *text*, it is not exterior to the cinematic *experience*. Vision and hearing are active processes of filtering information, and in the cinema we are assumed to not see (or pretend not to see) the surrounding *mise-en-scène* of the auditorium. Watching a film entails actively not seeing, by directing our attention to the screen and by relying upon the innate perceptual slowness that allows for the persistence of

vision. As art historian and visual theorist James Elkins observes, blindness is an essential part of seeing:

Because we cannot see what we do not understand or use or identify with, we see very little of the world – only the small pieces that are useful and harmless. Each act of vision mingles seeing with not seeing, so that vision can become less a way of gathering information than avoiding it.... [H]uman sight is not merely partial blindness or selective seeing but a determinate trading of blindness and insights.¹¹

As Elkins comments, we sometimes fail to notice mundane details that we encounter repeatedly simply because the information isn't essential for our understanding. Similarly, our brains will fill in details as we process sights, so that we perceive objects as whole even if we only see fragmentary images. Even if a spectator's head blocks part of our line of vision, we can usually mentally compensate for the missing part of the image without confusion. Though we may strain our necks to peer around the intrusion, it does not ultimately alter our comprehension of the film. (As *BOOTLEG [THE PASSION...]* demonstrates, with subtitles this can pose more of a problem.)

By directing our attention away from the screen to the space of spectatorship, perhaps Routson's recordings allow us to reconceive reception. Considerable scholarly attention has reviewed the developmental history and cultural-aesthetic impact of audio reproduction; such work suggests that recordings function as preserved texts and, more interestingly, argue that each new technology has required different manners of performance and studio manipulation while creating new perceptual and consumptive relationships between the listener and the format/text.¹² This body of work remains indebted to Walter Benjamin, who expressed ambivalence about the status of the art object; removed from its former ritual function in the modern era, its reproduction can circulate more widely but without the aura of the original's physical presence. In taking film as his exemplary new medium for examination, however, Benjamin acknowledged that film technology and aesthetics have changed the way spectators *see*. As is too often overlooked, he wrote of perception and experience – of *reception* rather than *recording* per se.¹³

The space of the cinema and other spectators are generally considered irrelevant to our perception of the film. Yet, the occasional audio commentary in Routson's recordings suggest the sensibility of a viewer experienced in the specific milieu of interactive midnight movies and texts such as *MYSTERY SCIENCE THEATER 3000* and DVD bonus features. Certainly responsive audiences contribute to the excitement of action and horror films, the pleasure of otherwise tedious cult flicks, and even enhance festival screenings of art films, for which applause appreciatively caps off the experience. Conversely, a rude neighbor can also spoil an otherwise pleasurable screening. Different types of venues,

geographic locations, and even screening times also attract different audiences and social dynamics, from reverential to rowdy. The cinema is a social phenomenon, though we have been trained not to see or hear our fellow filmgoers as anything but a nuisance. (Or, in special romantic instances, the real subject of our attention.) As cinema historians have documented, early film audiences were even more vocal prior to narrative integration and feature running times; perhaps, then, it is spectatorial silence that is antithetical to the cinema, rather than bawdy participation.

Routson's recordings suggest a cinephilia of distractions. Critics writing on cinephilia have suggested, particularly in the wake of cinema's centenary, that there is a nostalgic impulse behind it – a fear of the cinema's death and an attempt to reclaim or maintain celluloid and public film culture.¹⁴ Working with the vilified video medium, Routson reclaims the social, public exhibition of film. Annette Michelson has pointed out that cinephilia takes on variant modes in different periods, so there is no single or "proper" form of cinephilia.¹⁵ She describes a specific early 1970s movement to eliminate social distraction and isolate a direct cinematic experience in the (curiously named) Invisible Cinema at the Anthology Film Archives; in this experiment, blinders were installed between each seat so that the faces and sounds of neighboring viewers would be blocked out. Routson's work perhaps seems antithetical to "classical" cinephilia's ideals of the primacy of celluloid screened in a cultural vacuum. (Ironically, total spectatorial privacy would not be available for most audiences until the advent of home video.)

Inverting the desire for asocial cinema or technically innovative venues, Routson's work emphasizes human disruption and the shortcomings of more decrepit spaces—the materiality of film exhibition. *BOOTLEG (NASHVILLE)* is especially – and probably accidentally – illustrative of the way film may be seen and heard.¹⁶ Like most of his other recordings, this one begins abruptly; the image shifts about while Routson gets comfortable in his seat with the camera on, and silhouettes of latecomers cross in front of the screen. The audio track betrays the tinny echo of a lo-fi sound system so common to independent art houses, in comparison to the surround sound of new corporate theater complexes. In addition, film splotches and scratches – presumably at reel changeovers – are evident during this screening from an old and abused print. And, most importantly, the projector bulb is obviously too weak to evenly illuminate the widescreen framing, so the image is blatantly oval-shaped with dim corners.

The interference and the spaces of the cinema, complete with its restless and noisy audience, are precisely the subjects in Routson's work. The most exciting moments occur when the camera distorts the image or when someone talks over the soundtrack or gets up to leave the theater, blocking the screen. Routson's videos may be the exemplary cinephilic art in a moment of heightened

public attention to exhibitions spaces (particularly with sound systems and stadium seating) and to the convergence of piracy and media. These bootlegs are less than pure spectatorial or art experiences – the works are neither fully conceptual (at times the viewer can get pulled into the narrative) nor cinematic (there is too much interference for these videos to replace authentic film screenings). If anything, the recordings point to the fact that there is no such thing as uncorrupted spectatorship in the cinema. There will always be a level of ambient distraction, of waning attention, of human shortcoming in any feature-length viewing act, as much as theorists and buffs may want to pretend otherwise. Rather than hijacked films or artistic pirates, these recordings are reproductions of reception that call our attention to all that we don't see when we watch films – or, perhaps, all that we do.

Thanks to Jose Friere and Miriam Katzoff at Team Gallery for making Routson's work available for study.

Notes

1. See Young, Michael. "The Art of Stealing Movies." *V-Life* [*Variety* supplement], Nov. 2003: p. 76; McCabe, Brent. "Scene Stealer." *The Baltimore City Paper*, 21 January 2004. <http://www.citypaper.com/2004-01-21/pf/feature_pf.html>; Smith, Roberta. "When One Man's Video Art Is Another's Copyright Crime." *The New York Times*, 6 May 2004: E1 and E5; Lieberman, Rhonda. "Sound and Vision. John Routson." *Film Comment* (July/Aug. 2004): p. 17. In addition, his shows have been reviewed in *The Village Voice*, *Time Out New York*, *The New Yorker*, and *Flash Art*.
2. For an ode to pirate tapes of Hollywood films, see Crouse, Edward E. "Mageddo: Adventures in Lo-Fi: Sampling Bootleg Videos Bought on New York Streets." *Film Comment* (May/June 2001): pp. 58-61.
3. Heylin, Clinton. *Bootleg: The Secret History of the Other Recording Industry*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994: p. 8.
4. Idem: p. 6.
5. See Alberro, Alexander and Blake Stimson (eds.). *Conceptual Art: A Critical Anthology*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1999.
6. In his earliest publicly exhibited works (both 1992), Routson produced a random, untitled VHS mix-tape by recording moments from television broadcasts that caught his interest and, as a work titled *Free Kittens*, released five felines to run loose in a gallery. He also has a continuing, long-term project of collecting commercial photographs of Easter bunnies taken at malls; these come from seasonal set-ups where parents pay for kitsch images of their children on the laps of adults in fuzzy white costumes, but Routson purchases photos of the rabbits alone, looking alternately cheery and desperate.

7. Found footage films and appropriation video have extensive histories; Joseph Cornell, Bruce Conner, and Ken Jacobs were the seminal innovators of found-footage film, Dara Birnbaum of appropriation video. Recent examples are far too numerous to recount in detail, but prominent contemporary artists continuing in these modes include Douglas Gordon, Christian Marclay, Peter Tscherkassky, Caspar Straake, Mike Hoolboom, Leah Gilliam, Nikolas Provost, Craig Baldwin, and Abigail Child; working specifically with early or damaged orphan films, Peter Delpout's *LYRICAL NITRATE* (Netherlands: 1991) and Bill Morrison's *DECASIA* (USA: 2002) appropriate the texture of the medium itself more than its content. In addition to his feature film bootlegs, Routson has produced a pair of works that involve critical intervention through extensive re-working. With *CARRIE/PORKY'S: ORIGINALITY, NEATNESS AND HYGIENE* (USA: 2000) he created a stroboscopic work of gaze theory that alternates frames from shower scenes in *CARRIE* (USA: Brian DePalma, 1976) and *PORKY'S* (Canada/USA: Bob Clark, 1982). He also re-edited a bootleg of Matthew Barney's *CREMASTER 4* (USA: 1995) for television, complete with network tags and station identification (for Disney-owned ABC) and commercials (beginning with an Audi ad prominently featuring the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York, one of Barney's major sponsors and exhibitors).
8. Gordon's *24 HOUR PSYCHO* (1993) slows down Hitchcock's film to approximately 24 hours, playing out in stuttering slowness that makes the thriller tedious. His installation *FIVE YEAR DRIVE BY* (1995) extends duration of *THE SEARCHERS* (USA: John Ford, 1956) to a five-year running time, replicating the narrative's temporal span. In the installation *BETWEEN DARKNESS AND LIGHT (AFTER WILLIAM BLAKE)* (1997), *THE SONG OF BERNADETTE* (USA: Henry King, 1943) and *THE EXORCIST* (USA: William Friedkin, 1973) are projected on opposite sides of a translucent screen simultaneously so that the films' images dissolve into each other.
9. Bellour, Raymond, Kent Jones, et al, "Movie Mutations. Letters from (and to) Some Children of 1960." Rosenbaum, Jonathan, Adrian Martin, eds. *Movie Mutations: The Changing Face of World Cinephilia*. London: BFI, 2003: p. 8, pp. 28-29. See also Sontag, Susan. "The Decay of Cinema." *The New York Times Magazine*, 25 February 1996: p. 60.
10. In relation to Ken Jacobs's *TOM, TOM, THE PIPER'S SON* (USA: 1969), in which the camera moves around to focus on details within the frame as it reproduces an early film, Annette Michelson suggests that "cinephilia will now assume the guise of meta-cinema," also an apt description of Routson's work. Michelson, Annette. "Gnosis and Iconoclasm: A Case Study of Cinephilia." *October*, no. 83 (Winter 1998): pp. 15-16.
11. Elkins, James. *The Object Stares Back: On the Nature of Seeing*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996: pp. 201-202.
12. Several books have been published on the subject, but the most comprehensive and useful are Sterne, Jonathan. *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004; and Chanan, Michael. *Repeated Takes: A Short History of Recording and Its Effects on Music*. New York: Verso, 1995.
13. Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. Arendt, Hannah (ed.), Zohn, Harry (trans.). New York: Schocken Books, 1969: pp. 217-251.
14. Paul Willemsen suggests connections between cinephilia and both nostalgia and necrophilia in "Through a Glass Darkly: Cinephilia Reconsidered." *Looks and Frictions*:

Essays in Cultural Studies and Film Theory. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press and BFI, 1994: pp. 223-257. Editors' note: see also Thomas Elsaesser on cinephilia as essentially necrophilic/vampiristic: Elsaesser, "Ueber den Nutzen der Enttaeschung: Filmkritik zwischen Cinephilie und Nekrophilie." Schenk, Irmbert (ed.). *Filmkritik. Bestandsaufnahmen und Perspektiven*. Marburg: Schueren, 1998: pp. 91-114.

15. Michelson, Annette. "Gnosis and Iconoclasm": p. 3.
16. An early scene takes on new significance in Routson's bootleg, as Haven Hamilton (Henry Gibson) expresses anger at the presence of the BBC reporter (Geraldine Chaplin) with her recording equipment in the studio; he says that if she wants a copy, she can wait and buy the album.