# Introduction – The Othered Cinema

> [T]he need is to propose new answers to the question that is now raised in all institutions dedicated to modern and contemporary art: How is film to be exhibited and how is film to attain the status of an artwork?
> –Bruno Racine, president, Centre Georges Pompidou, 2006[1]

To open, an Overture. In 1986, Stan Douglas produced a 16mm work that recycled some of cinema's earliest images and one of its earliest genres, the phantom ride. Douglas paired recycled footage from two Edison films shot in the Canadian Rockies, Kicking Horse Canyon (1899) and White Pass, British Columbia (1901), with a soundtrack of passages excerpted from Marcel Proust's *In Search of Lost Time*. Overture consists of three image sections, each separated by black leader, and six passages of text. These passages are read by a male voice-over through two repetitions of the image track, resulting in the same image being accompanied by different text in the second iteration of the seven-minute loop. The phantom ride celebrates technologized perception, bringing together two of its most powerful incarnations: the speed of the locomotive and the mechanical eye of cinema. At a time when it was not possible to move the camera, the genre functioned as one way of enabling a mobile gaze. The iconography of the train, meanwhile, is inextricably linked to the birth of cinema through the inaugural rush of the Lumières' L'Arrivée d'un train à la Ciotat (1895).[2]

In Overture, the train winds around the mountains, supplies views of the landscape, and travels through tunnels of darkness, offering the spectator a glimpse of how train travel would appear from the front window of the conductor's car. On the soundtrack, a monologue unfolds that is drawn from those fragile moments between sleeping and waking. Seemingly opposed to the fast-moving views of faraway lands seen on the image track, the voiceover speaks of private, internal experience. And yet, as memories rush in and surround the narrator, he describes the experience in distinctly cinematic terms: "Everything revolved around me through the darkness: things, places, years." He then goes on to discuss the inability to separate one sensation from another with reference to the illusion of movement achieved by the proto-cinematic device of the Bioscope. Overture thus brings together two conceptions of time that are central to late nineteenth-century modernity: the public, standardized time that is closely linked to the development of the railway and the subjective time of in-

voluntary memory as elaborated by Proust.[3] Somewhere between them – between regularity and contingency, public and private – lies the time of cinema.

*Stan Douglas,* Overture *(1986).*

Overture would not be out of place amongst the many works of the experimental film tradition that have drawn upon the preclassical cinema, such as Ernie Gehr's Eureka (1974), which also uses footage of a phantom ride.[4] However, Overture is not an experimental film, but a film installation. It belongs not to the movie theater, but to the art gallery. It is an early example of the ways in which artists would claim the gallery as a space to investigate film history in the 1990s, mobilizing two strategies that would become central to this undertaking: the remake of an existing film and the investigation of 16mm as a medium aligned with historicity. Overture is, then, something of an overture for the explosion of references to film history and uses of the moving image that would occur in artistic production from around 1990 onwards. From one fin-de-siècle to another, it is a return to the subjective transformations brought about by the invention of cinema at the end of the nineteenth century amidst those initiated by new electronic media at the end of the twentieth. As an indexical trace of pastness, the grainy footage of the Edison films contains within it

the very force of time that Proust's narrator sought to recover, testifying to the way in which the past can be summoned in all its anachronism to challenge the present. As Douglas has remarked, "When they become obsolete, forms of communication become an index of an understanding of the world lost to us."[5] In Overture, the cinema emerges as such an obsolete form of communication, a superannuated technology that might possess a redemptive power. Douglas' use of cinema conceives of it as an old medium, but does so on the horizon of staking out a new moving image practice that might provide a reflection on the encounters between novelty and obsolescence, subjectivity and technology, that mark our moment.

In the decades following Overture, a whole host of artists raised precisely these questions and, in the process, reinvented cinema within the spaces of art. Though little explored within the discipline of film studies, this explosion of the moving image in contemporary art constitutes a primary site at which notions of cinema have been renegotiated and redefined in recent decades. Cinema becomes a preoccupation of contemporary art precisely at a time when it is perceived to be in crisis due to the increasingly consolidated hegemony of new, electronic media – media that would be digitized and networked as the 1990s progressed. Cinema enters the gallery on the tide of a culture converging under the sign of the digital, appearing there as something of an old medium to be commemorated and protected, as exemplified by Overture. However, though the cinema is older than new media, it is also newer than traditional media such as painting or sculpture. It is a technology aligned with mass culture that may be summoned to provide entertainment and accessibility. Enormous cinema-themed exhibitions and projected-image installations of high gloss and bombast underline cinema's novelty in an art institutional context. Rather than standing against the convergence of media by commemorating a senescent cinema, this mobilization of cinema in contemporary art – as a new medium – participates very much in its movements. It compromises what were once relatively rigid borders between the image-regimes of cinema and art and emblematizes the new mutability and transportability of moving images after digitization.

In this book, I will trace out the ways in which this interplay of old and new media has unfolded across the multifaceted explosion of cinema in the gallery since 1990. Moving across theoretical debates, curatorial decisions, and artistic practices, I will bring the tools of film theory to bear on what have traditionally been considered to be art historical objects, both to shed light on a new sector of moving image practice and to conceptualize how this sector relates to both cinema and cinema studies. Following Giuliana Bruno's assertion of the necessity of an interdisciplinary study of film and art,[6] I contend that cinema studies must reckon with the increasing presence of moving images in the gallery, for it represents a crucial site where one glimpses a sustained inquiry into the cultural

meaning and history of the cinema over the past twenty years. In the 1930s, Walter Benjamin articulated the pressing question of how the advent of mechanical reproduction, most forcefully embodied in the cinema, might change our conception of art.[7] Without abandoning this notion – for it is by no means settled – I will invert this query for the twenty-first century to ask: how does the progressive integration of cinema into the gallery and the museum change our conception of it? And how might the presence of moving images in the gallery function as a microcosm in which to examine the transformations cinema is undergoing today in the broader cultural field?

Certainly, uses of film and video have been central components of artistic practice since at least the 1960s or even reaching back to the cinematic experiments of the historical avant-garde. Throughout most of the last century, however, many artists undertook a determined effort to disarticulate any relationship between their employments of the moving image and the mass-cultural institution of cinema. Artists working with film and video tended to refuse illusionism and narrative and instead cultivated alliances with other media, such as sculpture and performance. Gallery-based uses of film virtually disappeared with the popularization of video, while video art developed a history of its own fundamentally apart from interactions with cinema. In something of a paradigm shift, since 1990 there has been a marked emergence of moving image art very much under the sign of cinema. If video art had aligned itself for decades with other media such as sculpture, performance, or even the democratic impulse of television in an effort to distance itself from cinema, since 1990 one witnesses a marked cultivation of cinematic tropes and conventions, such as mise-en-scène, montage, spectacle, narrative, illusionism, and projection. Jean-Christophe Royoux has termed these developments the *cinéma d'exposition* ("cinema of exhibition"), while Catherine Fowler has coined the term "gallery film."[8] Chrissie Iles has referred to this as the "new cinematic aesthetic in video," writing that, "In form and content, video is now mimicking the qualities that had always pertained exclusively to film. The use of the word *video* as a defining term for a particular area of contemporary art no longer appears to be either necessary or relevant."[9] In place of video art, artists' cinema has emerged. Far from reducible to a single postulate, this cinema is multifaceted. It encompasses single-channel works alongside multiscreen projection, film as well as video, looped exhibition and scheduled screening times, an interest in the virtuality of a represented world or in the phenomenology of spectatorship, an espousal or a rejection of narrative, and works made expressly for a gallery context and those made for traditional cinematic exhibition but now transported into the white cube.

Some artists take up the history of cinema as fertile ground for artistic inquiry, while others avoid specific references to film history in favor of an employment

of tropes and strategies drawn from cinema. Filmmakers such as Chantal Akerman, Atom Egoyan, Jean-Luc Godard, Peter Greenaway, Abbas Kiarostami, and Chris Marker have made installation works, while recent editions of the Venice Biennale have been filled with moving images and the 2006 Whitney Biennial was cinematically titled *Day for Night*. The Museum of Modern Art, New York, created a Department of Media and Performance to deal with its growing collection of film and video artworks in 2006, and even *Cahiers du cinéma* produced a special "Cinéma au musée" ("Cinema in the Museum") dossier for issue 611 in April of that year. The products of the movie theater are increasingly shown in gallery settings and group exhibitions thematically curated around the notion of cinema abound. These exhibitions range from using cinema as a rubric to explore art across various media, to exploring the presence of cinema within new moving image practices, to exhibiting works originally made for a movie theater within a gallery, or even concentrating solely on the design of film credits.[10]

This book's titular notion that contemporary art "exhibits" cinema is meant in two senses. The importation of cinema into the space of gallery constitutes a new way of exhibiting or displaying cinema, certainly. But this title also draws on the etymological meaning of the verb "to exhibit" as stemming from the Latin *exhibere*. In its conjunction of *ex-* (out) and *habere* (to hold), *exhibere* invokes the presentation of something for examination. These works "exhibit cinema" in the sense that they hold it out to view or subject it to scrutiny. Uses of cinema in the gallery since 1990 provide a site at which one may discern a sustained reflection on the kind of mutations and migrations the cinema has undergone all across the cultural field during this period; in other words, these exhibitions of cinema *exhibit* cinema and its contemporary changes. As such, this study may be understood not only as an overview of how cinema has entered contemporary art, but also as an intervention into recent film theoretical debates that speculate on the present and future of the institution of cinema. If it is possible to identify a single set of questions that has preoccupied film theory in the past twenty years, it is without a doubt a return to the ontological inquiry, "What is cinema?," now understood as an eminently historical formulation to which numerous answers might obtain. The gallery-based moving image production of the last two decades is a key site at which interrogations into cinematic specificity have taken place that both reflect on the material components of the apparatus and extend beyond them. These works "exhibit" cinema not simply as celluloid, projector, or binary code, but also as a social and historical institution. They offer numerous answers to the question of what cinema might be and, in so doing, may be understood as engaging in film theory through practice.

On a very basic level, the keyword "convergence" designates the operation by which media lose their medium-specific qualities by being remediated or

transcoded to data based in binary code.[11] It must be emphasized, though, that convergence is not merely a matter of material substrate. Rather, as the products of cinema become available on an increasing number of viewing platforms, the heterogeneous representational and spectatorial practices that form a part of the cinematic institution also shift, giving rise to an anxiety concerning its place – in both a literal and a figurative sense – in an increasingly digitized and mobile culture. While anxieties over the increasing obsolescence of celluloid film proliferate, the products of commercial cinemas have attained a greater reach than ever before, with markets expanding worldwide through the Internet and mobile wireless technologies. It would risk historical blindness to speak of a new ontological instability of cinema, for it is clear that the cinema's ontology has always been diverse and variable, developing from a mute technological marvel through the epic spectacles of CinemaScope and the advent of the blockbuster, to the small screens of television broadcasting and VCR platforms.[12] However, it is certain that since the 1990s, widespread digitization has sparked diverse and palpable anxieties concerning the fates of both the material of film and the institution of cinema.

If, for decades, the elements of the cinematic apparatus had been relatively tightly sutured together to form a discernible entity, recent years have seen these elements dispersed across the field of culture, shattering the cinema into a multiplicity of attributes that separate, recombine, mutate, and enter into aggregate formations with other media. "Convergence" is perhaps an ironic title for this movement, which might just as easily be named "divergence" or "dissolution" – for when formerly discrete sectors of culture converge according to a shared technological substrate, the contours of formerly delimited zones dissolve. Elements of the cinematic apparatus break out of the previously fixed network of relations of which they were once a part to now appear far from their usual configuration in new constellations that inhabit a murky interstitial space between cinema and its various others – television, the Internet, video games, mobile phones, and, of course, media art. For Henry Jenkins, convergence has less to do with technological change than it does with this kind of circulation of media content across various platforms, national boundaries, and economies.[13] In other words, convergence is not simply technological, but also representational and industrial/infrastructural. This tripartite definition of convergence has important implications for understanding the mutations of cinema in the gallery from the 1990s onward, as it speaks to the reconfiguration of cinema vis-à-vis other media on levels other than technology alone.

Newton's third law of motion states that for every force there is an equal and opposing force. No exception to this law can be made for the motions of convergence. Its dissolution of the boundaries of individual media has been met by a reassertion of medium specificities produced out of intermedial tension. In the

face of new media, for example, analogue film has reasserted its uniqueness. The contemporary moment is not simply one of convergence, but also one that sees an unleashing of multiple medium specificities that disperse the notion of cinema across varied conceptual and material spaces. Ideas of what the cinema might *be* are now articulated in numerous and incompatible forums, ranging from Hollywood's increasing efforts to combat online bootlegging through campaigns that emphasize the giganticism of the multiplex screen to partnerships with mobile telephone companies (now rebranding themselves as providers of "multimedia devices") to deliver content on tiny, handheld gadgets. When one speaks about the transformations cinema is undergoing in the early years of its second century, it is most often in the context of a digital threat, a becoming-calculable of the film image that makes way for the CGI monsters of summer blockbusters and movies based on video games. Surely, this is one mutation that is occurring. But one might also look to the domain of moving image art to find alternate responses to the proliferation of digital media and the changes wrought to distribution and exhibition structures. Hollywood is not alone in its attempt to redefine the cinema.

Responding to the large number of moving image installations he encountered at the 2001 edition of the Venice Biennale, Raymond Bellour writes that,

> These installations, and the forces that animate them, may seem to be the effect of the so-called "crisis" within cinema and to the difficulties of contemporary art, of which installations are probably the most vivid manifestation. But if it is difficult to assimilate these works to the tradition of the plastic arts, the very framework of which they explode, it is no less difficult to take them as belonging to traditional cinema or as a supplement of cinema; it would rather be better to continue (to the extent that it will be possible) to recapture cinema in the historical and formal singularity of its own device. The strange force of these works is thus to open ever more clearly the indefinable expansion of *an other cinema*, according to which the conditions of an *aesthetics of confusion* are clarified and amplified. It is better to try to describe its nuances than to pretend to be able to escape them.[14]

The following pages will take up the task of describing the nuances of what Bellour terms the "other cinema," but will depart from Bellour's preference that it would be better to "recapture cinema in the historical and formal singularity of its own device" and maintain a rigid division between this cinema and the "other cinema." To do so would be to overlook the many ways in which this "other cinema" recontextualizes the cinema and reflects on it as it has traditionally been conceived. Indeed, some components of the "other cinema," such as Douglas' Overture and the 16mm practices that will be discussed in chapter two, attempt to re-collect cinema in its analogue form – that is, to both remember it and piece it to together again. The "historical and formal singularity of

cinema" is precisely that: historical. It is not something that can be taken for granted as having an existence independent of the many transitions cinema is undergoing. Accordingly, in what follows, I will establish a dialogue between the history, present, and future of cinema as it has traditionally been conceived and the contemporary gallery-based practices Bellour refers to as the "other cinema." I will by no means, however, attempt to collapse these works into an already existing tradition of cinema for, as Adorno notes in his *Aesthetic Theory*, to understand the new only in terms of the old is to engage in a certain form of betrayal: "In the relation of modern artworks to older ones that are similar, it is their differences that should be elicited."[15] I will pay keen attention to these differences, but also point out certain continuities, outright rejecting the term "post-cinema" in favor of interrogating the interactions between old and new incarnations of an ever-changing entity.

In a play on the terminology of Bellour's notion of the other cinema, I prefer to see in these developments an *othered cinema*. Rather than the strict alterity Bellour's term maintains vis-à-vis cinema as traditionally conceived, understanding these gallery-based practices as an othered cinema is to suggest that they represent a site at which the cinema has become other to itself. They differ from it and yet share elements in common as well. The cinematic *dispositif* that had maintained hegemony for so long – what Bellour refers to as "the historical and formal singularity of cinema" – has shattered into its aggregate parts, which are now free to enter into new constellations with elements once foreign to it. By using the term *dispositif*, often translated as "apparatus," my intention is to emphasize the necessity of considering the specificity of cinema as residing not merely in its material substrate.[16] *Dispositif*, as defined by Michel Foucault – rather than by Jean-Louis Baudry, whose use of the term is perhaps more familiar within film studies – refers to a heterogeneous ensemble of material and discursive practices whose configuration is historically specific.[17] Foucault has described the concept as

> a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions – in short, the said as much as the unsaid. Such are the elements of the *dispositif*. The apparatus itself is the system of relations that can be established between these elements.[18]

In the case of cinema, the classical *dispositif* would thus include everything from the celluloid print to the projector, the theater, ticketing policies, audience protocol, distribution practices, advertising methods, and more.

This notion is central to conceiving of the relationship between cinema and the spaces of contemporary art for, in many cases, certain elements of the *dispositif* remain constant with cinema as traditionally conceived, while numerous

others suggest a drastic mutation. This ensemble of parts irreducible to self-identity is precisely what the term the *othered cinema* invokes. It is clear that cinema no longer means just one thing – though, of course, it never did. Rather than buy into the notion that all media will converge into an homogeneous digital field, it is necessary today to interrogate the ways in which the boundaries between media are both articulated and blurred, to see the pair convergence/specificity as existing in a dialectical tension with one another that allows for a new thinking of historicized ontologies rather than a dissolution, or even disappearance, of a given medium. By demonstrating the heterogeneity and variability of contemporary cinematic practices, I will avoid reifying cinema into a set of essential characteristics, thus dismantling predictions of apocalypse (for how can an apocalypse occur when variability and historical change is taken as the standard?) and avoiding mythologization (for the centrality of historicity impedes the freezing of contingency into the eternal nature of myth).

Asserting the variable specificity of cinema necessitates grappling with its changing cultural status, as it both persists and even expands its reach as mass spectacle but simultaneously metamorphoses into an object worthy of the protection of the sanctified spaces of the museum and the gallery. Though this latter operation has been going on for some time now – beginning at least with the Museum of Modern Art's decision to open a film library in 1935, contemporaneous with the formation of film archives worldwide – the contemporary moment is representative of a new phase in the claiming of cultural respectability and artistic value for the cinema. Iris Barry, founder of the MoMA film department, remarked in 1944 that the relationship of the film library to the rest of the museum was "rather remote" and compared it to the "slightly ambiguous position of an adopted child who is never seen in the company of the family."[19] Now, however, to continue the metaphor, film has become the golden child of the museum, showered with attention and praise. One might argue that it is precisely the continued assertions that cinema is now an "old" or "dead" medium that make it fit for entrance into the museum – for, to follow Adorno, "museum and mausoleum are connected by more than phonetic association. Museums are like the family sepulchres of works of art."[20]

The presence of film in the museum and the gallery prompts important questions about the contemporary status of cinema as a cultural institution and a mass medium. For Benjamin, cinema was a primary agent in the liquidation of cult value, that singularity deemed essential to the authentic work of art.[21] Art's basis in ritual gave way to exhibition value, which was characterized by an increased mobility and availability of the work of art by way of its reproduction. It induced a withering of aura. Certain elements of the contemporary integration of cinema into the museum are marked by a reversal of this process. Rarity and

preciousness are cultivated as, in a digital age of individualized image consumption, cult value is retroactively attributed to the senescent cinema. Cinematic ruins and cinematic refuse appear within the museum and gallery as so many relics of another age. This new cultic attachment to the cinema ranges from the employment of 16mm as a medium linked to a spectral historicity, to the selling of limited-edition films and videos as art objects, and the nostalgic veneration of cinema as a lost object now incessantly remade and recycled. These diverse developments are bound together by their shared status as reactions to widespread fears concerning the contemporary status of cinema.[22] This is by no means to partake in the melancholic refrain that proclaims the cinema to be dead, but rather to emphasize that such fears play an integral role in the tendency under discussion here. Over the last two decades, the field of art has become a space in which these anxieties are exhibited and worked through.

To understand the integration of cinema into the museum as simply a matter of obsolescence, however, would be to ignore central aspects of how cinema has been mobilized in contemporary art. The activation of a cinematic cult value, visible in a work such as Overture, is matched by an unparalleled expansion of the value of exhibition within the museum itself. Museums resemble Adorno's mausoleum less and less as they integrate new technologies to provide interactive and visually stimulating experiences. The new availability of high-quality video projection in the late 1980s and early 1990s was a key factor in this transformation, as it exploded the restricted scale of monitor-based presentation and offered gigantic images that could bathe the surrounding architecture in electronic light. Many uses of the moving image in art over the past two decades demonstrate not a resistance to but a marked affinity with more generalized transitions in visual culture brought about by the ascendance of digital media. The rise of multiscreen projected-image installations, for example, may be linked to a change in what Anne Friedberg has called the "vernacular system of visuality" following the past two decades of digitization, wherein a single-point perspective has fractured into multiple windows.[23]

In 1983, Hal Foster described an increasing spectacularization of contemporary art that abided by a Baudrillardian paradox: spectacle pervades artistic practice as an attempt to rescue the fading real, but by the same movement, it exacerbates this loss.[24] A footnote to Foster's article reveals a key alliance between this spectacularization and the cinema:

> The work of [Robert] Longo and others also suggests a new "spectacular" model of the artist...Given the generic or serial form of so much contemporary art and the way it is "subcontracted," produced by specialists (the division of labour has penetrated even this last enclave), this cultural epitome might well be the artist not as producer (as Benjamin hoped) but as director, *Hollywood* director.[25]

Foster's statement is prescient indeed and has turned out to be more literal than he perhaps intended.[26] The artist is now a Hollywood director not simply in the production methods embraced, but also in the big-budget work produced. The division of labor Foster saw as mimicking that of Hollywood has been fully adopted by many contemporary artists working with the moving image. In a sharp departure from the personal authorship proper to the experimental film tradition, artists regularly employ professional editors, production designers, and cinematographers as collaborators. Some, such as Doug Aitken and Sam Taylor-Wood, cast well-known celebrities in their videos and installations. Matthew Barney's three-hour CREMASTER 3 (2002) possesses a list of credits as long as a mainstream feature, including visual effects supervisors, a large crew, and an entire sound team.[27] While this is perhaps an extreme example given the budget and magnitude of that artwork, it is by no means exceptional. Rather than the artisanal mode of production one associates with experimental film, contemporary artists' cinema often involves large budgets and large crews alike. It is this division of labor that makes possible the production of technically complicated and polished artworks by individuals who, in many cases, have received little or no formal training in filmmaking. Such large-scale productions represent a pole of contemporary moving image art that opposes the quiet interrogations of temporality and historicity found in OVERTURE, one that – rather than suggesting any death of cinema – speaks loudly to cinema's status as a new medium within an art context.

In short, the integration of cinema into the spaces of art after 1990 must be seen as abiding by an interplay between old and new media, whereby cinema is both an old medium in which one might encounter the redemptive possibilities of the outmoded *and* a new technology that has wrought dramatic changes to the place of the moving image in art and to the spaces of art more generally. The museum is a respite from the privatization of experience, providing a public space in which to excavate cultural memory, contest a logic of technological progress, and imagine collectivity in an age of individualized consumption. However, it must be remembered that it is also an ideological apparatus facing distinct challenges to attract audiences and compete for consumer dollars at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Large-scale moving images are an integral part of what Rosalind Krauss has termed the "late capitalist museum,"[28] offering the possibility of a fun, special-effects spectacle that still retains an element of highbrow cachet.

"New media" is commonly used as synonymous with digital media, but what is it that makes a medium – or an artwork – new? Adorno notes that the category of the new has been central to art since the rise of high capitalism in the mid-nineteenth century and is inextricably bound up in its commodity character.[29] This spurious novelty is present as the moving image is recruited to pro-

vide awe-inspiring fare that will satisfy museum visitors and, in turn, administrators. However, Adorno also makes clear that the new is equally present in art's ability to dislodge established frameworks of understanding; it is a kind of "blind spot."[30] In this second formulation, the novelty of the new lies in its unfamiliarity and its trespassing of categorical boundaries, something very much at stake in the liminal space between art and cinema many of these practices open. As Jacques Rancière has put it, these gallery-based moving image practices indicate first and foremost "a redistribution in the system of correspondences of the arts."[31] In other words, the novelty of such practices is not simply the affinity with the commodification of aesthetic experience that they sometimes manifest, but rather a throwing into question what had once been a stable and easily definable relationship between art and cinema. Certain familiar attributes of cinema reappear in unfamiliar contexts, allowing for the creation of truly new narratives, temporalities, and images.

This study begins in 1990, though certainly the first stirrings of this tendency may be located earlier, as the opening example of Stan Douglas' Overture suggests. Any periodizing mechanism will necessarily be marked by a degree of arbitrariness, cutting off the flow of non-synchronous developments in order to impose the fiction of a clear historical break. And yet, as Frederic Jameson has put it, "We cannot not periodize."[32] The year 1990 marks the date of a watershed exhibition at the Centre Georges Pompidou entitled *Passages de l'image*, curated by Raymond Bellour, Catherine David, and Christine van Assche. This exhibition, discussed at some length in chapter one, opens a problematic concerning the relation between cinema, the other arts, and the fate of the image after digitization that would become predominant in the years that followed and, indeed, is the very problematic of this book. The location of *Passages* at the beginning of the 1990s initiates a decade that would be marked by an increasing spectacularization of the museum and new initiatives by major institutions to further integrate moving images into their collections and exhibitions.[33] The tremendous institutional endorsement of the moving image at this time is inextricable from the widespread embrace of high-quality video projection that occurs at the turn of the decade. Projection weakened video's link to television – an apparatus that is a piece of domestic furniture as much as an image support – and forged a link with cinema and its giganticism. Bill Horrigan notes that conferences held in 2000 on the history of video art at the Museum of Modern Art, New York, and the Art Institute of Chicago both pointed to 1990 as the end of a "golden age" of video art and the advent of a different, more cinematic paradigm of moving images within the gallery, largely due to this "triumph of projection over monitor-based presentation."[34] It is also at this time that one encounters an increasing number of pronouncements concerning the endangered

state of cinema. Dominique Païni, for example, has written that 1990 signals the date after which "cinema becomes the heritage and cultural inheritance [*patrimoine*] of the century,"[35] taking on a surplus cultural value I will argue is integral to the way in which cinema has been conceptualized within the spaces of art during the past two decades.

The relationship of the othered cinema to that realm traditionally called "avant-garde" or "experimental film" is a vexed one. In his account of artists' cinema and avant-garde cinema as modes of production, Jonathan Walley holds fast to sharp distinctions between the two.[36] Avant-garde cinema is personal and artisanal, while artists' cinema is collaborative. The modes of distribution espoused are different, with the avant-garde preferring a rental-based model to the limited edition that dominates the art world.[37] Walley asserts that experimental filmmakers tend to only produce moving image works, while artists often work in various media beyond film and video, something that largely holds true but which neglects the non-filmic artistic production of many experimental filmmakers, such as Bruce Conner, Morgan Fisher, and Michael Snow. Though Walley's distinctions serve an important heuristic value, they are lacking in historical specificity. He asserts, for example, that experimental filmmakers are devoted to the specificity of film whereas artists are not – a claim that once might have been true but that is unfair in an age when many "experimental filmmakers" increasingly work on video, and certain artists such as those discussed in chapter two are committed to interrogating the specificity of 16mm film. Furthermore, there is considerable evidence to suggest that the institutional boundaries between these two modes of production are in the process of breaking down as increasing numbers of experimental filmmakers move into the structures of distribution and exhibition proper to the gallery.

Take, for example, Matthias Müller. Müller had established an international reputation as an experimental filmmaker, distributing his work in the United States through San Francisco-based Canyon Cinema, before beginning to produce work for a gallery context. In collaboration with Christoph Girardet, Müller was commissioned to produce The Phoenix Tapes (1999), a forty-five-minute work in six chapters made up entirely of clips from some forty films by Alfred Hitchcock for the 1999 exhibition *Notorious: Hitchcock and Contemporary Art* at the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford. Since that time, Müller has continued to exhibit work within a gallery setting, describing the choice in very pragmatic terms:

> The art world's increased interest in the moving picture cannot be seen as merely a liberation from the cinema and its limited receptive conditions. Rather, each situation presents each work with specific challenges... When, through the laws of the art market, a moving picture is transformed into an object – a work of art issued in a limited edition – this transformation can seem an expression of bourgeois possessiveness, as

> Peter Weibel puts it. After twenty years of making "experimental films," though, I know there will never be enough profit to secure my existence. Thus, there is no alternative *but* a gallery, which demands that works be sold as limited editions.[38]

Experimental filmmakers such as Peggy Ahwesh, Martin Arnold, and Jonas Mekas have all produced moving image installations. This incorporation of experimental film into the space of the gallery affects not just contemporary work but the past as well: the historical products of experimental film increasingly appear in art exhibitions, whether monographic (*Kenneth Anger*, P.S.1, New York, 2009) or otherwise (*Le Mouvement des images*, Centre Pompidou, Paris, 2006). These examples are not meant to reduce the very real economic, institutional, and aesthetic distinctions that continue to distinguish experimental film and video from the othered cinema; these are spheres which do continue to remain different, if not entirely distinct, from one another. However, it is to suggest that over the past two decades the dividing line between experimental cinema and artists' cinema has become increasingly blurred, pointing to yet another way in which this period witnesses a profound reconfiguration between the spheres of art and cinema.

The move into the space of the gallery has been similarly pronounced in the domain of experimental documentary. Like Chantal Akerman and Chris Marker, two prominent filmmakers working in the documentary mode who have more recently turned to installation, artists such as Kutluğ Ataman and Amar Kanwar – both of whom will be discussed in chapter four – made nonfiction films for exhibition in the movie theater before moving into a gallery-based multiscreen format. For example, Kanwar's A Season Outside (1998), A Night of Prophecy (2002), and To Remember (2003) constitute a trilogy of single-screen videos about postindependence India, completed before the artist's first foray into multiscreen work with The Lightning Testimonies (2007), an installation of eight projections that deals with violence against women on the subcontinent. The gallery provides an expanded field of formal possibilities for documentary and can also serve as an incubator for practices that might be unviable outside of it in a cultural climate with decreasing financial support for vanguard nonfiction practices. As Maria Lind and Hito Steyerl have written, "Due to the increasing privatization of media and cuts in public funding, experimental documentary production has again been increasingly pushed into the art field. The art field has become a laboratory for the development of new documentary expressions."[39] Leaving behind the notion that documentary film and art are opposed – the former category constituted by a closeness to the world while the latter is constituted by its departures from it – artists are now making use of the formal and financial possibilities of the gallery to pioneer

new nonfiction genres, something that will be explored in this book's final chapter.

The tendency under discussion here speaks to an increasingly blurred line between experimental filmmaking and artists' cinema on the plane of practice, but it also points to a crossdisciplinary space on the plane of critical and scholarly inquiry. The border between film studies and art history persists, as large bodies of moving image practices are neglected by the former due to their apparent status as objects of the latter. Art history has historically minimized the role of the moving image while film studies has manifested a distinct phobia towards films produced by individuals identified as "artists" rather than "filmmakers" (with Andy Warhol constituting a notable exception).[40] Tanya Leighton has speculated that, "To a great extent the problem...has been caused by the formalist, high modernist allegiances of much of the experimental film world," but one must also note that it was the high modernist allegiances of the art world that led to the marginalization of film as an artistic medium in the first place.[41] The reasons behind this divide are complex indeed, but it is certain that practices residing in the interstitial space between the black box and the white cube pose something of a disciplinary conundrum that has too often led to their marginalization in scholarly studies of both art and media. One might argue that such practices remain fully within the domain of art history and are not in fact the concern of film studies; however, this would not only perpetuate a disciplinary divide that has led to incomplete understandings of this field of cultural production, it would also enforce a bias within film studies towards feature-length narrative filmmaking that has too consistently resulted in the marginalization of vital experimental practices.[42] Though Vachel Lindsay's 1915 *The Art of the Moving Picture,* the first book-length study of film published in the United States, saw film as deserving a place amidst the fine arts and as involved in a dialogue with sculpture, painting, and architecture, art and film have too often remained separated in the academy.[43]

*Exhibiting Cinema in Contemporary Art* will trace the contours of the othered cinema across four chapters, unfolding the interplay of old and new media in the heterogeneous moving image practices that have been deployed in art since 1990.

Chapter one, "Architectures of Exhibition," examines how the tension between new and old media that marks the integration of cinema into the museum is manifest in institutional and curatorial practices. In this chapter, I interrogate the changing characteristics of the museum as it moves away from Adorno's old museum/mausoleum equation and towards a twenty-first century institution that prizes attributes of interactivity and accessibility. Here I also ex-

plore which model of spectatorship might best be able to grapple with the particularities of the moving image installation.

Chapter two is entitled "Filmic Ruins." In this chapter, I examine how artists such as Matthew Buckingham, Tacita Dean, and Jeroen de Rijke/Willem de Rooij use 16mm film as an obsolescent medium linked to a spectral historicity, the pathos of the ruin, and the failed utopias of modernity. As noted above, the use of celluloid within the space of the gallery virtually disappears after the widespread availability of video. When celluloid returns as a prominent feature of gallery-based moving image practice in the 1990s, it is inextricably linked to the rhetoric of a "death of cinema" at the hands of a digital villain and, as such, engages in a rethinking of the medium specificity of film in relation to the calculation of the digital. Here, I question what desires and fears reside in the fascination with celluloid that has emerged concurrently with its increasing obsolescence. I examine how the superannuated apparatus of analogue film projection figures as a site of opposition to high-tech novelty, but also endows the film print with the very aura it was once said to destroy.

In chapter three, I turn to the obsession with remaking the products of film history that marks the artistic production of the 1990s and 2000s. In "The Remake: Old Movies, New Narratives," I discuss the work of artists such as Candice Breitz, Douglas Gordon, and Chris Moukarbel, arguing that they ambivalently engage the pleasures of cinema and its status as a cultural vernacular to reflect upon it as a site of collective memory in an age of atomizing home-viewing technologies. A focus on cinema's status as a public institution becomes paramount. Rather than the refusal of popular cinema that marked film and video art through the 1980s or the relentless negativity of Situationist *détournement*, contemporary practices of remaking ambivalently make use of a nostalgic cinephilia. They call upon cinema as a memory of lost collectivity while retaining an investment in a critique of the culture industries and of cinema as an apparatus of ideological interpellation.

"The Fiction of Truth and the Truth of Fiction" is this book's fourth and final chapter. Here I leave behind the investigations into cinema as an old medium that mark chapters two and three and instead examine how fiction and documentary, modalities previously problematized in artists' employments of the moving image, have become central to artistic production since the widespread embrace of video projection in the early 1990s. In these practices, cinema is not old but rather offers a novelty that is irreducible to that of the commodity form, as new technologies of projection are put in the service of new forms of artistic expression. Radicalizing Jean-Luc Godard's claim that "all great fiction films tend towards documentary, just as all great documentaries tend towards fiction,"[44] the works discussed in this chapter declare the inextricability of these modes by pioneering hybrid formations that interrogate them both. Through a

discussion of works by Eija-Liisa Ahtila, Kutluğ Ataman, Omer Fast, and Amar Kanwar, I demonstrate that artists rehabilitate cinema's status as a technology of the virtual in order to interrogate subjective and historical experience.

In 1965, Jonas Mekas published an article in the *Village Voice* entitled "On New Directions, On Anti-Art, On the Old and the New in Art." In it, Mekas discussed the proliferation of experimental and expanded cinema practices that he saw around him. He wrote, "The medium of cinema is breaking out and taking over and is going blindly and by itself. Where to – nobody knows."[45] While one might adjust Mekas' proclamation to assert that the cinema no longer goes forth by itself, but in aggregate formations with other media, it is a sentiment worth resuscitating today. Gallery-based moving images that both inherit the legacy of those practices Mekas describes and depart from them are engaging in important articulations of the histories and futures of cinema. In the pages that follow, I will provide an account of these practices and some of the questions they raise, all in an effort to emphasize that, rather than being a time to mourn the death of yet another cinema, the contemporary moment is characterized by a renewed vitality and reinvention of the cinema that has opened new paths that will continue to be explored in the years to come.