

1 [

The title of this essay paraphrases Pavle Levi's [Cinema by Other Means](#), New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

2 [

On the “cinematic turn” see: Eivind Røssaak (ed.), [Between Stillness and Motion: Film, Photography, Algorithms](#), Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011, pp. 109–156.

1. The task of defining expanded cinema is as much a needed enterprise, which might help to shed light on current debates surrounding the so-called “cinematic turn”² [in contemporary art, as it is a vexed one, for—and that is what I would like to argue in this paper—the very spectrum of practices it describes resists attempts at producing clear definitions. Not only is “expanded cinema” merely a name among others to describe forms of work and artistic practices whose nature is hybrid and cuts across media, it also always refers to a dynamic field made up of struggling concepts and objects. As its heterogeneous genealogies and its openness to plural becomings suggest, the category of expanded cinema itself is—no pun intended—subject to expansion. In the wake of contemporary debates on multi-screen and immersive video and filmic installations that place these genres within a historical continuity with expanded cinema (alongside an analogous questioning of the links between contemporary artists’ films and videos and the video art which emerged in the 1960s, or between the former and avant-garde film), a possible “definition” of expanded film practices emerges from a position oscillating between historicism, from which unfold multiple genealogies (and by extension a form of relativism as to the different fields and discourses), and a

3 [

The idea that a (literary) genre can participate in multiple genres without belonging to any one of them was developed by Jacques Derrida in "The Law of Genre," *Glyph 7* (Spring 1980,) pp. 202–229.. If we keep the idea of participation without belonging in mind, Derrida's focus on linguistic effects at the cost of concrete objects is for us highly problematic. Indeed, while we would like to describe similar processes, these are to be found in the way such modalities of participation are (re-)mediated through apparatuses that distribute objects, discourses, and technologies within specific spatial and temporal situations.

45

kind of media essentialism which de-historicizes and transposes a medium and the sensible regimes it structures across contexts. The question of defining what the modalities of expansion entail in the sphere of film practice depends on their belonging and/or participation 3 [in the planes of **visuality, spatiality, temporality, performativity, and affect.** One would also have to consider how they are negotiated among the arts, their articulations around the tensions between the discourses of medium specificity, intermediality, and post-mediality, and the dialectics of ideation and materiality through which a work comes into being.

● ● This confusion of terms, which asserts a direct filiation between contemporary installation art involving multiple screens and expanded cinema, has been criticized by German film theorist Volker Pantenburg. For him, to posit expanded cinema as the predecessor of installation art relies on the denial of several parameters. First, the notion of "expansion" is reduced to its spatial dimension; second, it is based on a misunderstanding regarding the modalities of mobility and the temporalities of experience, respectively in the spheres of experimental cinema and contemporary art; third, a misapprehension regarding the institutional and economic structures of production and reception of moving image works (roughly the film coop model vs. the museum); finally, what he calls an "asymmetry of discursive capacities," that is, a monopolizing of critical discourse mediated

4 [

Volker Pantenburg, "1970 and Beyond. Experimental Cinema and Installation Art," in: Gertrud Koch, Volker Pantenburg, Simon Rothöhler (eds.), [Screen Dynamics: Mapping the Borders of Cinema](#), Vienna: Synema, 2012, pp. 78–92.

5 [

Gene Youngblood, [Expanded Cinema](#), London: Studio Vista, 1970.

6 [

Ibid., p. 41.

7 [

Ibid., p. 348.

8 [

Most notably in: Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," [Art and Literature](#) 4 (Spring 1965), reprinted in: Francis Francina and Charles Harrison (eds.), [Modern Art and Modernism: A Critical Anthology](#), London: Harper & Row, 1982, pp. 5–10.

9 [

Reproduced in Astrit Schmidt-Burkhardt, [Maciunas' "Learning Machines": From Art History to a Chronology of Fluxus](#), Vienna / New York: Springer, 2003, pp. 18f.

10 [

Dick Higgins, "Intermedia," [Something Else Press Newsletter](#), vol. 1, no. 1, New York: Something Else Press, 1966. The founding of Something Else Press by Higgins marks his departure from the Fluxus network. See for instance: Cuauhtémoc Medina, "The 'Kulturbolschewiken' I: Fluxus, the Abolition of Art, the Soviet Union, and 'Pure Amusement,'" [RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics](#) 48 (Autumn 2005), pp. 179–192. It is also noteworthy for the discussion on the uses of the concepts of expanded cinema and intermedia and their relationships

47

by the art world through the medium of the catalogue.⁴ [Although Pantenburg can be criticized for being overly schematic and for failing to account for the many historical cases of exchanges between expanded cinema and the art world as well as the numerous precedents aimed at integrating cinema as part of the visual arts, it is useful to keep these parameters in mind to think about the ways expanded cinema is discussed. Thus we might better understand the conditions under which expanded cinema can (or cannot) be reactualized in different contexts, as well as the relationships it entertains with formally similar practices—in our case: live audiovisual performance, VJing, visual music, and live cinema. ✱ 2. The "spatial misunderstanding," as Pantenburg calls it, has to be placed in its historical dimension. It is Gene Youngblood's conception of expanded cinema in his eponymous book 5 [that has come to act as canonical reference. Here it becomes necessary to quote the definition Youngblood gives in his preface: "When we say expanded cinema we actually mean expanded consciousness. Expanded cinema does not mean computer films, video phosphors, atomic light, or spherical projections. Expanded cinema isn't a movie at all: like if it's a process of becoming, man's ongoing historical drive to manifest his consciousness outside of his mind, in front of his eyes. One no longer can specialize in a single discipline and hope truthfully to express a clear picture of its relationships in the environment.

that in Japan, after the term *intermedia* (*Intāmedia* in Japanese) had first been officially used for the “Intermedia” festival at the Runami Gallery in Ginza, Tokyo, in May 1967, it quickly became synonymous with “cinematic projection that refuses to comply to the rules of normative projection” and was discussed by artists and critics such as Yasunao Tone, Juzo Ishiko, or Miyabi Ichikawa. For a discussion of expanded cinema practices in Japan, see: Julian Ross, “Site and Specificity in Japanese Expanded Cinema: Intermedia and its Development in the late 60s,” *Décadrages* 21–22 (Winter 2012); online at: <http://www.decadrages.ch/site-and-specificity-japanese-expanded-cinema-intermedia-and-its-development-late-60s-julian-ross> (accessed Sep 1, 2015). If in Japan expanded cinema was discussed in relation to its North-American definition, in the UK, most specifically in the films and performances made in the framework of the London Filmmakers Cooperative, another and almost oppositional kind of expanded cinema emerged. Influenced by Bertolt Brecht’s theories of estrangement and distancing effects, and articulated in Peter Gidal’s formulation of a “structuralist-materialist film,” expanded cinema in London sought a rigorous and analytical deconstruction of the film apparatus and of its technological elements as well as a radical exploration of spectatorial viewing conventions, contrasting with the technophile utopianism of Youngblood. See Malcolm Le Grice, “Digital Cinema and Experimental Film” [1999], in: *Experimental Cinema in the Digital Age*, London: BFI, 2001, p. 319. Youngblood’s conception was also criticized by Deke Dusinberre in his introduction to the catalogue of the Festival of Expanded Cinema at the Institute of Contemporary Arts in London in 1976, a critique embodied in the curatorial choices of the committee of this institutional exhibition of (mostly British) expanded cinema. Dusinberre stated that Youngblood’s eclecticism was “combined on the cinematic level with a technological fetish

This is especially true in the case of the intermedia network of cinema and television, which now functions as nothing less than the nervous system of mankind.”⁶ [§ When Youngblood describes a rich spectrum of audiovisual situations—ranging from what he terms a “synaesthetic cinema,” which includes Carolee Schneemann’s *Fuses* (1965), John Whitney’s computer film *Catalogue* (1961), experiments by the Alwin Nikolais Dance Company with WCBS-TV, or seminal “intermedia” environments like Aldo Tambellini’s *Back Zero* (1965)—for him expanded cinema is a media ecology that exceeds the realms of art and film. The image-making technologies he discusses are inscribed within a cybernetic utopia, corollary to what he sees as a general anthropological mutation. The latter is enabled by the rise of an intermedia culture, following the collective USCO’s definition endorsed by Youngblood: “The simultaneous use of various media to create a total environmental experience for the audience. Meaning is communicated not by coding ideas into abstract literary language, but by creating an emotionally real experience through the use of audiovisual technology. Originally conceived in the realm of art rather than in science or engineering, the principles on which intermedia is based are grounded in the fields of psychology, information theory, and communication engineering.”⁷ [● Hence, not only does the intermedial nature of expanded cinema bring into crisis the medium-specificity of the

which equated cinema with the expanded consciousness available through expanded technology. As such, it yielded a synthesis with occasional connotations of psychedelia, and the resultant fascination with the new perception tended to overlook the actual aesthetic implications of both the original and the expanded perception [...]. Thus the critical criteria on which the committee attempted to base its selections centered on the creative use of the projection event and the possibilities offered by the facilities at the ICA; the selected pieces tend to emphasize either the physical, spatial, or temporal aspects of these creative possibilities to facilitate such a perceptual shift.” Deke Dusinberre, “Festival of Expanded Cinema: An Introduction,” The Festival of Expanded Cinema at the ICA, London January 4–11th 1976, London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, 1976, unpag.

11 [

In recent years, renewed scholarly and curatorial interest for the history of the avant-gardes and neo avant-gardes has led to several books and catalogues about the history of expanded cinema and related practices. For writings that specifically address expanded cinema see: A. L. Rees, Duncan White, Steven Ball, David Curtis (eds.), Expanded Cinema: Art, Performance, Film, London: Tate Publishing, 2011; Lucy Reynolds, British avant-garde women filmmakers and expanded cinema of the 1970s, unpublished PhD thesis, University of East London, 2011; Andrew V. Uroskie, Between the Black Box and the White Cube: Expanded Cinema and Postwar Art, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014; and in French: François Bovier and Adeena Mey (eds.), “Cinéma élargi,” Décadrages 21–22, Lausanne: Publications universitaires romandes, 2012. For published works that place expanded cinema in relation to contemporary moving image work or artists’ film and video at large, see respectively: Maeve Conolly, The Place of Artists’

modernist work of art as advocated by Clement Greenberg. 8 [The interdisciplinarity of its intellectual determinations furthermore undermines artistic autonomy, both on the level of the work itself and on that of the artistic institution. Also, expanded cinema conceived as both a theoretical proposition and as a set of artistic and media practices emerged as part of a larger dynamic of expansion of the arts—set against what was discussed in terms of a crisis of modernism and of aesthetic autonomy—as best exemplified by the visualized art-historical genealogy of George Maciunas’ Expanded Arts Diagram (1966) 9 [and in Dick Higgins’ essay “Intermedia.” 10 [● 3. Among recent scholarship on expanded cinema, 11 [Jonathan Walley’s writings stand as some of the most eloquent. He posits film practices that place film outside of the “standard” apparatus in the context of anti-Greenbergian strategies, through his concept of “paracinema,” which he developed to discuss works such as Anthony McCall’s Line Describing a Cone (1973). For Walley, “paracinema identifies an array of phenomena that are considered ‘cinematic’ but that are not embodied in the materials of film as traditionally defined. That is, the film works I am addressing recognize cinematic properties outside the standard film apparatus, and therefore reject the medium-specific premise of most essentialist theory and practice that the art form of cinema is defined by the specific medium of film.” 12 [Ö α Å ® ë ý Ā α Ę

[Cinema: Space, Site and Screen](#), Bristol/Chicago: Intellect Books, 2009; Tanya Leighton (ed.), [Art and the Moving Image: A Critical Reader](#), London: Tate Publishing/Afterall, 2008; Kate Mondloch, [Screens: Viewing Media Installation Art](#), Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press, 2011. As part of a movement toward the historicization of expanded cinema and its understanding, in relation to other artistic practices that use projected images or which have a performative dimension, through restagings or reconstructions of historical artworks, see the catalogues: Chrissie Iles (ed.), [Into the Light: The Projected Image in American Art, 1964–1977](#), New York: H. N. Abrams, 2001; Matthias Michalka (ed.), [X-Screen: Film Installations and Actions in the 1960s and 1970s](#), Vienna: MUMOK, 2004; Christopher Eamon (ed.), [Anthony McCall: The Solid Light Films and Related Works](#), Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2005; Joachim Jäger (ed.), [Beyond Cinema, the Art of Projection: Films, Videos and Installations from 1963 to 2005](#), Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2006. For a re-reading of the histories of minimalism in which expanded cinema appears in a network of art practices, complicates canonical readings, and departs from conventional art and film historical categories (minimalism, structural film, conceptual art) see: Branden W. Joseph, [Beyond the Dream Syndicate: Tony Conrad and the Arts after Cage](#), New York: Zone Books, 2008, also his [The Roh and the Cooked: Tony Conrad and Beverly Grant in Europe](#), Berlin: August Verlag, 2011.

12 [

Jonathan Walley, “The Material of Film and the Idea of Cinema: Contrasting Practices in Sixties and Seventies Avant-Garde Film,” [October](#) 103 (Winter 2003,) pp.15–30. Walley’s definition borrows from Ken Jacobs, who coined the term “paracinema” to describe his performative pieces known as [Shadow Play](#) and [Nervous Magic Lantern](#), which use no celluloid or involve multiple projections. See Lindley Hanlon,

Walley’s distinction between cinema as an idea and its “materials” (and therefore its materiality and physical existence) enables him to bring what he names paracinema close to conceptual art, in that—following Lucy Lippard’s formula of a “dematerialization of the art object”¹³ [—it “dematerializes” cinema from its medium, equated here with the situation described by traditional apparatus theory.¹⁴ [If Walley’s heuristic claims to locate “cinematic properties” and identify film outside of the movie theater are praiseworthy, he does so at the price of reiterating, as George Baker rightly points out, “a false and ultimately Platonic separation of ‘matter’ and ‘idea’ that is one of the most common and banal of the misreadings to which so-called Conceptual art has been repeatedly subjected.”¹⁵ [÷ As a matter of fact, the paracinematic strategies described by Walley, which take part in the spectrum of inter-media practices and of the expansion of the arts, consist more in a process of rematerialization than dematerialization, a set of movements through which “cinema” unfolds in the form of multiple materialities, as they appear in Pavle Levi’s precise analysis of a Cinema by Other Means.¹⁶ [Levi’s argument is set out using as case studies a range of little known Yugoslavian avant-garde works, such as the “written films” of the Hypnist and Zenitist movements active in the 1920s, or 1970s experiments with the physicality of film (Nikola Djuric’s *Remembrance* from 1978; Tomislav Gotovac’s

"Kenneth Jacobs, Interviewed by Lindley Hanlon (Jerry Sims Present), April 9, 1974," Film Culture 67–69 (1979,) p. 65–86.

13 [

Lucy R. Lippard, John Chandler, "The Dematerialization of Art," Art International vol. 12, no. 2 (February 1968), pp. 31–36.

14 [

Jean-Louis Baudry, Alan Williams, "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus," Film Quarterly vol. 28, no. 2 (Winter 1974–1975), pp. 39–47.

15 [

See George Baker, "Film Beyond Its Limits," Grey Room 25 (Fall 2006), pp. 92–125.

16 [

Pavle Levi, Cinema by Other Means (see note 1).

17 [

Ibid., p. 27.

18 [

Ibid.

19 [

Ibid.

55

It's all a movie as documented in a photography by Ivan Posavec in 1979). Hence, "cinema by other means" relates to "the practice of positing cinema as a system of relations directly inspired by the workings of the film apparatus, but evoked through the material and technological properties of the originally nonfilmic media." 17 [× × × In Levi's argument, the "medium" thus appears as both a concept ("a nexus of different elements, understood and/or imagined as capable of generating specific effects") and an actual apparatus ("as concrete technology embodying this nexus of relations"). 18 [∅ Finally, to render his definition as synthetical as possible, he makes the point that "cinema by other means" suggests a "conceptualization of the cinema as itself a type of practice that, since the invention of the film apparatus, has also (simultaneously) had a history of execution through other, often 'older,' artistic media." 19 [By extension, we could say that in Pavle Levi's reformulation of film history, "cinema" and "cinema by other means" always coexisted. Δ Debates in film history can be divided, schematically, into two different types of explanation, according to the philosopher Gabriel Rockhill and his study of the "coordinates" of the debate. The first type is technological. From this point of view, the birth of cinema in the 19th century was enabled by emerging technical possibilities of fixing, projecting, and reproducing movement as an optical phenomenon. Such possibilities had as corollary

20 [

Gabriel Rockhill, "Le cinéma n'est jamais né," Revue Appareil 1 (2008), <https://appareil.revues.org/130> (accessed Sep 1, 2015).

21 [

François Albera, "Introduction," in: S. M. Eisenstein, Cinématisme: Peinture et cinéma, Dijon: Kargo/Les presses du réel, 2009, p. 11.

57

the scientific understanding of the phenomena themselves. The second explanation is "notional" and is based, roughly, on the idea that the material technologies of cinema could only be designed within a favorable intellectual context. Hence, in this schema, idea precedes technology, 20 [and, by extension, cinema by other means can be said to articulate these two vectors—technological and notional—in a dynamic process. ₹ 4. What we identify under the labels of expanded cinema, paracinema, and cinema by other means can be subsumed into two other categories, that of Sergei Eisenstein's notion of "cinematism" and of Karel Teige's "poetism." The idea of cinematism emphasizes fundamental principles of cinematic art such as montage and movement and identifies forms of cinema that unfold outside of traditional filmic material, embodied in other arts, such as painting, architecture, drawing, or literature. Hence, as film historian François Albera has written, through the concept of cinematism, Eisenstein could see in cinema "a way to go beyond art (from a diachronic perspective) and, by the same token, a kind of general model to understand all the arts (from a synchronic perspective)." 21 [If indeed cinematism both serves to identify objects that open up film to the world at large and offers a tool to think of the latter in cinematic terms, the problem remains that "cinema" still acts as the frame of reference; we might call "cine-centrism" the conceptual foundation upon which the idea of

22 [

Among the many elements inspiring poetism, Peter A. Zusi cites “film, jazz, and circuses, and even [...] activities such as tourism and athletics.” Peter A. Zusi, “The Style of the Present: Karel Teige on Constructivism and Poetism,” Representations 88 (2004), p. 103. I am here willfully taking the formulation of poetism out of its historical context—where it stands, according to Teige, in a dialectical relationship with constructivism—to use it as a tool to rethink the objects addressed in this essay.

59

cinematism is built. Formulating the contours of an a-foundational frame to think about expanded cinema would exceed the present essay. But, as a first step, we can suggest at least one element toward the multiplication of heuristic tools through which we can rethink and recast expanded cinema and its multiple means, and that is poetism. Coined and theorized by the Czech avant-garde artist and critic Karel Teige, poetism identified a spectrum of work in poetry and painting that had managed to break from, respectively, literature and representation, and eventually provided a conception of art cutting across disciplines and embraced modern life at large. 22 [✱ As Teige put it: “We have created pictorial poems: compositions of real colors and shapes within the system of the poem. The animated pictorial poem: photogenic poetry. Kinography. We have tried to formulate a proposal for a new art of film—pure cinematography, photogenic poetry, a dynamic picture without precedent. Luminous and glittering poems of undulating light—we saw in them the leading art of our epoch: the magnificent synthetic time-space poem, exciting all the senses and all the sensitive areas of the viewer via sight. We defined film as a dynamic pictorial poem, a living spectacle without plot or literature; black-and-white rhythms and possibly the rhythm of color too; a sort of mechanical ballet of shapes and light that demonstrates its innate affinity with light shows, pure dance, the art of fireworks (and the art of

The Audiovisual Breakthrough

Editors ø Ana Carvalho, Cornelia Lund

Authors ø Ana Carvalho, Eva Fischer,
Cornelia Lund, Gabriel Menotti, Adeena Mey

Survey ø Maria Pfeifer

Copy editing ø Lutz Eitel

Design ø Eva-Maria Offermann, Kassel

Printed by ø Collin&Maierski Print GbR, Berlin

Printed on ø Geese Pegasus

Font ø GT Cinetype

Supported by ø our Indiegogo supporters

PDF for download ø <http://www.ephemeral-expanded.net/audiovisualbreakthrough>

© 2015 the authors and
fluctuating images. contemporary media art e.V.
Willdenowstraße 10 D-13353 Berlin
www.fluctuating-images.de

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means (graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying or information storage and retrieval systems) without written permission from the copyright holder.

ISBN 978-3-00-051072-4
Printed in Germany