

EDITED BY FRANÇOIS PENZ AND ANDONG LU



URBAN CINEMATICS

UNDERSTANDING URBAN PHENOMENA THROUGH THE MOVING IMAGE

(2011). *Reconsidering Cinematic Mapping: Halfway Between Collected Subjectivity and Projective Mapping*.

In F Penz & A Lu (Eds.), **Urban Cinematics; understanding urban phenomena through the moving image** (pp. 239-256). Bristol: Intellect, The Mill.

Introduction

Connected to the research described in *Understanding the Socius through creative mapping techniques* (A.Graafland, 2008), a long term research and educational programme was set up by the Delft School of Design, faculty of Architecture at the Delft University of Technology in the Netherlands, to investigate if and how videography could play an additional role in the exploration, registration and understanding of urban environments. The programme started with a design studio named 'Camera Eye' as described extensively in *The Body in Architecture* (D.Hauptmann (ed.), 2006). This and subsequent projects clarified how to apply moving images in - urban - mapping, and show why it is helpful to start with the notion of *collected subjectivity* as a guideline in this quest. With this is meant the method of collecting video footage which was produced by a number of individuals or groups without much form of orchestration, but with a very specific artistic approach and a clear identification of the site-specific conditions, in order to create an 'objective' depiction of those urban settings. Particular interest was drawn towards the development of a methodology which would apply videography as part of a mapping process and which was in itself comprehensible enough to be transferred, solid enough to be operated in remote places and thorough enough to lead to repeatable and comparable results.

Suppositions

Building on James Corner, Arie Graafland (2008) uses four primary mapping techniques as a starting point (*Dérive, Layering, Game-board and Rhizome*) and clarifies how these methods philosophically and theoretically interlink with specific site analysis and design in his book- *The Socius of Architecture* (Graafland, 2000). It was clear that a direct implementation of the moving image in or on top of these techniques would not automatically function properly. So the first challenge was to find a method of translation which would enable us to apply the moving image in the framework of an intellectual and cognitive setting, as well as to develop the procedures in order to link to the site-specifics, without necessarily taking over the functionalities of other media, such as cartography and photography.

For this purpose we needed two suppositions. One, theory should come first. Starting this trajectory without exploring the analogies in constructing film and architecture and the corresponding interchangeable notions of rhythm, structures, space and time, would have been completely wrong. Secondly, we made a very clear distinction in what could be called its happening 'In the screen' and its happening 'On the screen'. This notion refers to the fundamental distinction between the perception of moving image as being a fixed and static object, which can be studied but cannot be altered (on the screen) and working with moving image while being able to create and alter the images and sounds (in the screen). I will address this distinction below, as it is a vital element in my argument on how to reach a state of projective mapping.

When working with mapping techniques, the first issue that arises is the matter of objectivity. To what degree will the mapping-process lead to an objective representation (and is the process intended to do so?), how will the different types of media relate to each other in this process and which media type performs best in this process. Noël Carroll regards Arnheim's *specificity thesis* as a proposal; 'As a recommendation, the specificity thesis appears to have two components. One component is the idea that there is something that each medium does best. The other is that each of the arts should do what differentiates it from the other arts. These two components can be called the excellence requirement and the differentiation requirement.' (Carroll, 1988: 57)

With this notion in mind, it was clear that using video - produced according to some of the basic rules of cinematography - as a mapping tool, should not compete with the other techniques, especially when it comes to objectivity and completeness, and it should utilize its unique features like the ability to manipulate time, the ability to show motion, the ability to change orders and the ability to switch between linearity and non-linearity. Eventually the path we took developed itself along the line: objectivism, mapping, structuring, gridding, zoning, collecting, sensing and collected subjectivism. Some of these stages will be briefly addressed.

Gridding

The first strategy put into practice, was that of *gridding*, meaning that on forehand the group of researchers were distributed into smaller groups which were to *videomap* a given area in an unknown foreign city according to a specified set of instructions (a grid). Groups were connected to specific topics like infrastructure, boundaries, mobility, economy, housing, and would produce videomaps which were strictly limited to their particular theme. By combining the different maps, we would ideally get a collectively constructed and complete map of the area of interest. Note that *gridding* is connected to *layering* but differs (among other aspects) because it is applied in a descriptive and outside-in way and not as a projective inside-out method. This because we are not physically making an intervention - we only take in and leave no marks (outside-in) - as opposed to designing interventions which actually alter the specific setting (inside-out). This method had the advantage of being easy to use and clear in its instructions, but missed the very necessary depiction of context, relations and interdependencies. A railway-line crossing a rural area obviously has a substantial impact on its surrounding, but this effect would not be made visible by applying only this method. Meticulously summing up the parts might be precise and full of detail, but this will not necessarily lead to a better understanding of the whole. Besides this, it proved to be hard to make a balanced presentation of the different approaches, combining them in one film raised the question of priority (due to the linear structure), using multiple projections dispersed the attention of the viewer and required a meta-editor with a strong vision on what to present, which again took away much of the diversity.

Zoning

A next strategy was connected to the *game-board* theory and was referred to as *zoning*. By differentiating the usage of different urban areas and places, we distinguish their function on a different level. We will see the city-map being built up out of corridors, hubs, transistors, collectors and transformers. If for example we would look at a railway station in relation to the quality of 'movement', its primary character would be that of a transformer (turning pedestrians into passengers, train-passengers into bus-passenger etc.), which would connect several corridors (roads and tracks). A bus stop could be regarded as a collector and a warehouse, a transistor (keeping people in for a certain amount of time). To focus on these parts, their function and the effects on their surrounding and on the urban conditions at large, we will be able to produce a (video)map which will be comparable to similar maps made of different cities or places, regardless of their geographic situation, cultural background or size. It also allows us to compress or skip less interesting area's in the way we would do if we wanted to map a subway system. In line with this method an attempt was made to compare three cities (London, Paris, Amsterdam) by mapping their performance at three different times during the day and see how all the hubs, corridors and transformers handled the morning, noon and evening rush-hours. The level of abstraction was necessary to make the cities comparable. The question was not how many cars, busses, train and other forms of transport were using the networks, but how well the network handled the amount of traffic. It is like translating exact figures into percentages. The disadvantages were of course this level of abstraction, which was not always compatible with other types of maps and the loss of scale, which took away elementary information as in 'what are we talking about?'. By looking at various functionalities (hubs, corridors etc.) of the different elements (buildings, area's etc.) on multiple levels (transport, economy etc.) in relation to their position in the hierarchy of the urban setting, hidden structures may become clear. This contributes to the understanding of the complex force fields that determine this hierarchy, and thus comes within reach of the game-board theory.

Provisional conclusions

After having passed these stages some provisional conclusions should be made:

(A) Videography did not prove to be able to be a self-supporting, objective and complete mapping tool.

(B) Videography excelled in portraying the 'soft side' of mapping, beautifully described by Jonathan Raban in his book *The Soft City* as: 'The city as we imagine it, the soft city of illusion, myth, aspiration, nightmare, is as real, maybe more real, than the city we can locate on maps in statistics, in monographs on urban sociology and demography and architecture.' (Raban, 1988: 10).

(C) Videography could not be made into a useful mapping tool without authorship.

Fragmentation

In order to complete the next transition, we should look at some specific qualities in what I refer to as the Agency of 'Moving-Image'. As we are not looking at the production of cinema in the classical way, where among the premises would be included the ability to shape and reshape the surrounding for the purpose of making the film, I would

rather avoid the term constructing when looking at these intrinsic qualities. One could argue that the connecting meta-quality of moving images is the ability to fragment. For this purpose we could define fragmentation as *creating the whole by the collection of its fragments* as opposed to defragmentation where we *create the whole by the assimilation of its fragments*, a classification open for discussion, but I would like to propose it because it is at least compatible with Rancière's scale of montage, where he puts dialectic montage on one end and symbolic montage on the other when he describes:

The dialectic way invests chaotic power in the creation of little machineries of the heterogeneous. By fragmenting continuums and distancing terms that call for each other, or, conversely, by assimilating heterogeneous elements and combining incompatible things, it creates clashes. And it makes the clashes thus developed small measuring tools, conducive to revealing a disruptive power of community, which itself establishes another term of measurement [...] The encounter therein of incompatible elements highlights the power of a different community imposing a different measure; it establishes the absolute reality of desires and dream [...] The symbolist way also relates heterogeneous elements and constructs little machines through a montage of unrelated elements. But it assembles them in accordance with the opposite logic. Between elements that are foreign to one another it works to establish a familiarity, an occasional analogy, attesting to a more fundamental relationship of co-belonging, a shared world where heterogeneous elements are caught up in the same essential fabric, and are therefore always open to being assembled in accordance with the fraternity of a new metaphor (Rancière 2009: 56-57).

We argue that 'The Agency of moving image' has three types of fragmentation which it uses most, but it should be noted that no single type could exist in a pure form. In all cases, one of the types will serve as the leading type, whereas the others will serve in function of this leading type. There are some films I would like to use as examples, but I am very aware that we will not be able to recreate these elaborate stylistic pieces within the frame of our research. It does serve a purpose nevertheless, because it also tries to close (part of) the gap between theoretical analysis and practical fieldwork.

(1) Fragmentation of time. Whether we approach it from Marker's perspective 'Nothing sorts memories from ordinary moments. They claim remembrance when they show their scars' (Marker 1963) or we take the *Irréversible* (Noé, 2002) motto 'Le temps détruit tout' (time destroys everything), it is clear that moving images provide opportunity to arrange, re-arrange, fragmentize, de-fragmentize, order, sequences, speed-up and slow down time on an unchallenged level. We will look at some elements of this in the section on representation and production.

(2) Fragmentation of memory. A usable definition of narrative cinema could be *the reconstruction of a fictitious memory* but as I carefully try to avoid any connotation with heavily loaded architectural notion of (de)construction, we could rather speak of *the creation of a fictitious memory*. Note how I name this memory non-specific. A memory, not 'The memory'. The completion of the depiction takes place in the mind of the viewer. The subjective view of the director will have to transform into the subjective state of his public. If we look at a film like *L'Année dernière à Marienbad/Last Year in Marienbad* (Resnais, 1961), all types of fragmentation are aligned to serve the main theme; creating a fictitious memory by fragmentation. According to Bruno 'The film is an architectural exploration of a memory, perhaps held as a shared space between two people' (Bruno 2002: 39). Carroll states that it is not a film at all, it is a film about films, which calls for the title *meta-cinema*, mainly because it does not adopt to the system of erotetic narration (i.e. the narrative does not answer the why-question):

That is, by frustrating our expectations in these matters, the plot arouses in the viewer the recognition that we are accustomed to having all of our pressing questions about the storyworld answered before the lights go up in the auditorium. By subverting these expectations, we are brought to an awareness of the way in which these expectations enable us to follow and organize the motion picture as it unfolds (Carroll 2008: 142-143).

We could classify narration as a form of - scientific - explanation and follow Kourany in distinguishing three conceptions of explanation; an inferential explanation (i.e. the explanation would follow a logical argument), a causal conception (i.e. the explanation would have a causal nature) and the already mentioned erotetic notion (i.e. the explanation answers a proposed why-question) (Kourany, 1987). But if we would apply Rancière's notion of dialectic montage within the frame of our quest, we could easily reach the conclusion that we don't need erotetic narration or even any kind of narration at all to create an *absolute reality of desires and dreams*. We would be talking on a totally different platform in a totally different language where the traditional narrative has no effect.

(3) Fragmentation of space. There are numerous films where we can see the function of architectural conditions represented very clearly. Its function as a medium that is, because stripped from their third dimension, these conditions can no longer provide a physical interaction with its audience. In no way can we recreate any of the practical aspects of any three dimensional object, nor its aspects in terms of these functionalities. The only architectural conditional elements which can be represented in two-dimensional moving images, are those which are connected to the way in which they are interacting with the *inhabitants of the moving image*, which in our case could be the actual users of the space we are recording and in case of a motion picture these would of course be the actors and extra's. As soon as we have recorded an architectural or urban condition, it obviously loses all its spatial and dimensional functions, but even in the process of recording we are not so much interested in these functions at all. All qualities connected to its volume and spatial structure function merely as manoeuvring space for the camera or manoeuvring space for the inhabitants. We just have to remind ourselves how carefully Hitchcock recreated his housing block for *Rear Window* (Hitchcock, 1954) in order to give the camera maximum manoeuvrability as is described very detailed by Pallasmaa in his *The Architecture of Image* (Pallasmaa, 2009). For all we care, it doesn't have to exist at all. Add to this the ability to create any *given suggestion of a spatial structure* in the editing phase, it is clear that there is no use to be true or precise in the depiction of such conditions, although their very nature - purely through its physical state - would demand this. In other words, we can only involve architectural conditions on an equal basis in our moving imagery, if we regard them solely as a medium. Note that this would bring us in conflict with the suppositions made in the *specificity thesis*. We then can start transferring some of the typologies two dimensional media have onto architecture and start combining their values working on the same level.

We will take two films to exemplify this, which have a very strong mutual connection (even the name is the same), but differ in the way they utilize fragmentation of time and space in order to strengthen the story line (although there might not be any traditional storyline present). Where Alan Clarke's *Elephant* (Clarke, 1989) uses the spatial structure of urban Northern Ireland to silently comment on a very violent social drama, Gus van Sant's *Elephant* (Van Sant, 2003) uses the spatial architectural structure of the Columbine High school to create a psycho-sociological depiction of a specific group of young people. The inevitable spatial- and temporal intertwining of the lives of these people creates situations which not only exemplify the almost banal normality of their lives (which could be seen as one of the leading motives of the film), but also pushes the architectural structure forward as a major player in the organisation of their physical- and mental state. It functions as the labyrinth which connects, divides, protects, conceals, attacks and ultimately, kills. The structure has the pretends of uniting its inhabitants, but in fact isolates and estranges them. Clarke uses his (urban) structure in a different way. By using ordinary settings and keeping them deliberately empty and tranquil, he also amplifies the banal nature of this normality, but with a different purpose. His structures function as hunting-grounds, where anonymous victims are being killed by anonymous hunters. The feeling of inescapability is strongly enlarged. Where the structure has an independent character in Van Sant's film (almost like an entity), Clarke's structure gets its role by totally blending into normality. In contrast to the carefully applied fragmentation of time in van Sant's *Elephant*, where every scrap of time frame is meticulously glued together at key scene's and other essential marks, Clarke's *Elephant* shows his scene's in a blunt serial order. He does not even use sequencing to accentuate relations or crosscutting to indicate the volume of the events, nor does he attempt to give any explanation of their order in a temporal or sequential way, he just shows series. Van Sant uses the repetition of exactly the same moment - seen from different perspectives - as an amplifier of 'his' normality. As the events already have taken place, Van Sant can utilize these time-frames in a different way. His time is precisely defined and possesses an intrinsic inescapability, as where Clarke's time has a random and open nature. Yet inescapable nevertheless.

But regardless of the different ways time is fragmented in both films, the relation between the spatial structures and its *inhabitants* is made very clear and plays a key role in the understanding of the narrative. Although the notion of narration is ambiguous. These relations are shown by using the spatial structure as a social reference in the film. In other words, not the structure (nor the architecture for that matter) is the direct subject, but it's *function* for the inhabitants is the subject. Essential in both films is the precise usage of the partial interchangeableness of time and *the suggestion of space* in film. Space gets the suggestion of volume by giving it time and movement, very well exemplified by the opening shot in Jennifer Baichwal's *Manufactured Landscape* (Baichwal, 2006). Space gets the suggestion of dimensions by showing different angles. By observing the architectural conditions indirectly through the mirror of their function in relation to the inhabitants of our picture, we can show much more of its character than approaching it directly. So, two directives can be found in the above. One, serial depiction of elements is a very mono-directional, but highly effective way to convey multitude, parallel depiction is more effective to focus on structure. Two, architectural conditions will reveal their nature much more effectively if 'peaked at' through their relationship to their inhabitants, but for this we have to address them purely on their merits as medium.

Collected Subjectivity

The presumption that we initially made was that all attempts to produce any kind of videography, should be orchestrated beforehand and during the actual site surveys. But after the first series (*gridding & zoning*) it had become clear that the use of video did not necessarily add much clarity to this process, as other media had proven to excel in certain aspects of the mapping techniques. Apart from the already mentioned disadvantages, the practical boundaries of what could be done on this scale and with this limited equipment became more and more clear. The second paradigm shift consisted of the evolving awareness that the notion of conducting these experiments in a centralized and preconceived way had not proven to lead to better results. As many of our students were automatically drawn towards the same highlights and hotspots when they entered new and remote cities, the thus formed *illegal* footage proved to be a valuable addition in order to construct little self-supporting moving city-maps, in which the harshness of the underlying strategy was being softened by the personal and often human-focussed additional footage. We realized that the dominant aspiration to rule out any form of narration, except that which was being generated by the strategy itself, blocked the better understanding of the social interaction and its human context. By allowing to load the *industrial and hollow* shell which was being created by the strategy, with very subjective and emotionally generated soft-topics like human interaction and behaviour, the impact of the complex relationship between the built environment and the human actor became much more clear. By strictly applying the predetermined rules, a container for emotional content is created.

The last strategy which I will address here is that of *collected subjectivity*, which is probably nearest to the *Drift technique (Dérive)*, coined by the 'Situationists International' in the mid-nineteen fifties. It appears that the best approach so far, was that of the use of the notion of collected subjectivity, which I briefly summarized above. Although one could dispute whether the terminology is the best suitable, I strongly cling to the expression *collecting* rather than to use *combining*, as combining automatically implies making compromises and losing intrinsic qualities. To exemplify this I will describe the process surrounding an expedition in which Singapore played the lead-role.

Singapore

The Singapore workshop distinguished itself not only by the high quality of the results, but also by its unique group configuration. Unlike the Newark, Santiago, Istanbul and Mexico groups in which teams were formed on basis of *metier* (urbanists to the right, architects to the left or something similar), the Singapore group was divided on basis of their individual artistic approach and worked according to a set of guidelines. The first guideline was the steadily growing level of complexity in the assignments, which followed the line: Single fixed images > sequenced imaging > moving image > sequenced moving image > sequenced moving image with sound > designed sequenced moving image with multilayered sound design. The second guideline was found by exploring some medium specific features that were connected to the level of complexity of the assignments. The understanding of the nature and effect of these features was exemplified by showing the work of Chris Marker (research & dynamic mapping), Patrick Keiller (dynamic mapping & projective videography), Stan Brakhage (medium analysis), Matthew Barney (projective), Karl Heinz Stockhausen (sound architecture), Lars von Trier (medium analysis), Alexander Sokurov (volume – time conversion) and Guy Debord (dynamic subjective mapping).

After having completed the first series of preparations, it was clear that the group could be divided along the lines each participant used in response to the assignment. This resulted in the formation of four groups; the conceptual, the poetic, the narrative and the constructive. The narrative group could express itself best if they used a form of visual narration, the constructive group literally constructed its films in the editing phase, to a point where the content of the footage became subservient to the editing process. The poetic group constructed intuitive, almost esoteric visual poems which were inspired by the site-visits themselves, this in sharp contrast to the approach of the conceptual group, which precisely worked out all shots and editing-plan beforehand and made sure they shot what they had intended. Part of the preparation for filming on location was the division of subjects - connected to the respective approaches - which helped to prevent generating double images. The general directive for all groups was not to strive for objectivity, but to *collect* their subjective visions on the topic. The four short-films put across a clear and critical yet constructive notion of the *problematique* (the complex interrelatedness of different problems), of the given sites. The dynamics of the generated images - edited in a very style-specific way - in combination with the constructed *soundscapes*, portray a highly intuitive and valid mental image, which runs quite well alongside the maps, drawings and statistics. When viewed sequentially, the individual and multi-angled character of the films adds greatly to the overall understanding and contributes highly to the explanation and exemplification of the proposed interventions which have been generated in the studio. The Singapore workshop marked the end of the development of this particular methodology and its success proves it is ready to be used on a different scale.

The next and provisional final phase in the development of our methodology can now be defined. Authorship, indirect depiction of architectural conditions, no pretence or need for objectivity or completeness, no urgency for narration, collecting on basis of the individual perception, it all carries the familiar smell of the methods used by the Situationists International. But it would be far too simple to state that the next phase in videography would be no more than a *technified* version of the *dérive*. As Graafland clearly states:

One of the most important precepts upon which Situationism was based was that social progress did not subsume the individual, but instead had to maximize his or her freedom and potential. This precept linked Situationism (as a practice), and in specific the "drift", to ideology and politics, something that is often overlooked in contemporary adaptations or interpretations of Situationism. The drift is not just another way of microscopic attention to city life; we cannot strip it from its political content. Using it as another way to "explore" the city is against everything the Situationists stood for, namely the revolution of the working class and an overturning of power. (Graafland 2008: 12)

As these particular political aspirations are not the primary motives for developing our videographic methodology, we have to make another connection.

The above mentioned explosive increase of the ability to collect and to distribute moving images which has taken place (following the tracks of non-moving images), has given us opportunities to easily experiment with other types of mapping. If we would - for the time being - accept the notion that images are true in itself - with this is meant the pure physical/digital image, with no connotation of any kind attached - we could regard the huge on line social networked image banks (like Flickr, YouTube etc.) as multi angled meta-mapping devices. As these data collections are so extensive in size, they are likely to comply with all sorts of statistical standards for manipulation, which would make them the true socially liberated agencies of mapping. Apart from all *Folksonomic* issues, we could - in time - simply navigate through a compressed non-formalized pre-selection of any given environment, registered by the highly subjective 'Eyes of the people' by applying our personal system of meta-tagging. Although this is a highly speculative thought, at this point there is no indication that such a system of collected subjectivism would function less well than any orchestrated form of audio-visual mapping. By allowing the collective to be the curators of their own work, including the choice of the way the different fragments were connected (think of the serial / parallel distinctions as described above), this mapping project becomes a significant part of the design process. The depiction the soft sided context of the intervention proposals in all its variety, by reflecting the architectural conditions through their relations to the inhabitants of the moving imagery and by allowing the audience to complete the internal structure of the presentation by refraining from using an overall narrative is perceived as a highly valuable form of cinematic aided design through projective mapping.

Future research

It should be clear that the results of this research formed the starting point from which many new directions can be taken. New outlines for future research have been drawn in which the use of moving image in relation to the *problématique* of mapping still plays a central role. But unlike the previous research we are not only focussing on mapping existing environments, but also try to depict future conditions. Not in a way a designer or a planner does, but as an archaeologist of conditions still to come. For this we should re-enter the level where the notions of what is happening 'in the screen' and that of what is happening 'on the screen' , because not only do they define the different approaches towards the theme, they also coincide and thus form a connecting element in which production and representation appear simultaneous.

It means that whenever we look at *architectural conditions* in cinema, we tend to look at them in terms of objects instead of functional subjects. Objects which play an important part in the depiction of the narrative structure, in the visual narration if you wish, but objects never the less. Objects being used as setting, decorum. Although it is clear that this distinction is very ambiguous, both in terminology as well as in interpretation, it is imperative to raise this question first, as for most of the theoretical and practical research has been done in the setting of 'what is happening on the screen'. A film could be regarded as a finished product, an object that can be analyzed, criticized and interpreted, but not altered. When we start depicting the urban- and architectural structures for the sake of depicting urban- and architectural structures *with a special set of directives*, then we can start looking at what is happening 'in the screen'. We then have made the essential transition from non-alteration to alteration. Now that we found the road to getting 'in the screen', could we make sure to connect to both past and future, shaping and depicting future conditions simultaneously? For this we have to get into representation and memory a little deeper.

On representation and production

The same media are being utilized both in the depiction of the creation, as well as in the production itself. We could claim that specific media would be appearing in different avatars. Under certain conditions, they would behave as a medium of creation, under other condition they would act as medium of representation. But of particular interest is the moment when a medium reaches both states simultaneously. Eisenstein exemplified a similar state by looking at:

The principle of the hieroglyph -denotation by depiction- split in two: along the line of its purpose (the principle of "denotation"), into the principles of creating literary imagery; along the line of its method of realizing this purpose (the principle of "depiction"), into the methods of expressiveness used by Sharaku. And , just as the two outspreading wings of a hyperbola meet, as we say, at infinity (though no one has visited so distant a region!), so the principle of hieroglyphics, infinitely splitting into two parts (in accordance with the function of symbols), unexpectedly unites again from this dual estrangement, in yet a fourth sphere - in the theatre (Eisenstein 1957: 35).

A medium such as photography, functions as a peephole, an encrypting encoder with its distinct yet limited qualities. Both production and representation pass through the same *corridor*. The act of taking a photograph (and the presentation of it) requires the presence of a very distinct set of mental assumption and rules in both the photographer and the audience. Notions of the fixation of movement and time, the dislocation of physicality, the counter-natural possibilities to analyse the subject in a one way fashion (without the possibility to act or interact), the removal of the third and fourth dimension and others, are all part the code which belongs to this particular medium. This encryption-process needs to be understood in order to be able to know what a photograph is, both in the process of producing as well as in representation. I do not mean the process of breaking through the *studium* by the emergence of a *punctum*, in the way Barthes distinguishes this, as we have not entered the level of the content of the image yet. But it is most likely that there is a correlation between the two systems.

As the production of the new is more and more limited to an automated process - based on the same encrypted code - the mental distance between the creation of a concept and the actual production of 'the physical' is getting smaller and smaller and its practical boundaries are getting more opaque . Therefore fixed notions of the possibilities and limitations in physical production will shift towards a state of mental *Plattenbau*, based on the models which have been conceived on the basis of the encrypted codes brought forward by media of representation. Physical distances are increasingly being replaced by reproductions, which in their turn are being collected and transformed into archetypes. The same sources which connect and explore architectural conditions also simplify and standardize them. In other words; we could only produce what our mental models allow us to conceive, but if these models are created by perceiving the representation of that what exists, it is clear that the production could in the end become reduced to being only the representation of the representation.

If we were to regard moving image in its state as cinema (on the screen) we could - conditionally - argue that the creation and the representation overlay. Filmic conditions are being created which can only be represented by the medium itself. And how does this relate to physical space? Obviously, the inhabitants of the movie show us that their space is as real as our space, as it is defining their conditions as much as our conditions are being defined by our space. In this way one could state that the viewer and the inhabitant are only separated by time, as we are witnessing a depiction of their being shown from the logical perspective as seen in hindsight. When Bergson makes a distinction between the notion of pure recollection which can only be virtual and the notion of the recollection image which needs to be connected to the present, it seems logical to stick to the latter to enable us (the ones of the present) to actually share in this conditional analogy space.

If representation itself would not be a too ambiguous notion to be unchallenged - Rancière notes that 'the failing of the stable relationship between the perceptible and the intelligible' might perfectly well be construed as the unlimited character of the powers of representation' (Rancière 2009: 130) - we could leave it at that. But if representations are based on mental models, inevitably the representation changes as we change these models. In this state we could argue that the continuous shaping and reshaping of the mental models involved in the

perception of the creation of such circumstances affect the socio-economic paradigm shifts which underlie the changes in our urban settings. As we close the gap between the representation and the production of physical space, then changing the representation is also influencing the production.

On time and memory

Deleuze's *sheet proposition* hands a case which could provide the essential link between the now and the recollected now in an interactive way by stating:

We constitute a continuum with fragments of different ages; we make use of transformations which take place between two sheets to constitute a sheet of transformation. For instance, in a dream, there is no longer one recollection-image which embodies one particular point of a given sheet; there are a number of images which are embodied within each other, each referring to a different point of the sheet. Perhaps, when we read a book, watch a show, or look at a painting, and especially when we are ourselves the author, an analogous process can be triggered: we constitute a sheet of transformation which invents a kind of transverse continuity or communication between several sheets, and weaves a network of non-localizable relations between them. In this way we extract non-chronological time (Deleuze 1989: 119)

And it is exactly this transformative notion which enables us to apply the notion of collected subjectivity to our future quest, as we are about to construct a form of 'projective mapping'.

Taking the conception that the representation of memory (recollection-image) is depending on the mental models which exist in the perceivers mind, than it would be defensible to state that the collection of mental models in any given group would form the social-cultural paradigms of that particular group. Following Halbwachs' notions of collective memory, we could now arrange all media avatars on a plane connecting reproduction, observation, analysis, criticism, instantiating, memorizing and production which - by the permeable nature of 'the peephole' - would become a *variable field array of media typologies*. By this array I indicate an abstract flexible organizing and storage system, in which every stored element itself defines the volume it needs. When focussing on the relation between photography and film in this context, we start with the premise that the absence of sequential motion in photography suggests a stronger state of objectivity, and therefore shapes the visual mental model of the producer more than other media, like film. On the other hand, the ability of reproducing motion in film, influences the spatial mental model much more than photography does. But looking at contemporary and future conditions, we should also include the influence of modern media. Hoskins says:

The transformations in time and space that have distanced (and instantiated) human relations since the writing of Halbwachs have also fundamentally altered the constitution of collective memory. The connectedness of the electronic media – of the network society – has provided new global collectivities through the use of satellite and digital technology. The social supports of collective memory are often intensively and extensively mediated. Thus, 'cultural memory' is based on socially organised mnemonics, institutions, and media. Although the individual remains (or perhaps appears as) the real holder of memory, what is valuable or necessary to remember (and to forget) is directed by a collective that today seems increasingly media-afflicted. Or one might even say that with the magnitude of the televisual archive and the internet, memory is less a function of remembering but more a question of knowing where to look (Hoskins 2003).

Next Phase

The next phase in our research will collect (not combine!) all mentioned notions to form its presumptive position and strive to engage moving images in the process of mapping future conditions from a *neutral* standpoint. By partaking in the construction of a medium (*in the screen*) which can represent and produce at the same time (*the peephole*), connecting ourselves to the past and the future past by applying the notion of sheets of transformation, using the paradigms formed by the underlying mental models, it should be possible to create a depiction of how future architectural conditions will be perceived. When we are able to calibrate and align the corridors of production, representation, perception and projection, it would create an open connection between communicators on all sides of the sheet of moving image, enabling the existence of intentionally installed and highly subjective *punctums*, as guidelines in the objective projection of future. In order to clarify the distinguishing character of this type of mapping, Radman has suggested to replace the *projective* by the well known 4EA approach - a suggestion I am happy to adopt as soon as a workable shorthand is found.

Marc Boumeester

Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture, Delft School of Design.

References

- Baichwal, Jennifer (2006), *Manufactured Landscapes*, New York,: Zeitgeist Films.
- Barney, Matthew (2003), *The Order; Cremaster III*, New York: Palmpictures.
- Barthes, Roland (1993), *Camera Lucida*, London: Vintage, pp.26-27.
- Brakhage, Stan (2003), *by Brakhage: an anthology*, New York: The Criterion Collection.
- Bruno, Giuliana (2002), *Atlas of emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*, New York: Verso, p. 39.
- Carroll, Noël (1988), *Philosophical problems of classical film theory*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 57.
- Carroll, Noël (2008), *The philosophy of motion pictures*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 142-143.
- Clarke, Alan (1989), *Elephant*, Belfast: BBC Northern Ireland.
- Debord, Guy (1994), *The Society of the Spectacle*, New York: Zone books.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1989), *Cinema 2*, London: Continuum,p.119.
- Eisenstein, Sergei (1957), *Film Form*, New York: Meridian Books, p.35.
- Graafland, Arie (2000), *The Socius of Architecture*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.
- Graafland, Arie (2008), *Understanding the Socius through creative mapping techniques*, Delft: Delft School of Design.
- Halbwachs, Maurice (1992), *On Collective Memory*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hauptmann, Deborah (Ed.)(2006), *The Body in Architecture*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, pp.223-233.
- Hitchcock, Alfred (1954), *Rear Window*, Universal: Universal City CA.
- Hoskins, Andrew (2003), *An Introduction to Media and Collective Memory*, Swansea: Dept. Of Media and Communication Studies.
- Keiller, Patrick (1994), *London*, London: British Film Institute.
- Kourany, J.A. (Ed.). (1987). *Scientific Knowledge: Basic issues in the philosophy of science*. Bolmont: Wadsworth.
- Marker, Chris (1962), *La Jetée*, Neuilly-sur-Seine: Argos Films, text from voice-over.
- Marker, Chris (1983), *Sans Soleil*, Neuilly-sur-Seine: Argos Films.
- Noé, Gaspar (2002), *Irréversible*, Paris: Wild Bunch, film's motto.
- Pallasmaa, Juhani (2001), *The architecture of image*, Helsinki: Rakennustieto Oy, pp.145-174.
- Sokurov, Alexander (2002), *Russian Arc*, St.Petersburg: The State Hermitage Museum.
- Raban, Jonathan (1988), *Soft City*, London: HarperCollins Publishers, p.10.
- Radman, Andrej (2010), Personal communication.
- Rancière, Jacques (2009), *The future of image*, London/New York: Verso, p.130.
- Resnais, Alain (1960), *L'Année dernière à Marienbad*, Neuilly-sur-Seine: Argos Films.
- Stockhausen, Karlheinz (1996), *Helicopter String Quartet*, Amsterdam: Allegri Film.
- Van Sant, Gus (2003), *Elephant*, Santa Monica: HBO Films.
- Von Trier, Lars (2003), *The five obstructions*, Hvidovre: Zentropa.

Folksonomy: 'the user-created bottom-up categorical structure development with an emergent thesaurus would become a Folksonomy' in Thomas Vander Wal, *Folksonomy coinage and definition*, The vanderwal.net Blog posted February 2,2007, <http://vanderwal.net/folksonomy.html> (accessed June 21, 2010).