ARCHITECTURAL CINEMATIC SPACES
AS COUNTER-ARCHIVE OF COLLECTIVE MEMORY

ABSTRACT

As human life is rapidly unfolding within digital realms, it has become urgent to (re)evaluate the meaning of the intangible heritage of our digital environments by looking closely into Hito Steyerl’s re-readings of Walter Benjamin with the recognition of the ‘image as object,’ not merely as representation. The idea of activating an object could be a starting point, or a productive force, in the new approach towards an architectural digital heritage, advancing the transformation of our everyday reality with new readings of architectural spaces. Even though film has been recognised as a form of heritage, it is less present in the case of architectural heritage. This article questions what is the afterlife of ‘cinematic spaces’ as an affective memory of the moving image since they are neither neutral nor passive, as film is a form of expression and a product of collective memory. At the same time, it emphasises the necessity of (re)questioning the ‘fluid’ borders of the ‘uncertain and complex’ past, the ‘acute and unstable’ present and the ‘desired or possible’ future within cinematic spaces by rethinking the practice of archiving ‘cinematic architecture’ and expanding it into the digital realm.
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1. INTRODUCTION: ARCHIVING THE INTANGIBLE

Within the so-called ‘post-truth’ era, our present moment, in which fundamental conceptions of reality are challenged, fiction is given a status upgrade. Fiction has become a reality, or better, dystopian present. Now, walls turn into screens of light and technologies belonging to NASA have become part of our quotidian reality. We are participating in a vibrant digital culture, practising the virtual economy, using digital currency, buying virtual real estate and other cyber phenomena like NFTs (‘Non-fungible’ Art). As Swagato Chakravorty states, we are now, more than ever, engaged with the growing conflation of screen practices and screen architecture. Since human life is rapidly unfolding within digital realms, it has become urgent to (re)evaluate the meaning of the intangible heritage of digital environments, especially those belonging to the past, overwritten by present time, existing only in ‘cinematic spaces,’ and film archives. Croatian visual artist Sandra Sterle posits that the present is not as self-sufficient as it seems. This article emphasises the necessity of (re)questioning the ‘fluid’ borders of the ‘uncertain and complex’ past, the ‘acute and unstable’ present and the ‘desired or possible’ future within cinematic spaces as agents of collective memory, by rethinking the practice of archiving and expanding it into the digital realm. With the assumption that (re)tuning the field comes with (re)examining its tools, looking closely into moving images and cinematic spaces and how they intertwine with core concepts of history writings is essential.

It could also be pertinent to question in addition the inadequacies of the archive as well as what kinds of histories result from ‘regular’ archives: as Daniel M. Abramson, Zeynep Çelik Alexander, and Michael Osman ask: ‘What are the implications of an archive that is too big or too small, inaccessible, or nonexistent?’ If it is not possible to resist formal interpretations without reinforcing frames of reference, it is crucial to recognise how the archive (re)animates the textual past. How does it deal with the dichotomy of each piece of evidence when the evidence is chosen by an authority? Who is the authority in question? What is worth memorialising at the frontier of digital and physical, from the intangible here and now? Besides, as filmmaker and producer Peter Van Goethem asks, what if an archived item derives value from the fact that it is archived, not because of its historical value? By being aware that the basic characteristics of the archive are fragmentation, unpredictability and uncertainty with a lack of clarity, one could easily relate it to the cinema. Moreover, if seeing an archive as a privileged site where different evidence can be found, it is crucial to examine the way it interacts with its content. The French film director Alain Resnais gives a formative example of a
relationship between an archive and its content before digital transformation in his homage to the National Library of France within the essay film *All the World’s Memory.* Specific cinematic space in this film is created through the narrative by borrowing the library’s existing space. The library building itself became a metaphor and protagonist at the same time. Resnais sees the library space as a body of repository - an archive of collective memory - that facilitates the process of remembering, as he finds the power of representation in the affective memory of the image. (Fig 1)

FIGURE 1: *Toute La Mémoire Du Monde*, directed by Alain Resnais, YouTube screenshots: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e83SCW1Ah8I
To redraw the boundaries of an archive, Abramson et al. note: ‘It takes political urgency’ and ‘historical imagination.’ What happens if one shifts gaze beyond the confines of an official archive by using a previously neglected, unacknowledged and unspoken, extending the focus from individual to collective? Within such a move, challenging the text-based archive in its desire for order, coherence and objectivity, Paula Amad interprets the emergence of cinematography. What Amad suggests is an example of a home cinema, with no utilitarian purpose, that ‘merely exists to be forgotten, due to its focus on the incidental, the everyday, the non-essential information,’ where history can be seen from various angles, providing different perspectives on the phenomenon of memory and the way we construct it.

FIGURE 2: Instagram as counter-archive: March 14, 2023, at 22:14 p.m., screenshots
Therefore, one could think of a film and its cinematic space - as something that could store the present for future reference - as an alternative archive. What if one, in the twenty-first century, finally starts to consider collaborative practices and subjectivities of cinema as a counter-narrative for an archive? In that case, the collective voice would select what is valuable to be preserved and future archives might base themselves on resilient collective outsourcing systems like The Pirate Bay - a BitTorrent site and various social media platforms: Facebook, Instagram, Tik Tok, YouTube etc. (Fig 2) Those platforms as ‘private’ archives could eventually mark the end of institutional cinematography as we knew it before total democratisation in the digital era of smartphones. Such perspectives require not only historical imagination but ‘a fundamental rethinking and renegotiation of institutional, disciplinary and working arrangements.’ If the truth is neither in the represented nor in the representation, archives could be approached as something dispensable that serves only to invent history. Granting that reality is only ‘the point of coincidence of different fictions,’ as Vilém Flusser tells us, and fiction is another angle of reality - ‘the lie through which we tell the truth’ - as Albert Camus marked in his famous novel The Stranger. If every fiction has its truth, can fiction be seen as a method or a ‘space’ for collective consciousness? If one realises that each present was once an imagined future, what more can cinematic spaces teach humans as an ‘unofficial archive’ created with fragments and figments of reality?

2. COMPLEXITY OF CINEMATIC SPACE

Film has been recognised as a form of intangible cultural heritage, but it is less evident in the case of filmic architectural heritage. If film is something that is saving the entirety of our outer reality - ‘collective subjectivity’ - of the world, then cinematic spaces could be used to (re)construct memory for the digital archives of our future. Cinematic spaces might be considered more complex; perhaps one can start seeing them as a new mode of remembering architecture.

Cinematic space, the type of space in the film, imagined or real, seen as an archive, relies on its perceived potential as intangible heritage, its impact on narration in film and its influence on the memory of built space. Cinematic space is neither neutral nor passive, as film is more than a form of expression. Films tell us stories through their spatial manipulation, often contrary to the usual understanding of built architecture or experiencing space. Therefore, through cinematic techniques, the space assembled becomes a tool for critical research on architecture and heritage, permitting new readings of architectural space(s).
For Jacques Lévy, a geography and urbanist professor, cinema is made up of a ‘number of languages that are spatial by definition in that they consist first and foremost of images.’ According to Lévy, cinematic space shows the presence of ‘space as environment’ but also ‘spatiality as action – geographicity.’ Lévy addresses André Gardies’s four kinds of cinematic spaces: 1. ‘Cinematographic space’ as the ‘institutional’ setting (the movie theatre, domestic environments containing screens, etc.), in which viewers are immersed in or exposed to; 2. ‘Diegetic space’ is what the film constructs as a reality independent of the story - film’s geographicity, a space as a set or context – ‘anecdotal space’; 3. ‘Narrative space’ relates to the specific spatiality of the characters, which gives substance to the story - as a framework for the action and 4. ‘Viewer space’ - the spatiality produced by the mode of communication that the film adopts towards the viewer.

Lévy argues:

In the most common form of spectator/film interaction, the film is watched rather than seen. [...] This technical choice echoes the emphasis on narration and correspondingly removes from the cinematographic language the awareness of anything in the image not directly connected with the story, in particular its geographicity.

One needs to learn how to ‘see’ a film instead of simply ‘watching’ it. However, the value people place on cinematic space, not as a setting but as a character, is minor. Despite this, it has contributed to the rise of collective nostalgia induced by collective affect, a memory of the mediated collective experience. Using cinematographic language and exploiting its possibilities is far from what it could be in relation to spatial practices and what it could enable. Assuming this to be the case, one can perceive cinematographic techniques - a ‘magic’ - as something useful for our memories of the past. However, being aware that it suspends the viewer’s mechanism of subjective identification and gives the spectator a degree of reflexivity through the knowledge of the ‘rules of the game’ and the director’s craft leads to the avoidance of critical thinking.

3. THE REALITY-FICTION INTERFACE: FACTS VS FICTION

‘In 2016, “post-truth” was selected as the word of the year by the Oxford English Dictionary’ (OED), as Nele Wynants outlines. This tells us that objective facts are becoming less important as it shows that we are living in a post-truth era ‘in which facts, the truth, and reality are increasingly undermined, while fiction is given a status upgrade.’ Reality and fiction are diluted, and tension between
them is intensified by the conditions of a ‘post-digital era’. The ‘sinuous’ relationship between images and reality is enlightened. In 2017, the OED word of the year was ‘youthquake’; in 2018 ‘toxic’; in 2019 ‘climate emergency’; in 2020 ‘unprecedented’; in 2021 ‘vax’ - a vaccine or vaccination; and in post-pandemic time, in 2022 the neologism ‘Goblin mode’. All these words reflect social and material transformations that unexpectedly came together due to the global pandemic in 2020. The virus completely changed our perception of reality and work culture, making us more dependent on digital technology since physical contact became limited. ‘In a pandemic context, it is through screens, and the mediation of images in real time, that the relationship with the world is made.’

During the indefinite quarantine, one witnessed a viral outbreak and the rise of the digital economy. The focus moved from the physical into the digital realm, from the public to the domestic. Suddenly, an implosion of the public into private space was experienced, which exploded in post-pandemic time to low societal expectations and the act of living in a hedonistic manner. In addition, ‘new technology delves deeper and deeper into the private.’ With each new invasion, our definition of ‘public’ changes, as architectural historian and theorist Beatriz Colomina underpins. Colomina examines mass media, especially the new surveillance technologies that emerged in the early years of the last century, as they changed definitions of ‘public’ and ‘private,’ and the way(s) architecture handles the bond between them, their interiors and exteriors. Our understanding of architecture is forever changing. The question is how architecture absorbs the latest communication systems if it feeds them and is not threatened by these technologies.

As a medium between constructed and experienced worlds, the film is laden with the hybridity of the everyday and extraordinary since it is a product of an ‘affected’ and ‘mediated’ collective memory. According to professor of Fine Arts Sofia Gonçalves: ‘Cinema is also a means in which we see, precast and shape […] the reality-fiction interface,’ as for cinema, ‘there is neither a definitive reality nor an absolute fiction.’ Facing a cinema screen, or multiple screens of our online existence, through mechanisms of suspension of disbelief, one projects on what he/she sees or believes momentarily in a possible reality.
4. TACKLING (IM)MATERIALITY: IMAGES-AS-OBJECTS - ALTERNATIVE RELATIONS TO THING(S)

If images operate as a mediator between humans and the world, one needs to acknowledge what a digital image is and how to approach it to stay ‘tuned’ with the present. Along with the recognition of the existence of ‘object-images’ and its opponents ‘subject-images’, filmmaker and writer Hito Steyerl observes the material aspect of ‘image as a thing’ - an object. For her, the objectification of the reproducible image becomes its value. Steyerl shows great potential in analysing the inherent power(s) of the ‘object’. In her outstanding essay ‘A Thing Like You and Me,’ she acknowledges: ‘Things condense power and violence. Just as a thing accumulates productive forces and desires, so does it also accumulate destruction and decay.’ In Steyerl’s reading of Walter Benjamin and his seminal text: ‘The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility’ she indicates:

When the subject identifies with the image as an object, the distinctions that are necessary for representation blur: the dichotomy between objects and images, between subject and object, between the perception of the living and that of lifeless material dissolves.

The archetypical example of objectifying image is pornography or advertising, where bodies are turned into objects of desire and commodity. In contrast, there are subject-images, as José Bartolo writes: ‘subject-images are images that hurt, images that assault, that crush; images that exert upon us […] they are images that act upon us,’ with their brutal immediacy. We are thought to distance ourselves from those kinds of images instead of trying to construct narratives where the approach to the images is mediated, as Armenian filmmaker Artavazd Pelechian theorised in his work combining archival images and his own original filmic records.

Benjamin’s sense of materiality can be seen as enabling history to be presented in objects. For that reason, reproducible technologies like film and photography significantly changed the relationship between history and materiality. According to Benjamin, who was writing before the advent of digitalisation, the reproduction of images threatened the authority of the ‘object’. Whereas, after digitalisation, with the extreme growth in the production and reproduction of imagery that is virally shared and reproduced infinitely, as Steyerl detects, the value of the reproducible image is linked to its ‘usability’. Therefore, with each download, post, like and share, its value grows, creating a way of
spreading and archiving. What becomes interesting in relation to digital image is that the age value cannot be off the topic, as one could rashly conclude that digital environments do not show symptoms of decay. Steyerl asserts:

"It is a complete mystification to think of the digital image as a shiny immortal clone of itself. On the contrary, not even the digital image is outside history. It bears the bruises of its crashes with politics and violence."

Can glitches and ‘dead’ pixels become a new value of image within digital archives? (Fig 3)


Art critic, curator and writer Marit Paasche notices: ‘The image is not enclosed in fiction: it spurs real affections; it motivates political action; it is a “protagonist,”’23 like in Steyerl’s films *November* and *Lovely Andrea*. Paasche renders an important detail of Steyerl’s work where she speaks about our desire to transform ourselves and the world we inhabit into images, something that Benjamin could not foresee as a future desire. Paasche suggests a human desire to create and become an image as a productive force - ‘a new way of tackling materiality.’ Steyerl’s optimistic ‘objectification of the reproducible image as something valuable’ challenges Benjamin’s24 pessimistic outlook of a future
alienated by cameras-based technologies. Steyerl’s recognition of the ‘image as an object’ could be a starting point in the new approach towards digital archives and digital heritage.

Theorist, writer and curator Claudia Giannetti proposes an interesting concept of the ‘ecology of images and media,’ related to ‘contamination of our world with phantasmatic hyper-representations’ that became mirrors of reality and the world, which, surprisingly, we barely think of when dealing with everyday images. ‘Phantasmatic hyper-representations’ can be seen as something that Soviet filmmaker and film theorist Dziga Vertov anticipated almost a hundred years ago in the 1930s, enabled by contemporary technology. In his writings and through newsreel series, Vertov developed a theory - ‘Kino-Eye’ (Russian Kinoglaz) - that speaks about the perceptive nature of the camera lens as the ‘second eye’ - the one that shows the ‘deeper’ truth - the ‘Film Truth’ (Russian Kinopravda) - more sensible than the human eye, thus able to capture more. In Vertov’s words: ‘We cannot improve the making of our eyes, but we can endlessly perfect the camera.’

To use yet another phrase by Benjamin: ‘Anything about which one knows that one soon will not have it around becomes an image,’ one could argue that Benjamin predicted the power of image and the decay of the physical. Steyerl expands this idea and confronts modernism by depicting the desire to transform ourselves and the world we inhabit into images, as she notices ‘the subject is no longer the centre of the universe but on equal terms with other objects.’ Steyerl introduces a ‘shift in perspective,’ a concept of the object and objectivity and how images alter the relation between subject and object in identification. Consequently, ‘things’ become free, active, alive, (co)creative, participatory and possibly influence everyday reality transformation. That said, Steyerl opens up space for discussion on what is worth remembering if history is ‘a pile of rubble,’ as Benjamin once phrased it. In addition, French philosopher Henri Bergson argues that the world exists not only as an accumulation of physical objects but as a reality of images as well. Those images are the (re)presented or (re)mediated collective memory. Thus, the relationship between man and the world consists of both: the world as an object and an image, more precisely, a moving image that can defy time using film techniques. For French film critic and film theorist André Bazin: ‘As soon as it formed, the skin of history peels off as film.’ It is interesting to note that Bazin also distinguishes two opposing trends in the cinema: the directors that relate to the plastics of the image and those that relate to the resources of montage, which is ‘simply the ordering of images in time.’ Bazin also argues that a photographic image is an object free from the conditions of time and space that govern it: ‘Every image
is to be seen as an object and every object as an image. Hence photography ranks high in the order of surrealist creativity because it produces an image that is a reality of nature, namely, an hallucination that is also a fact.\textsuperscript{33}

If affirming ‘image as a thing’, i.e., activating it, in order to prepare it for future archives, it might be helpful to look back into the progressive theoretical writings on the conservation of physical environments from the past. At this point, it may be worth recalling another ‘ghost’ scholar, Viennese art historian Alois Riegel with his, at the time and somehow still, progressive views on the \textit{revaluation of values} - innovative discussion of memory and forgetting within the essay ‘The Modern Cult of Monuments, Its Character and Its Origin,’ published in 1903, at the \textit{fin-de-siècle}. Riegel anticipated the relationships one has with the work of art and art history. He outlined a typology of the monuments, within the framework of the Western culture, by highlighting ‘age’ as the most modern value - a ‘deep sense of voicefulness.’ Riegel understood right, not to worry about ruins because everything will become ruined one day. Professor of Architectural History Erika Naginski symptomatically notices Riegel builds an argument by opposing critical objectivity and artistic subjectivity of ‘scientific aims’ and ‘aesthetic ends.’\textsuperscript{34} In other words, he positions ‘rationalism against affect’.\textsuperscript{35} Those contradictions could be seen as tools that offer a space for opposing points of view. Riegel’s anticanonical view on preservation is underlined within the concept of ‘flexible structure’ of priorities or values rather than monolithic principles. In Riegel’s alternative readings on relations towards things - the material world, the idea of the fragments as an aesthetic mechanism was initiated. This can be linked to a film - as a fragmented whole of moving images - and to cinematic space that constructs its image - a medium in which attention is objectified. Riegł’s concept of \textit{Kunstwollen}, cantered on form as the primary source of evidence, was useful in creating a unified narrative for the visual coherence of everything from buckles to buildings.\textsuperscript{36} Riegł’s emancipatory idea of grasping the work of art’s ‘large relationships’ is giving one an option to visualise the past, which can be associated with interdisciplinarity and intertextuality of the here and now.

5. MATERIALISATION OF IMATERIAL: CINEMATIC ARCHITECTURE AS CONSTRUCTED NOSTALGIA

Architect Zhivka Hristova\textsuperscript{37} departs from the idea: ‘The term memory, in our common understanding, refers to two closely related aspects: our recollection or remembrance of past experiences and the ability to recall them.’\textsuperscript{38} Among others interested in the phenomenon of memory, German Egyptologist Jan
Assmann argues that memory is a social and collective practice. According to him, the process of remembering is an individual act performed by re-living shared experiences and reconstructing events. Assmann opposes the concept of ‘communicative memory’ to ‘the cultural memory:’ communicative memory is a collective memory that constitutes itself in everyday communication with others - oral history - characterised by its proximity to the everyday. It shows thematic instability and disorganisation. According to Assman, its most important characteristic is its limited temporal horizon (eighty to one hundred years into the past). On the contrary, the cultural memory - ‘figures of memory’ - is characterised by its distance from the everyday (transcendence), as it marks its temporal horizon, revealing the idea that objectivised culture has the structure of memory as well. It is maintained through cultural formation and institutional communication. Assman’s theory attempts to integrate and relate all three poles - memory (the contemporised past), culture, and (society) - to each other. Central to this research is Assman’s argument related to one of the few main characteristics of cultural memory called the ‘capacity to reconstruct.’ As the author observes: “No memory can preserve the past. Thus, only what society can reconstruct within its contemporary context matters. Its figures of memory and knowledge are always related to the contemporary context that relates these differently by appropriation, criticism, preservation or transformation. Assman concludes: “Through its cultural heritage a society becomes visible to itself and to others. Which past becomes evident and which values emerge in its identificatory appropriation tells us much about the constitution and tendencies.” If so, it is highly important to master how to approach the reconstruction of the past, respecting the contemporary context.

5.1 Cinema as a time machine

Artist Yannis Karpouzis made a structuralist analysis of Chris Marker’s photo film about time and memory La Jetée. Karpouzis sees it as intermedial artwork created in a constant dialogue between photography and cinematography by using filmic signifiers: film stills, storyline and narration. Karpouzis speaks of Marker as a creator of an ‘archive’ of objects and conditions that have a photographic quality of their own. La Jetée is an example of the ‘diegetic’ reality of ‘cinematic space’ created by still images. There is an essential difference between memory and time, as Bruce Kawin notices: ‘The hero is not sent into his memory; rather his memory is used as a force that helps him to re-enter the past.’ Even though La Jetée carries the message that ‘one cannot escape from time,’ escape narration, or escape from the present, it uses the past, the memory and the future of the protagonist within a cinematic space specially created to assure us in its message. (Fig 4) The key line of the film
might be when the narrator says: ‘moments to remember are just like other
moments,’ which equals all that is presented at any moment, ‘presenting and
retrieving must look the same’, as it outlines how ‘any instant is capable of
being remembered, or of being presented as a memory.’ Furthermore, as
Kawin nicely rephrased, ‘one cannot escape from film.’ Alternatively, to
paraphrase Kawin, ‘one cannot escape reality,’ as our physical reality is not
composed of stills, which might change nowadays while being able to engage
digital reality.

5.2 Revising our notions of materiality

Cinematic experiences are also a social practice, more accurately - collective
experience - related to the collective memory, which is shared, passed or
constructed by the group. However, in our busy societies, one rarely has
time for the act of recollection of memories. As a comment or a critic, one
could see the opposite version of society shown in François Truffaut’s film
Fahrenheit 451 from 1966 - an oppressive future of controlled society - first
described in a dystopian novel by American writer Ray Bradbury. A society
that secretly keeps remembering ‘discrete’ layers of history while being aware that: ‘what remains visible is memory, memory of such is invisible, but the act of remembering makes it tangible, durable, existing.’\textsuperscript{44} French historian Pierre Nora argues that in the twentieth century, we are facing ‘the projection of a realm of memory’ as the sign of memory’s disappearance and ‘society’s need to represent what ostensibly no longer exists.’\textsuperscript{45} In fine, outlining a hypothesis - ‘the act of remembering’ - seen as proof - is more important than memory itself.

Rem Koolhaas calls attention to another phenomenon:

‘Architecture stands with one leg in a world that’s 3,000 years old and another leg in the twenty-first century,’ [...] we’re the last profession that has a memory,’ and ‘we were actually misplaced to deal with the present, but what we offer the present is memory.’\textsuperscript{46}

Koolhaas’s hypothesis opens up new ways of understanding the relation between architecture and memory. Since human memory is spatial, architecture has always been one of the ways of inducing memories for the reason we build different kinds of monuments to recall events and experiences. As Umberto Eco states: ‘perhaps architecture has always wanted to be a theater of memory... It all depends on what you want to remember.’\textsuperscript{47} Instead of a theatre of memory, one could argue, architectural cinematic space reaffirms the notion that cinema has indeed become the site of mediated collective memory.

5.3 Constructed nostalgia as a critical thinking tool and an instrument for retrieving collective memory

Induced nostalgia has a vital role in the writings of Svetlana Boym, who defines nostalgia (from nostos - return home, and algia - longing) as ‘a sentiment of loss and displacement,’ and ‘a romance with one’s own fantasy,’\textsuperscript{48} as well as something that enhances and enriches reflection and extends the self. For Boym, the cinematic image of nostalgia is ‘a double exposure, or a superimposition of two images of home and abroad, past and present, dream and everyday life. Boym recognises nostalgia as yearning for a different time, not longing for a place. According to her research, in the seventeenth century, nostalgia was considered to be a disease. However, nowadays, creative rethinking of nostalgia can be seen as a ‘strategy for a survival’ for all those displaced people who share the impossibility of homecoming. Nostalgia is about the ‘repetition of the unrepeatable,’ as well as the ‘materialisation of immaterial,’ thus its paradox lies in this fundamental ambivalence. Boym differentiates between ‘restorative nostalgia’ and ‘reflective nostalgia.’\textsuperscript{49} The former is concerned
with preserving the essence of things - ‘the truth’. The latter is related to
ephemerality and deals with fragments and ruins, as Riegl did a century ago
and as moving images do now.

British artist Mark Leckey incorporates nostalgia and anxiety of contemporary
society, intertwining collage art, music and video. In Lackey’s canonical video
essay, *Fiorucci Made Me Hardcore,* image is treated as a found object. It is
a compilation of found footage from the British underground music and dance
scene. These chronicles of club dance floors from the 1970s and 1980s to the
Rave scene of the early 1990s can assist one to embody or even overwrite
one’s memory. This example underlines cinematic space as a tool for ‘shaping’
- ‘constructing’ - one’s memories. It is not only about ‘shaping a memory’,
but ‘shaping a present’ through a memory. For that reason, cinematic spaces
should be abolished or nursed with care.

If invisible memory is becoming visible through cinematic spaces, could
nostalgia be seen as an instrument for retrieving our collective memory? Or,
could it be used as a critical thinking tool for overwriting memory that affects
the ‘post-truth’ era?

6. MOVED WITHIN THE MOVING IMAGES:
EMBODIED CINEMATIC SPACE

If one still questions the possibility of being ‘moved’ - affected by a digital
environment(s) or cinematic spaces, constantly believing that one can
never truly embody those space(s), one should take a closer look into the
writings of the scholar of visual art and media Giuliana Bruno for she opens
up the alternative way of cinematic space being read as ‘embodied space.’
If cinematic space can be embodied, then it can be safe to assume that humans
are affected by the digital environment(s). Bruno’s unusual approach to visual
studies is clearly visible in the influential book *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in
Art, Architecture and Film,* which reflects the necessity of rereading Sergei
M. Eisenstein’s work. As she confirms, his theories gave a new architectural
and cinematic aesthetic, a polyfocal alternative to the ocularcentrism of the
Renaissance perspective that directed the observer and ‘reduced spectatorship
to the fixed, unified geometry of a transcendental, disembodied gaze.’ Like
Eisenstein, Bruno is interested in the notion of ‘emotional space’ created by film
narratives or/and cinematic techniques. She interprets Eisenstein’s conception
of space and montage as something in which the spectator is a necessary
element, ‘embodied.’ Therefore, Bruno calls attention to the following:
Cinematic space moves not only through time and space or narrative development but through inner space. Film moves and fundamentally “moves” us, with its ability to render affects and, in turn, to affect. Retracing the steps of the cultural history that generated these “moving” images – our modern, mobile cartography – the book spirals backward into lived space.51

Following Bruno, Richard Martin describes the spectators’ experience as ‘traveling without moving’ while sitting in front of ‘celluloid cities.’52 Such cinematic movement is at the centre of Bruno’s work. Bruno sees ‘cinematic reception’ as a spatial practice of ‘embodied movement’ or ‘spatio-visuality’. She emphasises the major importance of motion to the production of emotion. Moreover, Bruno53 sets out a claim for revising our notions of materiality in the virtual age, such that it is “not a question of materials but rather […] the substance of material relations,” opening up space for new discussions.

7. CONCLUSION:
CINEMATIC SPACE AS A VALID DIGITAL ASSET

If our relationship with images can (re)configure our perception of the past, how can it contribute to a better understanding of the present or transform the future? If everything is the product of the spirit of its times, as in Zeitgeist theory, and nothing is the result of the thoughts of a single man, who has the authority to decide what is to become a digital asset - valid - to be preserved or (re)vitalised within digital environments?

If affirming image as a thing means participating in its ‘collision with history,’ should one still depend on Euro-Western academic narratives (re)contextualising them, acknowledging voices from the past in producing new criteria for valuing intangible spaces of our digital worlds? Alternatively, should one mute those voices for the sake of the present moment, although knowledge is there to be studied? However, one might assume that the collective voice as an alternative to the existing dominant narrative, together with resilient collective outsourcing systems, could become influential in deciding what is valuable to be preserved. Moreover, suppose the image does not represent reality and is just a fragment of the real world or a fabrication of it, as moving images are in their nature. In that case, one might consider ‘cinematic spaces’ as a counter-archive that would: challenge the status quo, (co)create and rebuild our physical and social space and permit new readings of architectural spaces, possibly transforming our quotidian reality. For all that,
one needs to be aware that sometimes the only access to certain places we have is through ‘cinematic spaces.’

Film testifies that one can experience nostalgia toward spaces that never materially existed, leading us to the conclusion that nostalgia can be easily constructed within the language of cinema. The act of remembering, as well as forgetting, becomes a social and highly politicised process, notably when placed in the contemporary context. If existing forms of remembrance can be transformed or reinterpreted and new constructed in their place, crucial is the decision whether one takes memory recollection as an advantage or disadvantage, in other words, whether one decides to preserve or overwrite it. Modernism longed to erase and lose memory, but one might reverse that perspective and use it as strength in a dialogue; consequently, memory recollection through moving images can become useful for future generations. However, if memory is embodied within or through cinematic space, then its memory is being effectively constructed.

Suppose the image is the materialisation of memory. In that case, one either has to learn to live with images as they are in their proximity or (un)learn how to look at them because the question is not only what images bring us but where they take us. If moving images, as intangible heritage, ‘move’ their fixed spectators along, it implies that images affect one’s perception of reality. In addition, if one perceives images as things or living persons that can become free and alive, it means that one accepts the digital environment as something non-resistant to decay or even constant reinterpretation and can be easily decomposed.

If ‘cinematic space’ is being perceived as a living image, it might influence the future of architecture and archives. When conceptualised as an archive, the tensions and characteristics of cinema allow us to reproach the concept of the archive broadly read. ‘Cinematic architecture’ - made of intangible moving images - has a specific nature that is being constructed from the fragments or figments of reality. This loss of continuity and fragmentation of memories may become a counter-narrative that could lead to the process of decomposition of reality itself as something particular for this century.

If invisible memory becomes visible within cinematic spaces or a collective memory constructed through film, one could learn how to approach the past, the present and the future. Nevertheless, what if preserving the memory through cinematic spaces becomes more important than material preservation? After all, what is the virtual afterlife of cinematic spaces in the digital era?
NOTES


5. *Toute La Mémoire Du Monde*, directed by Alain Resnais (Les Films de la Pléiade, 1965), 0:21:0, DVD.


11. A figment is something formed from imaginary elements. Daydreams are figments; nightmares are figments that can seem very real. Most figments are everyday fears and hopes about small things that turn out to be imaginary. However, when the radio play *The War of the Worlds* aired in 1938, it caused panic among thousands of people who did not realise the Martian invasion was just a figment of the author’s imagination. See: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/figment.

12. According to French film director Éric Rohmer the primary unit of filmic spatial representation. It can be seen as the ensemble of landscape, buildings,


14 Lévy’s typology of cinematic spaces can be related to seven levels of filmic reality by philosopher Étienne Souriau; see: Warren Buckland. The Cognitive Semiotics of Film: The Body on the Screen and in Frame (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 47.


21 José Bartolo, “The Subject-Image or the Post-Millennial Condition,” in Image in the Post-Millennium: Mediation, process and critical tension, eds. by Maria João Baltazar and Tome Saldanha Quadros (Portugal: esad/idea and Onomatopee, 2021), 16. Bartolo gives an example of subject-image describing the image of Georg Floyd dying from the pressure of a policeman’s knee on his neck. He explains how this kind of violent image prevents us from relating to it as an object.


The dark side of it all, harder to foretell, as architect, writer and historian Harriet Hariss mentioned during her lecture on February 7 2023, at the Faculty of Architecture — University of Zagreb, is the fact that digital images, that one lives and shares on the Internet, produce tons of CO2 every year, exceeding the amount emitted by air travel. Hence, how can digital environments ever become eco-friendly? Harriss presented the research conducted in preparing the book The Routledge Companion to Architectural Pedagogies of the Global South (editors Harriet Harriss, Ashraf Salama and Ana Gonzalez Lara). The book, in four parts, talks about the specifics of space education, theoretical foundations, the relationship with the canons of Western learning methods, political and social contexts, and interpretations.


André Bazin quoted in: David Forgacs, Rome Open City (Roma Città aperta) (British Film Institute, 2000), 23.


Riegel shifts the impact of artworks from their factual relevance to their psychological effect, as he comprehends that the viewer’s historical situation determines his visual reception.


La Jetée, directed by Chris Marker (Anatole Dauman, 1962), 0:28:0, DVD.


Kawin, “Time and Stasis in ‘La Jetée.’”

Fahrenheit 451, directed by François Truffaut (Universal Pictures, 1966), 1:52:0, DVD.
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ARHITEKTONSKI FILMSKI PROSTORI KAO PROTO-ARHIV KOLEKTIVNE MEMORIJE
Nina Bačun

Budući da nam se životi ubrzano odvijaju unutar digitalnog prostora, neizbežno je preispitati značenje nematerijalne baštine virtualnih okruženja detaljnim proučavanjem Hito Steyerlinih čitanja Waltera Benjamin, uz razumevanje 'slike kao objekta', a ne samo kao reprezentacije. Ideja o aktivisanju objekta slike poslužila bi kao polazna tačka ili produktivna snaga u novom pristupu arhitektonskom digitalnom nasledu, ubrzavajući transformaciju naše svakodnevne stvarnosti novim čitanjem arhitektonskih prostora. Istraživanje postavlja pitanje što je zagrobni život filmskih prostora kao afektivnog sećanja na pokretnu sliku, budući da oni nisu neutralni ni pasivni, jer se film definise kao oblik izražavanja i proizvod kolektivnog sećanja. Istovremeno, naglašava nužnost (pre)ispitivanja 'fluidnih' granica 'neizvesne i kompleksne' prošlosti, 'akutne i nestabilne' sadašnjosti i 'željene ili moguće' budućnosti filmskih prostora kroz promišljanje prakse arhivisanja filmske arhitekture i njenim širenjem u digitalno područje.

KLJUČNE REČI: ARHITEKTURA FILMA, FILMSKI PROSTOR, KOLEKTIVNO SEĆANJE, KONTRA-ARHIV, SLIKA KAO OBJEKAT, NOSTALGIJA

NASLEĐE U MEŠOVITOJ REALNOSTI: POTENCIJAL JAVNIH PROSTORA
U BLIZINI STUDENTSKOG TRGA ZA KONCEPT -EDUTAINMENT-
Milja Mladenović

Savremena svakodnevica afirmiše upotrebu novih tehnologija i digitalnih medija u mnogim sferama javnog života, zbog čega postaje dragoceni aspekt koji treba istražiti prilikom projektovanja savremenih javnih prostora. Pristupajući informacijama o nasleđu unutar javnih prostora, upotreba novih tehnologija omogućava interakciju ne samo sa vidljivim spektrom lokaliteta nasleđa, već može da omogući otkrivanje i interakciju sa 'nevidljivim' nasleđem u okruženjima mešovite realnosti. Preklopljeno nasleđe u istorijskom jezgru Beograda, posebno na području Studentskog trga nudi značajne uvide vezane za istraživanje potencijala za stvaranje interaktivnih okruženja mešovite realnosti. Cilj rada je da definiše raznovrsnost prostornih aspekata i kvaliteta javnih prostora, neophodnih za stvaranje mesta savremene interakcije sa lokalitetima nasleđa. Imajući u vidu prethodno usvojeni koncept edutainment-a (obrazovanje + zabava) za prenošenje informacija o nasleđu korisnicima putem različitih medija, istraživanje se bavi novim načinima prezentacije nasleđa kojim bi se unapredili javni prostori bogati velikom gustinom nasleđa. Po-smatrajući mešovitu stvarnost ne samo kao sredstvo interakcije već i kao način predstavljanja višeslojnih informacija, istraživanje tradicionalnoj analizi lokacije dodaje i zahteve za digitalnom infrastrukturom. Ispitivanjem ovog pristupa analizi na Studentskom trgu, istraživanje nudi novo razumevanje odnosa između mogućih stejkholdera, korisnika i prostornih karakteristika, neophodnih za prezentaciju kulturnog nasleđa u prostorima mešovite realnosti.

KLJUČNE REČI: PREZENTACIJA NASLEĐA, MEŠOVITA REALNOST, JAVNI PROSTOR, URBANI DIZAJN, ANALIZA LOKACIJE