14. Art, Otherwise Than Art

Cinema and Contemporary Art: A Mutual Challenge

Dominique Chateau

Abstract

Dominique Chateau posits that post-art can be characterized by the formula: *art, otherwise than art*. It means that in the institutional context presently governing art, the artworks or what serves as such, including objects or acts claiming non-art, are explicitly exhibited as art while different kinds of physical or mental attitudes are allowed toward them that have nothing to do with art in the first place. It is in this *art, otherwise than art* context that cinema and contemporary art are mutually challenging, as can be seen in the meeting of cinema with the *dispositifs* of exhibition spaces; the intrusion of cinema into art or post-art places. More generally, this possibility opens new paths for creation: new filmic form, changes in the creators' status, and the advent of exhibitions of a new kind.

Keywords: Contemporary art, long movies, aesthetics

For some years now, I have been developing the topic “art, otherwise than art.” While I now propose a new version that features the same basic idea, it has been modified and expanded to improve the mutual challenge between cinema and contemporary art. Not only is cinema increasingly playing a part in contemporary art, but filmic forms are also influenced by contemporary art. Included in the “expanded field” (Krauss 1979, 30) of contemporary art, cinema takes part in the current state of art that, in many ways, may be conceived of as a post-art state where, although it has not disappeared altogether, art is different from what it was originally intended to be (in terms of its state of fullness during the nineteenth century). However, the paradox is considerably more complex because at the same time, as new *dispositifs* emerge – computers, cellular phones, tablets – the “old” *dispositif*

of cinema-going remains, i.e., watching a film projected onto a more or less large screen in a theater. Moreover, the editing software (i.e., Final Cut Pro) is designed from pellicular fragmentation into photograms, no longer the unit of the digital medium. While participating in post-art, cinema is the last art form in which it is not a shame to produce artworks in a “classical” form – in other words, presented as an autonomous form animated by the artistic aura.

Art, Otherwise Than Art: A Clarification

Unless “otherwise than art” looks like Emmanuel Levinas’s “otherwise than being” (1998), it has nothing to do with his philosophy. Besides, I am not only interested in “otherwise than art” but also in the whole syntagm: “art, otherwise than art,” insofar as it suggests my intention to consider a new kind of artwork, not only of which the artistic characteristic may be ambiguous but also requiring or allowing more or less explicitly an attitude that is different from the expected one *given that the object is once again supposed to be an artwork* – and by artwork, I mean *something which is supposed to belong to art*. Thus, the question is not only the possible ambiguity of the artwork but also the possible ambiguity of the way in which the artwork is received.

We can distinguish four cases: art received as art, non-art-received at art, art received otherwise than art, and non-art received otherwise than art. In this kind of logical square, only art received as art is clear. For example, while visiting the Prado in Madrid, a certain amount of time lapses while standing in front of Diego Velázquez’s *Las Meninas* (c. 1656). *Non-art received as art* can be seen in Bertrand Lavier’s *Brandt on Haffner*,¹ and it seems very simple to explain why: if we had to describe the “work,” we would say that it is “a fridge on a safe!” But what can we imagine or understand from this assemblage? Bertrand Lavier says that “*Brandt on Haffner* is half way between the museum and the department store, and this place cannot be found” (Lavier 2012), except that these items are exhibited in a museum, probably in order to question the definition of an artwork; it seems to be directed at people who enjoy this ambiguity despite their being used to it, and who are neither shocked nor appalled by what they see. Unless *Brandt on Haffner*’s meaning is a conceptual one, people stand before it, contemplating it, as if it were a “classic” painting. In other words,

1 251 x 70 x 65 cm, Centre Pompidou, 1984.

in such a case, the *art, otherwise than art* scheme is limited to the audience's mental process.

My main interest in this paper involves acts rather than only minds, dealing with *art or non-art (whatever) received otherwise than art*. The main fact that I wish to emphasize is that, from this viewpoint, venerable paintings and poor objects are put on exactly the same level. We could say that the venerable paintings are degraded while the poor objects are elevated. Is there a pilot in the plane? That is, who decides? According to the well-known Breton-Éluard definition of the readymade, the artist decides – “an ordinary object elevated to the dignity of a work of art by the mere choice of an artist” (Breton 1992, 837). Closer to George Dickie's institutional theory, I think that every candidacy to artistic instauration needs to be certified by an institution.

I wish to make two remarks in passing:

1. Instauration is also a French concept coined by Étienne Souriau (Souriau 1939, 10, fn 1), and is a word as uneasy as *dispositif* (see below) to translate into English: establishment seems to be the best equivalent unless the word instauration means something which has to do both with institutions and ontology: artwork as a new concept introduced in the present world.
2. Concerning artistic candidacy, Dickie speaks of “appreciation” (Dickie 1974, 34), but I think that we would rather speak of “confirmation” – I mean, the fact that the candidate receives the artistic label in the frame of an institution which has the power to give it (whatever the members of this institution feel about the artifact).

The otherwise than art reception of art or non-art is a new habit of artistic institutions. It is not the decision of a singular artist or curator. It is a global habit determined by the postmodern process which has been applied to art since the 1980s. It is the habit of a new behavior in relation to artworks or something similar – a new habit determined by the cultural evolution that has started to change art and its reception throughout the world since the 1980s. I would not call this “revolution”; instead, I would refer to this as evolution. Though it is a rapid evolution, indeed, it took us a while to become conscious of this rapidly developing state of art, especially since the postmodern ideology has mistakenly transformed it into a kind of fairytale where, as if by waving a magic wand, it could abruptly end the so-called great tales. We once again find ourselves in a great tale. But while the tale's content has changed, the fact that we participate in a tale, i.e., human history has not.

Comment about the Word “Dispositif”

The post-art era is the era of the *dispositif*. This French word is not easy to translate even though people have tried to find possible English equivalents from time to time: dispositive, device, apparatus, machinery. Like most researchers, I will use the French word. We know that it appears in Michel Foucault's writings. However, I am less inclined toward his version than the one George Dickie suggests when speaking of a “framework for the presenting of artworks” (1974, 31) or Louis Marin's definition of “the dispositifs of presentation as the conditions for the possibility and efficacy of representation in painting, such as the frame, the décor, the layout of the representation, etc.” (1989, 10). Directly concerned with cinema, Frank Kessler provides more accuracy when he specifies that a *dispositif* involves three aspects: a material technology, a spectatorial positioning, and an institutionalized form of art presentation – the theater, for example (2003, 24).

We are fully in the time of *dispositifs*. The otherwise than art mode of reception is fully linked to this fact for two reasons. Firstly, many artists are so concerned with *dispositifs* that they consider them part of the artwork. Moreover, the necessary *dispositif* of exhibition has become the surprising exhibition of *dispositifs*. For example, André Rouillé writes:

[I]n a fully postmodern approach of mise en abyme, one does not enter into the traditional exhibition-dispositif to see and contemplate artworks-things, but to discover, experiment and activate other dispositifs: artworks-dispositifs. [...] While artworks-things primarily appealed to the eyes of viewers, artworks-dispositifs appeal to all their sensory abilities, their dispositions to act and react, as well as their ability to conceptualize. (2008, n.p.)

Secondly, we are simultaneously in the time of the greatest amount of growth in terms of cultural events, exhibitions of many kinds, and cultural and artistic tourism. The *dispositif* is more and more important as a mediation between us and artworks or what is supposed to be such. It guarantees spectatorial positioning as envisaged by the curators. But at the same time that this *dispositif* is, to some extent, helping to guide our behavior, it makes more or less unexpected attitudes possible – otherwise than art attitudes in front of art.

We could assume that this double emphasis regarding the *dispositif*, as art or as a condition of art spectatorship, means that the specificity of art has increased substantially in recent years. It is not far from being the contrary.

In other words, within the *dispositifs* that establish us as beholders of art, it happens to be more and more possible to do or to act in a way which combines the conventional attitude toward art with some additional and new attitudes, and even with attitudes which have nothing to do with art. In the context of contemporary art, the best exemplification of *art, otherwise than art* may be found in works that can be both contemplated and penetrated.

The *Too Too – Much Much* exhibition was a *dispositif* established by Thomas Hirschhorn in 2010 at the Dhondt-Dhaenens Museum (Deurle, Belgium). It was surprisingly opened to the outside, while indoors people were invited to move about laboriously on a carpet of soda cans. In this way, a focus on waste was emphasized by making it difficult to walk. Similarly, in the Berlin Jewish Museum, Daniel Libeskind's remarkable architecture, vertical *voids* (both in the sense of emptiness and nothingness) signifies the absence of Jews from German society; among these *voids*, there is *The Memory Void*, with an installation by the Israeli artist, Menashe Kadishman: in this installation called *Shalekhet (Fallen Leaves)*, the ground is covered with 10,000 steel faces dedicated to war and victims of violence; when visitors step on these faces strange and jarring sounds are heard.

The “art, otherwise than art” topic suggests looking at the proxemic point of view from which the spatial relationship between the outside and inside is of particular interest: what do we know about the inside space of an exhibition before entering? What can we see from an outside place which is more or less close to the exhibition space? How do we enter the exhibition space? Where is the doorstep, the threshold between the outside and the inside? Is there an in-between space, a transition, like an airlock, at the doorstep? And so on.

Among the exhibitions I visited in Tokyo in 2017, Kusama Yayoi's² display at The National Art Center has been one of the most thought-provoking. Having crossed the threshold of the museum, visitors received colored stickers and access to a so-called “Obliteration Room” where they could place the colored stickers on the walls or on some objects. This intermediate space had two functions. The first was to regulate the queue, whose length could be measured by the fact that it was almost impossible to access the library after having visited the exhibition. The second was to prepare the visitor for a kind of active involvement in the exhibition *dispositif*. Incidentally, this involvement concerned a tactile aspect that requires emphasis. In aesthetics, the notion of haptic is quite commonplace thanks to Riegl and Deleuze! Haptic denotes the fact that even in purely visual works, such as paintings

2 Japanese names are written here in their traditional form: surname first.

or sculptures, there are some aspects that deal with touch; coming back to the word tactile, in Kusama's "Obliteration Room" physical touching is an option rather than only the transmutation of touching into visual signs.

Film in Places of Exhibition

Film exhibition is particularly interesting in terms of envisaging the *dispositif* and an *art, otherwise than art* attitude. Victa de Carvalho and André Parente write:

The introduction of cinema into galleries and museums raises new questions. The fixed duration imposed on the spectator by regular movie theatres, for example, no longer applies in cinema of exhibition. Its conditions of reception imply an elasticity of time, allowing viewers to follow their own trajectory, to participate in an experience unique to them only. Instead of a definite sequence, it offers different modalities of perception, editing and temporality. (2008, 50)

This is a kind of in-between situation – “a cinema which is simultaneously the same *and* different”(51). Film exhibition is not a pure substitute for the *dispositif*, a pure replacement for the so-called “institutional cinema” *dispositif* by the exhibition dispositive. The best way to represent it is Hegel's *Aufhebung*: something is deleted, something remains, and it produces a more or less new thing or category of things. It is quite understandable if we remember the consensus definition of the “institutional cinema” *dispositif*, i.e., a film, a screen, and a theater: all have changed, but each remains the same to some extent. Indeed, within the exhibition room, one once again finds the film, the screen and a place more or less arranged according to the reference model of the theater space.

The only relevant distinction between the two kinds of *dispositif* has to do with the *art, otherwise than art* situation. Raymond Bellour describes the flow into and through the screening room where Mark Lewis presented four films based on the museum collection – PYRAMID, 8' 18"; CHILD WITH A SPINNING TOP, 4' 39"; THE NIGHT GALLERY, 4' 50"; and IN SEARCH OF THE BLESSED RANIERI, 23' at the Louvre from October 9, 2014 to August 31 – in the following terms:

It is 2:10 p.m. I am sitting on the front bench beside an attentive woman. A group of people comes in; one of them says: “It's a projection,” and all

leave. A family of three arrives; the daughter sits with one buttock on the bench to my left, the parents look as if they have been stopped in their tracks, ready to escape; she gets up almost immediately; they move away. 2:15 p.m. An old man comes in, sits and leaves immediately. [...] A couple enters; they sit behind us, speaking loudly. Two strollers arrive from the back of the room. [...] Someone comes up, stops, takes a photo with his iPad and leaves. A young woman leans against the entrance door just long enough to catch the long movement revolving around the *Victory of Samothrace*. Still chatting, the couple gets up and leaves. 2:25 p.m. My faithful screening companion abandons me. A horde of people comes from behind and leaves while, in the huge room, a crowd of visitors are attracted by the artworks. (2016, 239)

Bellour is wondering “who had actually watched Mark Lewis’s Films at the Louvre.” Indeed, in this case, the screening-exhibiting room is both a place where one can sit and a place of museum transit. People who try to stay in front of the screen can do so (on a very limited number of seats) but will probably be disturbed by people going through. It could be properly theorized by Benjamin’s scheme of the dialectical image, a halt in the dialectical process adapted to understand phenomena that, unless being one-sided, are divided between opposite things or characteristics. In view of such situations now being both *art, otherwise than art* and *movie, otherwise than theater*, Steve McQueen, artist and filmmaker, known as much for his exhibitions in galleries or Biennials as for his feature-films (*HUNGER*, 2008, *TWELVE YEARS A SLAVE*, 2013) explains why he does not merely settle for the theater system:

I try to get away from this kind of “popcorn mentality,” as I call it. Projecting the film onto the back wall of the gallery space so that it completely fills it from ceiling to floor, and from side to side, gives it this kind of blanket effect. You are very much involved with what is going on. You are a participant, not a passive viewer. (1996-1997, n.p.)

The reason that McQueen turns his gaze to exhibition clearly has to do with *art, otherwise than art*: the old condition of the passive artwork contemplation in a museum is reinterpreted as an up-to-date attitude of the *active visitor immersed in the work*. It is worth bearing in mind that post-cinema mutation refers to a change in the modes of receiving cultural products. Incidentally, the growth of tourism throughout the world is presently the main factor transforming art, a mutation working very deeply; consequently,

aesthetics, especially aesthetic attitude, is changing too – that is, the attitude of visitors not only in front of artworks but also inside exhibition rooms. However, the mutation is not only a change in aesthetic attitude which could be produced by a sociological mutation. The new audience faces new art challenges, new movie challenges.

Cinema in the “Expanded Field”

The present explains the past as much as the past illuminates the present. There were, without a doubt, premises of post-cinema before the full awareness of its ins- and outs, but the advent of this consciousness may also be considered as an event of this kind that means a transformation. If we take into account, for example, the premises that Lettrism exemplifies, we can measure what distinguishes the before and after: characteristic of an avant-garde climate specific to the twentieth century, Isidore Isou's statements in *VENOM AND ETERNITY*, his 1951 film (*TREATISE OF DROOL AND ETERNITY* would be a better translation of the original title: *TRAITÉ DE BAVE ET D'ÉTERNITÉ*), both partially anticipate post-cinema and have rather outdated accents:

I believe firstly that the cinema is too rich. It is obese. It has reached its limits, its maximum. With the first movement of widening which it will outline, the cinema will burst! Under the blow of a congestion, this greased pig will tear into a thousand pieces. I announce the destruction of the cinema, the first apocalyptic sign of disjunction, of rupture, of this corpulent and bloated organization which calls itself film (translated in Verrone 2012, 66).

As much as we can agree on the widening or expansion of the field of cinema, we know that it has not caused any break-up. Unlike the anarchist prophecy of a burst, it is an endless enrichment that must be observed.

It is in this regard that Rosalind Krauss's “expanded field” concept is relevant. Coined in reference to sculpture, she felt the medium had come to mean “surprising things” to a point where it is “almost infinitely malleable” (1979, 30). She adds that it is “an extraordinary demonstration of elasticity, a display of the way a cultural term can be extended to include just about anything” (30). She describes a Mary Miss installation (*Perimeters/Pavilions/Decoys*, Nassau County Museum of Art, 1977) as a *sculpture* which is “*more precisely, an earthwork*.” This kind of semantic elasticity manifests that,

impacting the reception of art, there has been a major evolution whereby artworks now have one foot in the category denoted by their name and the other in a new category which can be more or less vague. Harold Rosenberg (1964) called these kinds of artworks *anxious*. As the subtitle of Rosenberg's book *Art Today and Its Audience* already suggested, new kinds of artistic objects mean new ways of making and receiving them.

As far as the "expanded field" is concerned, we sometimes forget that this kind of cultural evolution was already known in the movie field. While Krauss's concept appears at the end of the 1970s, the concept of "expanded cinema," which was coined in the mid-1960s, applied to underground cinema. Here, *expanded* derives from drug vocabulary where "expanded consciousness" means "expanded or exploded consciousness" (Noguez 1979, 170, fn 1). The word, which was first publicized by Jonas Mekas and then by Gene Youngblood in his eponymous book (1970 – see also Andrew 2017), has been used to denote marginal kinds of movies, such as experimental films. This is particularly the case when considering film form or independent films, or the modes of production and post-production. Currently, the so-called mode of expanded cinema is no longer exclusive to the underground due to the fact that, in the meantime, cinema has been connected to the expanded field of art, i.e., post-art – what amounts to the same thing: *post-* does not imply an ultimate denial; rather, post-art is art after itself.

Regarding this expansion, we can also speak of intrusion: the intrusion of cinema into art or post-art places. There are four kinds of such intrusion: cinema as a theme or referent of contemporary artworks; introduction of the cinema *dispositif* in artistic installations; cooperation between filmmakers and artists; and contemporary art exhibitions made by filmmakers. I will develop some of these cases of intrusion on the grounds of, dialectically, the *art, otherwise than art* situation.

Hamaguchi Ryusuke's Case

Art, otherwise than art is not only a new way of receiving art but also a new way of creating and instaurating it, resulting in a major change in the status of filmmakers. In terms of its form and production, Hamaguchi Ryusuke's *HAPPY HOUR* (2015) contributes significantly to this point. The storyline of this movie appears very simple: four women, who live in Kobe (Japan), are great friends and frequently meet and travel together until one of them (Jun) disappears; the group disintegrates and the friends, who discover hidden feelings, must face their own personal situation. Richard

Brody rightly considers this film as “a work of distinctly modern cinema [that] reaches deep into the classic traditions of melodrama – along with its coincidences and its violent contrasts – to revive a latent power for grand-scale observation through painfully close contact with the agonizing intimacies of contemporary life” (2016, n.p.). Nevertheless, it is not mainly in this respect that the film challenges us. Brody writes that this “movie is extraordinary both in its artistry and in its dimensions: it runs five hours and seventeen minutes,” notifying that “MoMa is showing it only once daily, at 4:30 p.m.,” and observing that “it’s a tough film to release at all” – release, “as opposed to a scattered handful of screenings.”

MoMa’s screening context is one of several release locations; you can also watch such a film in a theater, on a TV screen, a computer, or a smartphone screen, and so on. I bought it from Orange VOD; it is now downloaded onto my iMac; I watched it on my TV, and then by means of a video projector on a larger screen in my living room. Despite its length, the film actually consists of different “films” or parts of the film – five parts grouped into three (1, 2-3, 4-5, and 5) – which can be seen in one go or one by one, giving the viewer the additional opportunity to interrupt vision and resume it after a shorter or longer period of time. There are different terms used to denote a series of successive films sharing the same diegetic universe: film series, movie series, and movie (or film) franchises. *HAPPY HOUR* belongs to a different category: the “film broken into parts” as David Lynch says about *TWIN PEAKS 3* (Chateau 2018, 138). The parts of this kind of series share the same diegesis, but we are invited to consider the whole as a single film. It is highly symptomatic that *HAPPY HOUR* and *TWIN PEAKS 3* can be wrapped up into one package although the first is a film and the second a series. As time goes by (without allusion!), film has come closer to TV series as much as TV series have come closer to film. It simply remains a distinctive criterion that decides in favor of cinema: authorship – i.e., it comes down to the question: could you name the author, or the main author (in the case of other screenwriters), like we do with David Lynch and Hamaguchi Ryusuke?

Concerning the Japanese filmmaker, art making and acting – *poietic* in the sense of Paul Valéry (1944) – have to do with authorship. By authorship I do not designate the film owner (who has the final cut?), but the one who appropriates the work by expressing its singularity. This attitude seems to be characteristic of post-cinema filmmakers even though the post-art atmosphere seemingly implies an authorship downturn, especially due to the spectator being more or less deeply involved in the process of creation. These new filmmakers, who are university graduates and who often refer to the French New Wave, are less determined by the model of the Hollywood

filmmaker than by the model of the contemporary artist (an avatar of the romantic model). Hamaguchi is a graduate of the Tokyo University of the Arts, where he studied filmmaking. He began his career with his graduation film, *PASSION*, selected by the 2008 Tokyo Filmex Festival. Paying tribute to Rivette and Cassavetes in an interview about *HAPPY HOUR*, he explains the *poietic* context for his film in a way that confirms his leaning toward the contemporary artist, in particular the artist in residence who leads workshops:

When I was a residence artist at KIITO, a design center in Kobe, from September 2013 to February 2014, we had “Improv Acting Workshops in Kobe” once a week, which didn’t require the participants to have any acting experience. We were supposed to shoot a film when the workshop ended, but what we were doing were lessons to be listeners, not lessons for acting. (2015, n.p.)

Film Length as Post-cinema Form

In *The Philosophy of Art: The Question of Definition – From Hegel to Post-Dantian Theories*, Tiziana Andina proposes the following definition of the artwork: “An artwork is a social object, an artifact, that embodies a representation, in the form of an inscribed trace upon a medium that is not transparent” (2013, 166). As with all definitions, it is the same for definitions of art: they can be found to be both too short and too long – too short to exhaust all the essential features of the object in question, and too long to coincide with the intuitive idea we have of it. More interestingly, elsewhere, Andina chooses to exemplify her “post-Dantian” definition of artwork with “Christian Marclay’s *THE CLOCK* (2010), a film that has an impressive duration of 24 hours.” She writes:

THE CLOCK is a true gem of cinematographic assemblage in which the separation between reality and the worlds of fiction marks the almost absolute erasure of the boundaries of temporality. Time, which is measured and indicated with obsessive constancy throughout the entire film, coincides with that of our lives in an astonishing way. The spectator realizes this immediately—at first with surprise and then with mounting unease combined with authentic enjoyment. Time passes and is measured; it is spoken of and considered throughout the whole of the film, for 24 extraordinary hours. It is measured not only by clocks that capture its

rhythm, but also by memory, which travels through Marclay's excerpts, contextualizes them, and experiences the irony of scenes that belong to a past in black and white, only to open itself to a world of colors. (Andina 2013, n.p.)

Is the length of movies a symptom of post-cinema? Does the category of the long film deserve to be considered a typical post-cinema form (or genre)? According to this hypothesis, post-cinema means a new form: a speedy montage of movie excerpts,³ sometimes called *supercut*, associated with a new filmic, or metafilmic experience: "The medium is never transparent, Andina adds; in fact, we do not watch the kaleidoscopic collage as a collection of images but rather as a revisiting of the history of cinematography and, at the same time, of our memory" (2013, n.p.). In addition, to be seen, *THE CLOCK* requires the contemporary art *dispositif*.

When asked about the length of his film (four hours and seventeen minutes), Hamaguchi says he thought that the film, previously called *BRIDES*, would last two hours and thirty minutes, but adds the following about the naming of his work using the French title *SENSES* (in reference to the film's subdivision in five parts corresponding with the division of the five senses: touch, hearing, sight, smell, and taste):

[T]he length and content are totally different in the final *SENSES* editing. In the end, the script was completely rewritten seven times. It was a never-ending process. During the shooting, we wondered how to finish the film properly. In a way, we can say that all the time we spent looking for that ending is reflected in the length of *SENSES*. (2015, n.p.; my translation)

This difficulty in finishing is symptomatic. Coming back to film exhibition, it is curious to note that this kind of movie relocation to the museum space allows one to show very long movies despite their length; the route and rhythm of the exhibition visit do not encourage standing in front of them for a long time, so that more often than not, you see only a fragment of them.

HAPPY HOUR has not broken the world record in terms of movie length. Although it seems odd, movie length is a challenge that well suits the post-cinema atmosphere and *art, otherwise than art*. Under the conditions of movie screening in the theater there is already a general tendency to extend duration. Moreover, films appearing in the context of the gallery or museum

3 For an overview of the films used in *THE CLOCK*, see: <https://letterboxd.com/thisisdrew/list/the-clock/>. Accessed August 28, 2019.

do not need to comply with traditional standards. Under these special conditions, film and its reception do not need to be shaped to the “seated beholder” model; to the extent that in addition the film can be perpetually relocated to a whole range of devices – TV, computer, smartphone – the beholder pecks at pieces with no regard for film length. If we wanted to be more precise, we would notice that the form of a film such as *THE CLOCK* requires the contemporary art *dispositif*, despite it not being the best condition in which to experience the endless projection (of which Andina accurately speaks).

The “Longest Film Ever”

To be honest, in accordance with the hypothesis that post-cinema began before it was explicitly recognized and consciously practiced as such, the increase in film length is no novelty as shown in the following non-exhaustive table:

Director	MOVIE	Year	Duration (minutes)
Louis Feuillade	LES VAMPIRES	1915	421
Louis Feuillade	VINDICTA	1923	320
Abel Gance	NAPOLEON	1927	562
Zhang Shichuan	THE BURNING OF THE RED LOTUS TEMPLE	1928-1931	1620
Andy Warhol	EMPIRE	1964	485
Sergei Bondarchuk	WAR AND PEACE	1966	511
Jacques Rivette and Suzanne Schiffman	OUT 1	1971	773
Gérard Courant (see chap. 18)	CINÉMATON	1978-2020	12048
Claude Lanzmann	SHOAH	1985	566
John Timmis	THE CURE FOR INSOMNIA	1987	5220
Peter Brook	THE MAHABHARATA (TV)	1989	360
Alain Resnais	SMOKING, NO SMOKING	1993	298
Béla Tarr	SÁTÁNTANGÓ	1994	440
Peter Watkins	LA COMMUNE	2000	345
Matthew Barney	THE CREMASTER CYCLE	2003	398
Christian Marclay	THE CLOCK	2010	1440
Danish artist group Superfex	MODERN TIMES FOR EVER	2011	14400
Wang Bing (see chap. 19)	DEAD SOULS 1	2018	506
Mariano Linás	LA FLOR	2018	840
Ilya Khrzhanovsky (see chap. 17)	DAU	2019	1000?
Anders Weberg	AMBIANCE	2020	43200

While this table is far from being exhaustive, it suggests a few thoughts. As seen in the early examples, long films may be serial ones, like *THE VAMPIRES* or the considered lost *THE BURNING OF THE RED LOTUS TEMPLE*, consisting of sixteen parts and released over a period of three years, and which holds the record for having the longest duration. But it may also be a feature-film, such as *NAPOLÉON*, an epic historical drama which is divided into three parts and lasts 9 hours and 22 minutes in its uncut version. To these we may add experimental film such as Warhol's *EMPIRE*, fiction film such as Bondarchuk's *WAR AND PEACE*, or documentary film such as Lanzmann's *SHOAH*, and the range of possibilities seems complete.

However, something special dealing with *art, otherwise than art* bases the discernment of post-cinema on the longest films. To be limited to a few cases,

- it may comprise a part-whole dialectic: in Gérard Courant's *CINÉMATON*, composed of silent shots where a fixed camera frames someone who does what he/she wants, the length of the reunion of thousands of portraits is potentially infinite – see chapter 18;
- it may be included in an artistic installation: Ilya Khrzhanovsky's *DAU* contains a set of fourteen films that can be seen in a huge and complex *dispositif* ("baroque" in the vulgar sense of the word) recreating the Soviet Union atmosphere – see chapter 17;
- it may be a strange experience of transienceness: *AMBIANCÉ* is an upcoming film whose existence will be as short as its first, and only, screening is long. *The Guardian* described Swedish artist and filmmaker, Anders Weberg's project as follows:

The film-maker, who says *AMBIANCÉ* will be his last movie, describes it as an "abstract nonlinear narrative summary of the artist's time spent with the moving image" that will show how "space and time are intertwined into a surreal dream-like journey beyond places." Weberg has made more than 300 short films in a 20-year career. He plans to screen his latest work, which from the trailer looks set to take an abstract and experimental form, just once simultaneously on every continent from 31 December 2020. It will then be destroyed. (Child 2014, n.p.)

Cinema as a Reservoir of Contemporary Art: Pierre Huyghe's Case

In order to evaluate the scope of post-cinema, we can look through the other end of the spyglass, and ask the question: what is the image of cinema in the expanded field of contemporary art? *Art, otherwise than art* generously

offers a context in which old habits are outdated, but to the extent that *movie, otherwise than theater* is only partially true, or only true within the orb of the contemporary art field: as expanded as it is, can it accommodate the traditional conception of cinema?

Two works by Pierre Huyghe provide a good example of a reinvestment of cinema in the personal imagination of contemporary artists involving, in this case, not only the “imaginary museum” (films, stars and so on) but also the cinematographic *dispositif*: *REMAKE* (1994-1995), which reprises Hitchcock’s *REAR WINDOW* (1954) in the context of a Parisian suburb, with amateur interpreters and by transposing the action near a building under construction; and *DUBBING* (1996), which shows filmed dubbing in the process of reading the dialogue of a horror film (Barikin 2012). Pierre Huyghe’s relationship with cinema is ambiguous. He says:

What interests me today is seeing how a story can go through different modes of visibility, whether it is an exhibition, a film, a book or a show. At one time, history may have passed through cinema, but today it no longer does. But if cinema has made history for a while, it is interesting to question what made the story and to see how this story was transmitted, how it was produced and how it was broadcast. [...] It would never occur to me to say that I want to make films or that I want to make art; it is a question that we are entitled to ask a second time but we first want to talk and only then, this word must find its place. (2017; my translation)

In such a case, cinema is clearly invoked and reinvested in the context of contemporary art exhibitions as an art of the past and a witness to a bygone era. Indifferent to the medium as such, the artist assimilates himself to the post-art denial of art. Whether or not Huyghe has a desire to make art, he does it all the same – in this respect, the phrase “we want to talk first” is not innocent since it refocuses the source of creation on the subject, the artist’s idiosyncratic attitude. This denial of the artistic posture, which expresses both postmodern ideology and an individual decision, suggests that the artist’s disposition (romantic, if you will) is persistent in the very context in which the ideology claims to erase it – it is a bit like the bloodstain on the carpet that the assassin washes in vain.

With regard to this ambivalent behavior, it is not surprising that Huyghe may say that he does not make films. But there is another reason, which is simpler and more essential: he does not enter, nor has desire to enter, the institutional field of cinema. His field is resolutely the expanded field of contemporary art. He rejects, at the same time, the specific filmic form,

having chosen to relocate the cinematographic residues that he borrows and/or parodies to his own institutional place of speech. This is no longer a question of denial, but of a simple positioning with regard to the institutional field and the forms of work recognized within it. There is, undoubtedly, a link between the idea that cinema would be an art of the past and the rejection of the film form – *cinema, otherwise than cinema* – which, it should be stressed, essentially maintains the form of “traditional” work.

Cooperation between Filmmaker and Artist: Michel Gondry's Case

A question haunts this entire discussion: the artist question (what is an artist?). Announcing my intention to talk about filmmaker-artist cooperation presupposes the distinction between the filmmaker and the artist as if they were two separate entities; the filmmaker cannot be considered an artist and vice versa. Post-cinema could be involved in post-art but only in the way a technician can be involved in a movie. Hamaguchi Ryusuke's case has already shown this not to be true. This is once again corroborated in Michel Gondry's case and his collaboration with Pierre Bismuth, who is a known artist. In 1993, Gondry began to make a video clip for Jean-François Coen's song, *La tour de Pise*, using as his starting point one of Bismuth's contemporary artworks, *La pièce de Châteauroux*. In 1998, Bismuth's idea of a narrative based on the agreed and controlled erasure of memory became a synopsis on which Gondry and Charlie Kaufmann (scriptwriter for Spike Jonze's *BEING JOHN MALKOVICH*, 1999) based their script for *ETERNAL SUNSHINE OF THE SPOTLESS MIND* (2004). Having collaborated on Bismuth's video *LINK* (1998) and Gondry's music video for a Kylie Minogue song, *COME INTO MY WORLD* (2002), Bismuth and Gondry would once again join hands, this time in contemporary art, with the installation *The All Seeing Eye* (Cosmic Galerie, Paris, 2005): on the four walls of the exhibition room images are projected in panoramic mode; these images are taken by a camera which, pivoting on its 360-degree axis, shoots a bourgeois apartment whose furniture appears and then disappears with each rotation until it is completely emptied (among the objects is a television set which broadcasts *ETERNAL SUNSHINE*).

McQueen may be said to be both filmmaker and artist since he embodies two cultural roles. In qualifying Gondry and Bismuth, however, the most immediate response would be to appoint Gondry as the filmmaker and Bismuth as the artist. This reflects the ideology attached to cinema and contemporary art respectively which, in turn, reflects their respective cultural status. As we know, artistic cinema is a subset of the cinema which also includes

productions that have no artistic aim; while, on the side of contemporary art, everything is deemed art. In this sense, Gondry clearly joins these new filmmakers who, as I said, are less determined by the feature-film model than by the model of the contemporary artist; more precisely, like McQueen (or Mary Miss, *mutatis mutandis*), he operates within both models. If we can name Gondry as an artist, it is by a specification of the field of cinema, whereas Bismuth is considered an artist by right despite the contemporary art field expansion, despite the *art, otherwise than art* situation that more or less concretely (and honestly) involves the sharing of authorship.

In order to complete Gondry's portraiture, we see also that in his person, several different postures are gathered: he stands on the advertising creative side with many audiovisual advertisements, on the side of "traditional" filmmaking with *HUMAN NATURE* (2001), *ETERNAL SUNSHINE OF THE SPOTLESS MIND*, *THE SCIENCE OF SLEEP* (2006), *BE KIND, REWIND* (2008) and so on, on the TV production side with the recent *KIDDING* (2018), and halfway again between creation and production with his video clips for Björk, the Rolling Stones, Daft Punk, Kylie Minogue, Massive Attack, etc. Gondry's case shows that post-cinema allows the filmmaker all kinds of practices more or less linked to cinema, that it is possible to belong to different artistic spheres at the same time, to circulate between these spheres and have ideas, themes and projects circulate between them, to enjoy this vertiginous intermedial exchange, while keeping a cool head toward each specific regime. People who seek out creatives, like Gondry, are adamant: *they want his signature, knowing that he is an artist, but they do not want him to make a work of art instead of an advertisement.*

When an advertiser needs an art-like advertisement, they know who to call. So when Apple orders a movie from Gondry, asking him to make it on an iPhone 7, the resulting work, *DÉTOUR* (2018) – a ten-minute film about a girl's tricycle abandoned on the road while the family continues their journey to their summer holiday destination and the tricycle's subsequent arduous route in search of its owner – is a demonstration of artistry which is used to enhance the value of the industrial device. In this case, we can consider that films "are among other things fossils of economic life," as Michael Baxandall writes about painting ([1972] 1988, 2). Gondry however shows that it is possible to transform an advertisement into an art film with considerations to film genre and the limits of the device. He explains:

The idea was to shoot a film with the iPhone, without any machinery during shooting or in post-production. To obtain a certain simplicity, as on a holiday film, while applying a rather rigorous cutting that uses classical

cinema. Which you do not necessarily feel, because it is supposed to be invisible. But the approach to the staging was quite rigorous. [...] These devices offer real flexibility; they allow you to do more things. But they also have their limits that have an influence on the staging. (2017, n.p.)

Filmmakers and the Post-art Exhibition

Art, otherwise than art is challenged by another way of exhibiting: aiming at scientific knowledge in astrophysics or anthropology, these postmodern expositions are designed based on artistic models. In these cases, *art, otherwise than art* means that essentially, non-artistic matter is aestheticized. Chased out of the door by post-artists, including those who are conceptual, the aesthetic once again slips in through the window, but in a rather different form. This triumph of aesthetics clearly means that the ambiguity of art no longer dominates or that it is superseded by the ambiguity of the practice of art or anything presented as art. In the present context of syncretic culture, the practice of art oscillates between art ritual and tourism. Tourism provides aesthetics with a second chance. Even the hardest science benefits from this aestheticization (defined in the same way by Benjamin who coined the concept).

Filmmakers also benefit from this aestheticization; paradoxically, art or post-art benefits from that as argued throughout the theme of the *aestheticization of art* (Chateau 2014). I will consider two cases of filmmakers, namely Agnès Varda and David Lynch, who, at some point in their career, chose to turn to exhibition. Or more precisely, they were enticed by the artworld (or post-art world). In such cases, *art, otherwise than art* clearly means the welcome reserved for a foreign body by the artistic institutions in the hope of refreshing themselves. Indeed, cinema is already artistic from the viewpoint of its specific system of production and evaluation: given its industrial nature, the cinematographic system of production raises doubts about the artistic character of its products to the extent that an artistic film overcomes the constraints of its own production system. One time, I asked Agnès Varda why she was moving from film production to the artworld; she responded significantly: "In the film system, I have to beg for money in a process which is exhausting in addition to the fear of not being able to do what I want to do. The artworld is asking for me and lets me do what I want, offering me the conditions to do what I want to do."

L'ÎLE ET ELLE, Agnès Varda's exhibition at the Cartier Foundation (June 18-October 8, 2006) testified to the vitality of current exchanges

between cinema and contemporary (post-)art. Significantly, Varda's work places her squarely within the artist's model: "I worked on the spot, like the painters on the motif" (2006). Similarly, with regard to the *VEUVES DE NOIRMOUTIER*, she highlights the specific nature of the work made possible by the exhibition system:

If there are more widows than widowers in the world, there are many widows on the island if I judge, first of all, by my neighbors. I imagined gathering some of them, by the ocean, dressed in black as it should be (a collective imaginary cliché for widows of sailors and fishermen) and placing around this central image fourteen portraits of women, set in monitors acting as a frame. In a film, I couldn't have shown so many faces simultaneously in moving images. (2006)

This awareness of the specificity of the exhibition device, of its rules and constraints, reinforces that of the film, even when the two meet in a kind of productive *paragone*.

This kind of filmmakers' exhibition in the contemporary art context can be considered a cultural symptom in terms of the extent to which it proliferates, as David Lynch's *The Air is on Fire*, also at the Cartier Foundation (March 3-May 27, 2007), attests. Lynch's interview began with this significant introduction:

Director, painter, musician [...] David Lynch's happiness depends on diversity and transcendental meditation. If *INLAND EMPIRE*, his latest UFO [film just released in France], leaves some in the dark, an exciting exhibition by the Cartier Foundation allows us to penetrate a little further into the head of this iconoclastic creator. (Lynch 2007, 4)

Far from giving the exhibition a didactic role only, *The Air on Fire* is described as "self-collection" since it proposes a kind of autobiographical journey that refocuses a diversity of media and devices (watercolor, mixed technique with oil, installation, photography, film, etc.) on Lynch himself. In addition, the highlight of the *TGV* article is preceded by this quote from the author: "Film language can, and sometimes should be abstract" (2007, 4). But the complexity of the film, its abstraction, differs from the complexity of the exposure in that the film remains a compact form that organically holds together various materials of expression, beyond the semantic and structural transgressions it involves.

As the Gondry-Bismuth system has been borrowed from Michael Snow (*LA RÉGION CENTRALE*, 1971, and other films, photographs, installations,

music), Lynch's diversity as "director, painter, musician" is still reminiscent of the Canadian filmmaker who, long before the postmodern discourse, proposed the inclusion of cinema in an intermediate practice where mediums exchange while being respected. As early as 1967, Snow said:

I am not a professional artist. My paintings are made by a filmmaker, my sculptures by a musician, my films by a painter, my music by a filmmaker, my paintings by a sculptor, my sculptures by a filmmaker, my films by a musician, my music by a sculptor ... who sometimes work together. (1978, 5)

Far from aiming at a mere amalgamation of the arts, he adds:

Moreover, my paintings have been made in large numbers by a painter, my sculptures by a sculptor, my films by a filmmaker, and my music itself by a musician. There is a trend towards purity in each of these media as separate companies. Painting as fixity, static image. Sculpture as an object. Light and time.

Remark Instead of Conclusion

Agnès Varda did not abandon cinema. One of her last works was *VISAGES, VILLAGES*, a documentary made with JR in 2017. A representative of *art, otherwise than art*, the artist JR (Jean René) exhibits black-and-white images in public locations throughout the world. He says that the street is "the largest art gallery in the world" (2009). *VISAGES, VILLAGES* is a kind of *documentary road movie*, a trip on French roads in order to meet people, but its main feature is the meeting between the filmmaker and the artist, not unlike the Gondry-Bismuth meeting, and further back, the Picasso-Clouzot meeting.

Addressing the linking of film and post-art helps us to refresh our memories which have become numb as a result of the postmodern ideology of unbridled intermediality. The point lies less in the exciting or debilitating observation of the current success of this ideology which, certainly, is gaining in people's minds, than in the apparent contradiction of the way in which cinema is once again conditioning its forms with those that dominate in contemporary art: both a work attached to a single medium and a dissemination of the work in a multimedia form. In view of its traditional packaging, what does cinema do in this playground of contemporary art where new toys are constantly invented? Or, to give the question a more controversial turn: why is cinema not ashamed of remaining attached to a cultural form of the past?

We do not know whether the *art, otherwise than art* situation leads to the metamorphosis of cinema in post-art, in a more or less near future. Hypothetically, it would probably mean that the recession of the single medium leads to a kind of undifferentiated mixture. What we can do is simply to observe the paradox of the inclusion of cinema in the sphere of post-art where the uniqueness of the medium is in crisis. Where, on the one hand, the various relations between cinema and contemporary art are increasingly being promoted; while, on the other hand, there exists a persistence of uniqueness in its own sphere, by the way of feature films, alongside the persistence of the position of the filmmaker as the main person responsible for the film – which is the main prerogative of the artist. These two sides are currently in a state of unstable balance, *to be continued ...*

References and Further Reading

- Andina, Tiziana. 2013a. "On Defining Art: A Quasi-Definition of Works of Art." *The Brooklyn Rail* (September). Accessed August 28, 2019. <https://brooklynrail.org/2013/09/criticspage/on-defining-art-a-quasi-definition-of-works-of-art>.
- . 2013b. *The Philosophy of Art: The Question of Definition – From Hegel to Post-Dan-tian Theories*. Translated by Natalia Iacobelli. London and New York: Bloomsbury.
- Andrew, Dudley. 2017. "Announcing the End of the Film Era." *Cultural Critique* 95 (Winter): 263-285.
- Barikin, Amelia. 2012. *Parallel Presents: The Art of Pierre Huyghe*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Baxandall, Michael. (1972) 1988. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bellour, Raymond. 2016. "But Who Actually Watched Mark Lewis's Films at the Louvre?" In *Screens: From Materiality to Spectatorship – A Historical and Theoretical Reassessment*, edited by Dominique Chateau and José Moure. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Breton, André, and Paul Éluard. (1938) 1992. *Dictionnaire abrégé du surréalisme*. In *Œuvres complètes*. Vol 2. Paris: Gallimard/Bibliothèque de la Pléiade.
- Brody, Richard. 2016. "A Five-Hour Japanese Film Captures the Agonizing Intimacies of Daily Life." *The New Yorker*, August 24, 2016. Accessed April 16, 2019. <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/richard-brody/a-five-hour-japanese-film-captures-the-agonizing-intimacies-of-daily-life>.
- Chateau, Dominique. 2014. *L'esthétisation de l'art. Art contemporain et cinéma*. Paris: Amandier-Archambaud, Ciné-cration.

- . 2018. "The Film That Dreams. About David Lynch's *TWIN PEAKS* Season 3." In *Stories: Screen Narrative in the Digital Era*, edited by Ian Christie and Annie van den Oever. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Child, Ben. 2014. "72-Minute Trailer Released for Longest Film Ever." *The Guardian*, July 11, 2014. Accessed April 18, 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2014/jul/11/trailer-for-longest-film-ever-ambiance>.
- De Carvalho, Victa, and André Parente. 2008. "Cinema as *Dispositif*: Between Cinema and Contemporary Art." *Cinemas: Revue d'études cinématographiques / Cinemas: Journal of Film Studies* 19, no. 1.
- Dickie, George. 1974. *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Gondry, Michel. 2017. "Détour: Michel Gondry dévoile son court métrage tourné à l'iPhone." *Allociné*, July 1, 2017. Accessed April 19, 2019. <http://www.allocine.fr/diaporamas/cinema/diaporama-18665358/>.
- Hamaguchi Ryusuke. 2015. "Entretien avec Ryusuke Hamaguchi." *Film de Culte*. Accessed April 17, 2019. <http://www.filmdeculte.com/people/entretien/Entretien-avec-Ryusuke-Hamaguchi-21834.html>.
- . 2019. *Film de Culte*. Accessed April 17, 2019. <https://www.google.com/search?client=safari&rls=en&q=Hamaguchi+Film+de+culte&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8>.
- Huyghe, Pierre. 2017. "Interview." *Pointlignepian*, February 12, 2017. http://www.pointlignepian.com/pages_html/huyghe3.html. Accessed February 12, 2017.
- JR (Jean René). 2009. "JR au JT FR2 – Rencontres d'Arles 2009" [Interview on TV broadcast, France 2]. *YouTube* video, 3:10. July 20, 2009. Accessed July 20, 2009. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J86Ri8v28yo>.
- Kessler, Frank. 2003. "La cinématographie comme dispositif (du) spectaculaire." *Cinemas magazine* 14, no. 1.
- Krauss, Rosalind. 1979. "Sculpture in the Expanded Field." *October* 8.
- Lavier, Bertrand. 2012. "Bertrand Lavier: frigo + coffre fort = 'ordonnance classique.'" *Blablart*, January 10, 2012. Accessed August 17, 2019. <https://blablartcontemporien.wordpress.com/2012/01/10/bertrand-lavier-frigo-coffre-fort-ordonnance-classique/17>.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. (1974) 1998. *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*. Vol. 3. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Dordrecht: Springer, Martinus Nijhoff Philosophy Texts.
- Lynch, David. 2007. *TVG Magazine*, no 92 (March).
- Marin, Louis. 1989. *Opacité de la peinture. Essais sur la représentation au Quattrocento*. Paris: USHER, Coll. Histoire et théorie de l'art.
- McQueen, Steve. 1996-1997. "Let's Get Physical: Steve McQueen interviewed by Patricia Bickers." *Art Monthly* 202 (December-January). Accessed April 19 2019. <https://www.artmonthly.co.uk/magazine/site/article/steve-mcqueen-interviewed-by-patricia-bickers-dec-jan-96-97>.

- Noguez, Dominique. 1979. *Éloge du cinéma expérimental: Définitions, Jalons, Perspectives*. Paris: Musée national d'art moderne, Centre Georges Pompidou.
- Rosenberg, Harold. 1964. *The Anxious Object. Art Today and Its Audience*. New York: Horizon Press.
- Rouillé, André. 2008. "Une esthétique des dispositifs." Paris Art. Accessed February 14, 2008. <https://www.paris-art.com/une-esthetique-des-dispositifs/>.
- Snow, Michael. (1967) 1978. *Statements, 18 Canadian Artists*. Regina, Canada: Norman Mackenzie Art Gallery / Catalogue du Centre Pompidou.
- Souriau, Étienne. 1939. *L'instauration philosophique*. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan.
- Valéry, Paul. 1944. "Première leçon du cours de poétique" [1937]. In *Variété V*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Varda, Agnès. 2006. "Exhibition. Agnès Varda, *L'île et elle*." Fondation Cartier. Accessed September 14, 2006. <https://www.fondationcartier.com/expositions/agnes-vara-lile-et-elle>.
- Verrone, William E.B. 2012. *The Avant-Garde Feature Film: A Critical History*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Youngblood, Gene. 1970. *Expanded Cinema*. New York: Dutton & Co.

About the Author

Dominique Chateau is Emeritus Professor of Aesthetics and Cinema at the Sorbonne School of the Arts at Panthéon-Sorbonne University, Paris I. His books include: *Cinéma et philosophie* (2003), *Philosophies du cinéma* (2010), *Subjectivity* (ed. 2011), *L'invention du concept de montage. Lev Kouléchov, théoricien du cinéma* (2013), *La direction de spectateur* (ed. 2015), *Après Charlie: Le déni de la représentation* (2016), *Screens* (ed. 2016), *Contribution à l'histoire du concept de montage* (2019), *Esthétique de la recreation* (ed. 2019), and *Une esthétique japonaise* (2019).