

University of East London Institutional Repository: <http://roar.uel.ac.uk>

This is an unpublished conference paper made available online by permission of the author. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

Author(s): Nigianni, Betty

Title: Film as Architectural Critique: the 'city-in-pieces' by three British avant-garde filmmakers

Year of publication: 2005

Citation: Nigianni, B. (2005) 'Film as Architectural Critique: the 'city-in-pieces' by three British avant-garde filmmakers', *Visualising the City International Conference*, University of Manchester, UK, 28 June Manchester: University of Manchester.

Author: Betty Nigianni, Visiting Lecturer, School of Architecture and the Visual Arts, University of East London

Title: Film as Architectural Critique: the 'city-in-pieces' by three British avant-garde filmmakers

Paper presented in 'Visualising the City', International Symposium, University of Manchester, 2005

Abstract

This paper argues that film practice can operate as architectural critique, in particular as a critique of the contemporary urban built environment. I will argue that film can record and represent the processes of 'juxtaposition' and 'superimposition', which shape the city as a layered environment and, thus, as a discursive production. In this context, I will argue that film's significance as a form of critique lies in the deployment of the technique of 'montage', which operates through the juxtaposition of fragments; and which, further, reconfigures visuality, beyond the focused, perspectival vision, as it has been established since the Renaissance. For the above theoretical discussion, I will refer to the urban films of three British avant-garde filmmakers: Patrick Keiller, William Raban and John Smith.

Introduction

My interest in film as architectural critique was initially inspired by a lecture delivered by ex-architect and filmmaker Patrick Keiller. In his lecture, Keiller argued that there is the potential, within film practice, to represent the city in a critical way. Taking his own urban documentaries as examples of such critical practice, Keiller further described film as a ‘tool’ for investigating the history, but also the future of the city: ‘By exploring the spaces of the past, we may be able to explore the spaces of the future.’ⁱ He further stretched the important role that visuality plays within this process, by quoting Oscar Wilde: ‘The true mystery of the world is the visible’ⁱⁱ. Having had recently finished my own filming of an Athenian site for the purposes of research, I had observed how filming a place can be quite revealing. Setting up a shot slows down the activity of ‘looking’, and therefore attention can be drawn to what otherwise would go unnoticed; in Walter Benjamin’s terms: ‘the camera introduces us to unconscious optics as does psychoanalysis to unconscious impulses’ⁱⁱⁱ. In this sense, I will argue that film confronts urbanism and architecture critically; by providing a reconfigured visuality, it can reveal the ‘hidden’, the ‘unnoticed’, the ‘left-out’ spaces in the city.

Subsequently, this paper will explore whether film can be a tool for critique in architectural terms. Contemporary discourses in the architectural humanities have considered architecture less as ‘objects’, as products of the (‘author’/) designer, and more as ‘process’, as production and reproduction by the (‘reader’/) user. In this context, the paper will argue that it is important, for architectural discourses, to recognise the role that ‘images both visual and lived’ play in studying the urban built environment^{iv}.

Filming the ‘porous’ city

Central to this paper is the idea of the city as ‘porous’. Benjamin originally used the term ‘porosity’ to describe the early 20th century city of Naples as an environment in which distinctions and boundaries between different spaces dissolve. Victor Burgin borrows this term in his essay *The City in Pieces*; and, drawing upon psychoanalytic discourse, he compares the city to a biological organism, which is layered and totally permeable. He argues that modern urban space is formed out of superimpositions of past spatial formations and of different layers of economic, socio-political and cultural practices; but also out of ‘interruptions’ and ‘dislocations’ of those layers. For Burgin, this is the result of the essentially ‘porous’ quality of space – similar to that of the ‘punctured by pores and orifices’ structure of a living organism^v – which subverts the supposedly coherent and homogenising urban environment of capitalist modern space, operating through delimiting and isolating contrasting elements, uses and operations.^{vi}

In my subsequent discussion of the films of Patrick Keiller, William Raban, and John Smith, I will draw upon a similar theoretical framework to argue that these works deal with the ‘porous’ quality of the city. By going beyond the Lefebvrian *façade* of modern urban space, these films reveal layers of political, cultural, historical, and personal narratives – as well as their, often tense, co-existence – in order to represent the city in a critical way, as a set of contradictions and a discursive production. I will further argue, in a historical-materialist manner, that, although these films take a political approach, their critical value does not lie upon a straightforward didacticism; but instead upon their particular way of representing the physical manifestations of the ‘layered’ urban environment through film. I will argue that this happens in a two-fold manner: by developing different ways of ‘looking’ at the city, beyond perspectival vision, and by adopting a more ‘peripheral’, almost ‘tactile’ vision; and further by providing critical representations through the deployment of montage. In this way, these

films succeed in performing an alternative ‘reading’ of the city, by addressing it, in Susan Buck-Morss’s words, ‘as a language in which a historically transient truth (and the truth of historical transiency) is expressed concretely, and the city’s social formation becomes legible within perceived experience’^{vii}.

Visuality

‘Reading’ the visible in a critical way presupposes a radically different way of ‘seeing’. As Burgin notes in regards to perspectival vision and representation, ‘the image of the convergence of parallel lines toward a vanishing point on the horizon became the very figure of Western European global economic and political ambitions’^{viii}. Therefore, a critical approach to architecture as a product of that regime would require a reconceptualisation of the sense of vision; and, consequently, of visual representations of architecture. Contemporary visual theories have discussed the deployment of a ‘peripheral’ vision, as opposed to the ‘focused’ vision of perspective. Drawing upon the phenomenological notion of sight as ‘embodied’ vision^{ix}, ‘peripheral’ vision refers to an optically non-focused, but rather tactile appreciation of architecture, which is similar to Benjamin’s ‘simultaneous collective reception’: a non-optical, habitual and tactile perception^x. Architect and theorist Juhani Pallasmaa has argued that ‘the quality of an architectural reality seems to depend fundamentally on the nature of peripheral vision, which enfolds the subject in space’^{xi}. According to Pallasmaa, this kind of unfocused vision transforms retinal gestalt into a spatial experience. Vision becomes a bodily operation and, this time, the body is not simply a viewing point within the centralised perspective, but it is transformed into ‘the very locus of reference, memory, imagination and integration’^{xii}. Burgin observes that this sort of shift, from focused vision to peripheral vision, implies a historical transition from the representational priority of ‘surface’ to that of ‘interface’, a transition which is reflected in the kind of visual imagery that is available in the

contemporary – digitalised – era^{xiii}. In such imagery, Pallasmaa recognises a critical form of architectural representation: ‘The haptic experience seems to be penetrating the ocular regime again through the tactile presence of modern visual imagery. In a music video, for instance, or the layered contemporary urban transparency, we cannot halt the flow of images for analytic observation; instead we have to appreciate it as an enhanced haptic sensation, rather like a swimmer senses the flow of water against his/her skin’^{xiv}.

Three ways of visualising

The films of Keiller, Raban and Smith follow a similar model of formal experimentation. Pioneered by the London Film-Makers’ Co-operative – known as ‘the Co-op’, a group of British avant-garde independents of the 1960’s and 70’s with which the three filmmakers held ties – formal experimentation was pursued in order to reject film as pure entertainment and as closed narrative^{xv}. Achieving often very impressive visual effects, usually produced ‘in camera’ by craft skill, the filmmakers of ‘the Co-op’ ‘assert a personal vision which is never finalised or fixed, and open a narrative space in which the viewer can question the construction of the film as a manipulated spectacle’^{xvi}. I will now discuss how the critical significance of this kind of filmwork lies on the filmmakers’ ability to reconceptualise the way we visualise the city.

Keiller’s neo-documentary work is particularly concerned with the visual as a means of exploring the city and suburban space. His urban documentaries *London* (1994) and *Robinson in Space* (1997) are set around a fictional character’s (named Robinson) ‘expeditions’ in the city of London and the built environment of greater England respectively. Most interestingly, these journeys aim to study a certain ‘problem’ of space; which, according to Keiller’s own observations, largely results from a disjunction of ‘new’ space and ‘old’ space; the first characterised by ‘conspicuous wealth’, the latter by ‘dilapidation and ruin’^{xvii}.

Approached on a different level, for Keiller, the ‘problem’ of modern urban space may also come ‘from a fundamental disjuncture between how the city works and what we see’^{xxviii}. When interviewed by Patrick Wright, the filmmaker commented that *Robinson in Space* was based on the preconception that ‘there is something up in the countryside, that the countryside is actually a rather forbidding place’^{xxix}. He also noted that the film was made partly in order to reveal the disjuncture between what is seen and what actually occurs, an intention that is manifested in his character’s wish to become a ‘spy’ on the city^{xx}: to ‘look’ at the ‘skin’ of the city, and through its ‘pores’, since seeing the surface as an opaque entity is inadequate, and even deceitful. ‘Looking’, therefore, for Keiller becomes a way of understanding what is at work in the city. In *London*, the narrator most explicitly claims: ‘Robinson believed that if he looked at it hard enough, he could cause the surface of the city to reveal to him the molecular basis of historical events, and in this way he hoped to see into the future.’^{xxi} This interest in ‘looking’ is also reflected in Keiller’s particular camera use, which is nearly always static^{xxii}. His largely flat and tableau-like shots, even though they almost force the viewer to ‘look’, at the same time they set the viewer’s vision free to wander in space. In Keiller’s films, ‘we watch the world become animate; we can catch the current of a canal, the rhythm of the river, the stasis of architecture’^{xxiii}; and we can further spot the dialectical tensions in the city^{xxiv}. Visuality reveals and reconstitutes the city as ‘porous’.

Dialectic also informs the work of landscape film artist William Raban. Starting by making abstract art films, Raban gradually got engaged with the urban context and increasingly included social and historical references in his documentaries which are focused around the river Thames. Raban also ‘looks’ at the city, but in a different way: using a more cinematic approach, he focuses on ‘juxtapositions’ and ‘superimpositions’ of contrasting, and layered elements in the city. In his short film *A13* (1994) – which traces the effects of building the Limehouse Road Link through a densely populated part of London – the area around

Canary Wharf and Limehouse is shown over a day^{xxv} through the juxtaposing of different, but co-existing realities: scenes from the construction of the road are repeatedly interrupted by more idyllic scenes of fishermen by the Regent's canal and views of Hawksmoor's St. Anne's church in Limehouse. Similarly, in his later piece *MM* (2002), Raban brings together a variety of visual material: footage from the construction of the Dome, black and white photographs of the building of the Blackwall Tunnel, old footage showing the blowing up of the power station where the Dome now stands, and shots from the Millennium celebrations. All this material is brought together to represent the Dome as a monument of its particular space and time, and to draw a critique of the building as 'a cipher for attempts at constructing a national ideal'^{xxvi}.

Raban's films can also be seen as a commentary on 'new' space and 'old' space, which reflect an understanding of the modern city that is similar to Keiller's. However, Raban's films propose a different kind of visuality, which does not remain on the surface of the city; but rather confronts the city from unusual and distorted angles, in order to reveal 'over-' or 'cross-layerings'. Those conditions are expressed in his films in a formal manner: *A13*'s urban environment of contradicting layers is represented through juxtapositions of different series of time-lapse sequences, whilst *MM*'s Millennium Dome is reconstructed through the juxtaposition of different visual material. Additionally, in both films, there is no commentary, 'meaning [being constructed] by sound and image alone', in the filmmaker's own words^{xxvii}. Raban's faith in the visual is most stunningly celebrated during the last minutes of *A13*: different sets of footage edited together, superimposed overlaps, variable speed, all combined in representations of a multi-layered, incoherent urbanism.

John Smith's belief that 'if you look hard enough all meanings can be found or produced close to home' (O'Pray) manifests in his particular, quite idiosyncratic, way of filming the city. Most of his films have been shot in his house, and within a few hundred

yards of it. Using authentic East London locations, Smith focuses on the microlevel of the neighbourhood. In films that mix together ‘iconic camerawork, experimental sound tracks and a melee of voices’^{xxviii}, the house, the pub, and local landmarks, become signs of the transience and fluidity of London suburbia.

Slow Glass (1988-91) most explicitly portrays urban change. The film begins by showing us a pub-talk: whilst looking at a close up shot of a half-full glass of beer, we can hear a voice discussing the liquid composition of glass. The observation that glass, ‘even when it’s hard, it is still a liquid’^{xxix}, becomes a metaphor for the world. While the voice goes on about how everything is fluid^{xxx}, the camera captures the same views of the urban fabric at different times, showing how a shash window, a tree on a crossroad, a church, a building’s *façade*, become completely transformed over a period of two years. Similarly, in *Home Suite* (1993-4), following the camera on a journey throughout the filmmaker’s house, which soon will be demolished to make way for the new M11 Link Road, there is an overwhelming sense of ephemerality, as the filmmaker narrates the history of the house and those who have lived in the house.

Like Keiller and Raban, Smith follows the British documentary tradition of making films with a social context^{xxxi}; and, like them, he tries to achieve this through cinematographic experimentation. He often uses a handheld, ‘wandering’ camera (as in *Home Suite*) which makes the viewer see things ‘on the periphery of vision’^{xxxii}; and further a lot of close-up shots which draw attention to the micro-level and its materiality. In Smith’s films, ‘every screw and nail, every stain and scratch’^{xxxiii} can reveal something about urban life. In *Blight* (1994-6), another film about the house demolitions due to the new M11 Link Road, Smith’s camera records the detritus of urban demolition to make a political statement: aluminum sheets, soil, and tarmac compose the slogan ‘Homes, not roads’. Focusing on materiality and the microlevel, Smith’s urban films have an almost tactile quality^{xxxiv}, objecting to

contemporary representations of the city as spectacle: ‘all looking, and no feeling’ (Smith, 2002: 106). As Ian Bourn observes, ‘So often in his work he uses the device of making us close our eyes’^{xxxv}; and in this way, of ‘looking’ at the city as a sensate world.

Montaging the urban pieces

So far, I have discussed how film’s critical significance lies upon the multitude of ways in which it rejects the ‘totalizing gaze’, the perspectival look that comprehends everything in a single glance; in order to adopt, instead, a vision that is more partial and integrated with the environment. In my discussion, I made references to the work of three British filmmakers, often characterised as ‘avant-garde’ because their films adopt an experimental form and a socio-political content. I argued that these films perform a reconceptualisation of visuality to show that: ‘the nature of visual perception is momentary, partial and fragmentary... Like a film camera wielded by a Soviet montage director, you take in the world in a series of glances’^{xxxvi}. I further argued that this reconceptualisation can encounter architecture critically, by representing the urban environment as multi-layered and discursively produced. Before I conclude, I will further discuss film as a montage practice, which can represent architecture critically. Architectural theorist Jonathan Hill has written about the deployment of montage as a way of critically representing and designing architecture; since ‘it is in principle anti-perspectival’, and it ‘involves the juxtaposition of fragments’^{xxxvii}. This process of juxtaposing different, contrasting elements requires an understanding of the tension – or, in Benjamin’s terms, ‘shock’ – created, which immediately situates the spectator in a critical position^{xxxviii}, and, in this way, leaves the work open to interpretation and appropriation; by allowing for the ‘reconstruction of each of the absent elements’, the ‘gaps’, in Hill’s words; and for ‘the formation in the imagination of a new hybrid object formed from the sensations present.’^{xxxix} Hill proposes an architecture that, not unlike film, will montage together ‘spatial,

sensual and semantic gaps'. In this way, an 'environment' that will require the mental and bodily activity of the user, therefore a critical environment, is created^{xl}. I will now briefly discuss in what way the filmwork of Keiller, Raban and Smith operates as a 'montage of gaps', in the above described sense:

- In Keiller's films, history appears to be just disconnected debris. Keiller attempts to reconstruct British culture by making links between the disconnected, discarded elements, however not via creating a coherent narrative. As he mentions on *London*, the film 'aimed at changing the experience of its subject'^{xli}: Robinson's digging-up of all sorts of references throughout his expeditions reveals what is 'forgotten' by the official history of London. As 'the public world of monuments and statues is mixed with the private 'non-spaces' of memory and association'^{xlii}, the viewer is set free to 'weave' his own net of stories about the city. Keiller's cinematic interpretation through the montage of the, almost portrait-like, still shots of the left-out urban spaces makes this storytelling possible.

- Similarly, Raban's films are, as he claims, 'about showing people things, not telling them how to interpret the world'^{xliii}. Raban explores the 'gaps' within urban space in a more explicit way than Keiller: through his use of mediated images, as in *A13*, where we see views of the city through windscreens, mirrors and CCTV cameras; but also through his constant juxtapositions of 'the organic and the mechanistic, historical and present, image, object and representation'^{xliv}. Moreover, in Raban's films, different facets, such as landscape, narrative, documentary, formal experiments with process and duration, are all montaged together to represent an urbanism that is 'hybrid' in its essence.

- Smith's use of montage reconstructs the city as a series of interrupted and distorted views. In *Blight* and *Slow Glass*, we get glimpses of urban spaces through still shots that are constantly disturbed by passing-by buses, vans, and trains, or are reflected in windows and car mirrors. Smith's montage operates as a critique of the 'objective' view, following Keiller's

and Raban's practices. Smith however goes further to superimpose the 'objective' and the 'subjective', the 'macro' and the 'micro' level: *Blight* closes with a black and white image of London's road map, accompanied by the dramatic narration of a woman that lived in one of the demolished East London houses. In this way, Smith shows us that the city is constituted as much from official, as from personal narratives; and that 'we have the power to construct our narratives exactly how we want to.'^{xlv}

I will close my discussion on montage by proposing that, if montage can operate as a critical practice which, in Benjamin's terms, 'can arrange the materiality of modernity into a design that awakens it from its dreamscape and opens it out on to history'^{xlvi}, then perhaps architects could learn from this technique in order to address architecture critically: in a way that would dissolve 'the distinction between author and public'^{xlvii} and would allow for openness in interpretation and critique.

Film as architectural critique

In this paper, I discussed how film can operate critically, as a montage practice, but also in terms of producing a reconceptualisation of visuality and visual representation. I have further suggested that, for the above reasons, film can provide a means to examine and represent architecture critically. To conclude, I would like to expand further on this last point. I would like to add that film can inspire a new architectural imagery which, as Pallasmaa has envisaged, would employ 'reflection, gradations of transparency, overlay and juxtaposition to create a sense of spatial thickness', and would reflect a new spatial sensibility 'that can turn the relative immateriality and weightlessness of recent technological construction into a positive experience of space, place and meaning' (Pallasmaa, 1996: 32). Film can further provide alternative ways of examining architecture historically. Since, as Borden suggests,

traditional techniques of observation of architecture may not be sufficient any more, 'history as film or as media-montage might be possible responses.'^{xlvi}

I would further suggest that representing, in the sense of re-presenting, the city is necessary in order to sustain a critical position. As Burgin observes, 'it is necessary to re-present in different ways what we already know in order to find a way of dealing with the world as it exists, and not the world as it exists in the fantasy of those in power.'^{xlix} For Burgin, this 'dealing with the world' involves a drawing of attention to subjective experience^l. Benjamin first saw links between the ways in which both architecture and film are received by the subject: on a wider socio-political level, 'by a collectivity in a state of distraction'^{li}, and on a more personal level, through a form of 'photographic' image, which imprints architectural spaces onto the mind, similarly to the camera's 'snapshot'^{lii}. In *Robinson in Space*, Keiller makes an appeal for 'a bridge between imagination and reality' to be built^{liii}. Film's critical value for architecture may therefore lie precisely on this: its ability to act as a mediating tool between the subject and space.

References

Books/Articles:

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction". In Benjamin, Walter. 1992. *Illuminations*. London: Fontana Press. pp: 211-244.

Borden, Iain. 2001. *Skateboarding, Space and The City: Architecture and the Body*. Oxford: Berg.

Buck-Morss, Susan. 1999. *The Dialectics of Seeing*. London, England. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Bourn, Ian. "The sound of loss". In Smith, John. 2002. *Film and Video Works. 1972-2002*. Bristol: Picture This Moving Image and Watershed Media Centre. pp: 32-41.

Burgin, Victor. 1996a. "The City in Pieces". In Burgin, Victor. *In/Different Spaces: Place and Memory in Visual Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Burgin, Victor. 1996b. "Venise". In Rüedi, Katerina, Wigglesworth, Sarah, McCorquodale, Duncan (eds.). *Desiring Practices. Architecture, gender and the interdisciplinary*. London: Black Dog Publishing.

Burgin, Victor. 2002. *Relocating*. Bristol : Arnolfini.

Calvino, Italo. "Visibility". In Calvino, Italo. 1993. *Six Memos for the Next Millennium*. New York: Vintage Books.

Heighmore, Ben. 2002. *Everyday life and cultural theory: an introduction*. London: Routledge.

Hill, Jonathan. 2003. *Actions of architecture. Architects and creative users*. London: Routledge.

Keiller, Patrick. 1999. *Robinson in Space: and a conversation with Patrick Wright*. London: Reaktion Books.

Keiller, Patrick. "London in the Early 1990s". In *AA Files 49*.

Leach, Neil. "Walter Benjamin, mimesis, and the dreamworld of photography". In Borden, Iain, Rendell, Jane (eds.). 2000. *Inter/sections: Architectural Histories and Critical Theories*. London: Routledge.

Pallasmaa, Juhani. 1996. *The eyes of the skin. Architecture and the senses*. London: Academy Editions.

Raban, William. 1998. "Lifting Traces". In *filmwaves*. 1998, Spring Volume.

Rees, Al. 2002. "Associations: John Smith and the artist's film in the UK". In Smith, John. *Film and Video Works. 1972-2002*. Bristol: Picture This Moving Image and Watershed Media Centre. pp: 14-31.

Smith, John. 2002. *Film and Video Works. 1972-2002*. Bristol: Picture This Moving Image and Watershed Media Centre.

Web pages:

Danks, Adrian. "On the street where you live. The films of John Smith".

In: http://www.sensesofcinema.com/contents/03/29/john_smith.html

Green, Darren. "William Raban".

In: http://www.luxonline.org.uk/articles/essays/william_raban/detail1.html

Moore, Rachel. "Patrick Keiller".

In: http://www.luxonline.org.uk/articles/essays/patrick_keiller/detail1.html

O'Pray, Michael. "John Smith".

In: http://www.luxonline.org.uk/articles/essays/john_smith/detail1.html

Films:

Keiller, Patrick. 1993. *London (Videorecording): a film by Patrick Keiller*. London: Connoisseur/Academy Video.

Keiller, Patrick. 1997. *Robinson in Space (Videorecording): a film by Patrick Keiller*. London: Academy Video.

Raban, William. 2003. "A13". "MM". In Raban, William. *William Raban (Videorecording)*. British artist's films. London: BFI.

Smith, John. "Blight". "Home Suite". "Slow Glass". In Smith, John. 1997. *John Smith (Videorecording): anthologies / presented by London Electronic Arts. - Vol.1, Vol. 2.* London: London Electronic Arts.

Notes

ⁱ Keiller's lecture "Film as Spatial Critique" in the conference 'Critical Architecture' that took place in The Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL, in November 2004.

ⁱⁱ Quoted in Keiller's film *London*. Keiller, Patrick. 1993. *London (Videorecording): a film by Patrick Keiller*. London: Connoisseur/Academy Video.

ⁱⁱⁱ Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction". In Benjamin, Walter. 1992. *Illuminations*. London: Fontana Press, pp. 230-231.

^{iv} Borden, Iain. 2001. *Skateboarding, Space and The City: Architecture and the Body*. Oxford: Berg, p. 265.

^v A term borrowed from Walter Benjamin, who used it in order to describe precapitalist Naples. In his essay 'Naples', published in English in *Reflections. Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*, p. 163-173.

^{vi} Burgin, Victor. "The City in Pieces". In Burgin, Victor. 1996. *In/Different Spaces: Place and Memory in Visual Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, pp. 143, 147.

^{vii} Buck-Morss, Susan. 1999. *The Dialectics of Seeing*. London, England. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, p. 27.

^{viii} Burgin, Victor. "The City in Pieces". In Burgin, Victor. 1996. *In/Different Spaces: Place and Memory in Visual Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, pp. 148-149.

^{ix} Merleau-Ponty's and even Descartes' equation of vision with touch; that forms an 'osmotic relation', in Merleau-Ponty's words, with architectural space. In Pallasmaa, Juhani. 1996. *The eyes of the skin. Architecture and the senses*. London: Academy Editions, p. 20.

^x Benjamin writes: "Buildings are appropriated in a twofold manner: by use and by perception – or rather by touch and sight...On the tactile side there is no counterpart to contemplation on the optical side. Tactile appropriation is accomplished not so much by attention as by habit. As regards architecture, habit determines to a large extent even optical reception." In "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction". In Benjamin, Walter. 1992. *Illuminations*. London: Fontana Press, p. 233.

^{xi} Pallasmaa, Juhani. 1996. *The eyes of the skin. Architecture and the senses*. London: Academy Editions, p. 13.

^{xii} *Ibid.*, p. 11.

^{xiii} Burgin, Victor. "The City in Pieces". In Burgin, Victor. 1996. *In/Different Spaces: Place and Memory in Visual Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, p. 157.

^{xiv} Pallasmaa, Juhani. 1996. *The eyes of the skin. Architecture and the senses*. London: Academy Editions, p. 36.

^{xv} In this way, the Co-Op sought new relationships to audiences. In Rees, Al. "Associations: John Smith and the artist's film in the UK". In Smith, John. 2002. *Film and Video Works. 1972-2002*. Bristol: Picture This Moving Image and Watershed Media Centre. p. 14.

^{xvi} *Ibid.*, p. 16.

^{xvii} In the interview Keiller, Patrick. 1999. *Robinson in Space: and a conversation with Patrick Wright*. London: Reaktion Books, p. 227. In the film's narration: "He told me that some weeks before, he had

received a letter from a representative of a well-known international advertising agency in viting him to a meeting at the hotel. These people had heard of his study of London and wished to commission him to undertake a peripatetic study of the *problem* of England. He had accepted this offer with alacrity and insisted that I join him as a researcher.” (Keiller: 6)

^{xviii} Moore, Rachel. “Patrick Keiller”.

In: http://www.luxonline.org.uk/articles/essays/patrick_keiller/detail1.html

^{xix} Keiller, Patrick. 1999. *Robinson in Space: and a conversation with Patrick Wright*. London: Reaktion Books, p. 228.

^{xx} “He had once told me that he wished to become a spy, but was not sure who to approach.” Ibid., p. 6.

^{xxi} Ibid., p.

^{xxii} Ibid., p. 231.

^{xxiii} Moore, Rachel. “Patrick Keiller”.

^{xxiv} As Moore observes, “*Robinson in Space*’s didacticism is not about history but about seeing; a historical materialism that is sensate in its essence.” Ibid.

^{xxv} While making this film, Raban was influenced by Vertov’s *Man with a movie camera*, also picturing the city in a day. Raban, William. “Lifting Traces”. In *filmwaves*. 1998, Spring Volume, p.

^{xxvi} Green explains further that the film plays with the Dome as a visual metaphor of New Labour and the Canary Wharf Tower as a symbol of Thatcherism. In Green, Darren. “William Raban”. http://www.luxonline.org.uk/articles/essays/william_raban/detail1.html

^{xxvii} Ibid.

^{xxviii} Rees, Al. 2002. “Associations: John Smith and the artist’s film in the UK”. In Smith, John. *Film and Video Works. 1972-2002*. Bristol: Picture This Moving Image and Watershed Media Centre. p. 24.

^{xxix} Smith, John. 2002. *Film and Video Works. 1972-2002*. Bristol: Picture This Moving Image and Watershed Media Centre, p. 106.

^{xxx} “The world is changing all the time. Everything.” Ibid., p. 107.

^{xxxi} Rees, Al. 2002. “Associations: John Smith and the artist’s film in the UK”. In Smith, John. *Film and Video Works. 1972-2002*. Bristol: Picture This Moving Image and Watershed Media Centre, p. 24.

^{xxxii} Bourn, Ian. “The sound of loss”. In Smith, John. 2002. *Film and Video Works. 1972-2002*. Bristol: Picture This Moving Image and Watershed Media Centre, p. 39.

^{xxxiii} Ibid., p. 39

^{xxxiv} Smith has very good experience in dealing with of the material stuff of film, “gathered over many hundreds of hours spent in splicing and editing”. Ibid., p. 11.

^{xxxv} Ibid., p. 32.

^{xxxvi} Hill, Jonathan. 2003. *Actions of architecture. Architects and creative users*. London: Routledge, p. 117.

^{xxxvii} Ibid., p. 118

^{xxxviii} Benjamin saw montage as “a constellation that produces a spark and allows for legibility and critique.” In Benjamin, Walter. 1992. *Illuminations*. London: Fontana Press, p. (work of art)

^{xxxix} Hill, Jonathan. 2003. *Actions of architecture. Architects and creative users*. London: Routledge, p. 121.

^{xl} Ibid., 128.

^{xli} Keiller, Patrick. 1999. *Robinson in Space: and a conversation with Patrick Wright*. London: Reaktion Books, p. 223.

^{xlii} Rees, Al. 2002. “Associations: John Smith and the artist’s film in the UK”. In Smith, John. *Film and Video Works. 1972-2002*. Bristol: Picture This Moving Image and Watershed Media Centre. p. 24.

^{xliii} In Green, Darren. “William Raban”.

http://www.luxonline.org.uk/articles/essays/william_raban/detail1.html

^{xliiv} In Green, Darren. “William Raban”.

http://www.luxonline.org.uk/articles/essays/william_raban/detail1.html

^{xliv} Bourn, Ian. “The sound of loss”. In Smith, John. 2002. *Film and Video Works. 1972-2002*. Bristol: Picture This Moving Image and Watershed Media Centre, p. 41.

^{xlvi} Highmore, Ben. 2002. *Everyday life and cultural theory: an introduction*. London: Routledge, p. 71.

^{xlvii} Hill, Jonathan. 2003. *Actions of architecture. Architects and creative users*. London: Routledge, p.

^{xlviii} Borden, Iain. 2001. *Skateboarding, Space and The City: Architecture and the Body*. Oxford: Berg, p. 266.

^{xliv} Burgin, Victor. "Venise". In Rüedi, Katerina, Wigglesworth, Sarah, McCorquodale, Duncan (eds.). 1996. *Desiring Practices. Architecture, gender and the interdisciplinary*. London: Black Dog Publishing, p. 68.

¹ I refer here to Burgin's proposal for an introduction of 'psychical reality' into spatial representation and his observation that "Attention to psychical reality calls for a *psychical realism*". In Burgin, Victor. 1996. *In/Different Spaces: Place and Memory in Visual Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, p. 56.

^{li} Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction". In Benjamin, Walter. 1992. *Illuminations*. London: Fontana Press. p. 232.

^{lii} Leach, Neil. "Walter Benjamin, mimesis, and the dreamworld of photography". In Borden, Iain, Rendell, Jane (eds.). 2000. *Inter/sections: Architectural Histories and Critical Theories*. London: Routledge, p. 28.

^{liii} *Robinson in Space* opens with a quote from Raoul Vaneigem's *The revolution of everyday life*: "Everything is changed into something else in my imagination, then the dead weight of things changes it back into what it was in the first place. A bridge between imagination and reality must be built." In Keiller, Patrick. 1999. *Robinson in Space: and a conversation with Patrick Wright*. London: Reaktion Books, p. 1.