The Invisible Cinema

Julian Hanich

THE INVISIBLE CINEMA

The Invisible Cinema was an experimental movie theater designed by an experimental filmmaker. Devised by the Austrian avant-gardist Peter Kubelka, it served as the first place of exhibition for the Anthology Film Archives in New York. Apart from the screen (and some exit signs and aisle lights installed for safety reasons), the auditorium was kept completely in black. Its partitioned, high-winged seats had blinders at the sides and a small hood-like top. The rows were arranged stadium-like, and the viewers had to follow a number of strict behavioral rules. This unusual 90-seat auditorium only existed from 1970 to 1974, but its ideas had an afterlife in other venues such as the Austrian Film Museum.

THEORETICAL FRAMING

Discussing the Invisible Cinema as a specific type of movie theater, this chapter has two goals. First, it describes what the cinema looked like, what the aims of its specific interior design were, and what rules of conduct existed for the audience. Second, it tries to reconstruct in a phenomenological reception study the viewing experience this specific cinema may have enabled for its historical audience. Described by Peter Kubelka as a "viewing machine," the Invisible Cinema apparently caused sensations of floating, drowsiness, and strong absorption among its viewers, but it also gave an unexpected weight to the collectivity of the audience.

THE INVISIBLE CINEMA

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I discuss the Invisible Cinema (IC), a specific historical type of cinema which was characterized by an unusual interior design and strict behavioral rules. The Austrian experimental filmmaker Peter Kubelka, known for his groundbreaking structural films SCHWECHATER (1958) and ARNULF RAINER (1958), devised it in 1970 for the Anthology Film Archives in New York, of which he was one of the co-founders together with Jonas Mekas, P. Adams Sitney, Ken Kelman, and James Broughton.[1] At the Public Theater on 425 Lafayette Street where the Anthology Film Archives was first located, the IC existed for only four years: from 1970 to 1974. When the Anthology Film Archives had to move to its new home in 80 Wooster Street in 1974 for budgetary reasons, the IC was not reconstructed.

This short lifespan could raise doubts about why one should be interested in this movie theater in the first place, also considering that its 90-seat auditorium was fairly small. However, I contend that the IC can be seen as an exemplary media technology for at least two reasons. First, its designer had envisioned it precisely as such: "a viewing machine."[2] Kubelka argued that his movie theater's "revolutionary and controversial design was based upon the notion that like the other machines that a film depends on—cameras, developers, printers, editing machines, and projectors—the room in which one sees a film should also be a machine designed for film viewing."[3] Second, the IC can be regarded as a model media technology because it had an afterlife in other venues.[4] At the Austrian Film Museum in Vienna, which Kubelka co-founded in 1964 and where he worked as one of the directors until 2001, he established the Invisible Cinema No. 2 in 1989. And Alexander Horwath, who had become Kubelka's successor as director of the Austrian Film Museum, initiated a renovation and opened the Invisible Cinema No. 3 in 2003. Another version also existed in the Amerika-Gedenk-Bibliothek in Berlin until January 2014.[5] Cur-

rently, the Whitney Museum in New York is considering reconstructing the original and is in negotiations with Peter Kubelka and Jonas Mekas.[6]

My chapter has two goals. First, I will describe what the IC looked like and what the aims of its specific interior design were but also its rules of conduct for the audience. Second, and more importantly, I want to explore from a phenomenological perspective the viewing experience it enabled. By interpreting quotes from historical sources as well as reminiscences of some of the protagonists of the Anthology Film Archives, I will attempt to provide—or at least *speculate* about—what one could call a phenomenological reception study. The aim is to lend evidence to our intuition that with different types of "viewing machines," we make different types of viewing experiences. As we shall see, when viewers recall their IC experience, they describe sensations of floating, drowsiness, and absorption. Moreover, in contrast to other types of cinema—such as the Nickelodeon, the movie palace, the drive-in theater, the megaplex, to name but a few—the IC resulted in a highly concentrated film experience in which the collectivity of the audience played an unexpected role. In this second part I will therefore also put an emphasis on the audience effect, i.e., the effect that the co-presence of other, mostly anonymous viewers has on one's cinematic experience.[7]

THE INVISIBLE CINEMA CONCEPTION

What is the Invisible Cinema and where does its name come from? Peter Kubelka called his cinema "invisible" because the architecture of the auditorium and its interior design were not supposed to distract. The screen was meant to be the only center of attention: "an ideal cinema should not at all be felt, should not lead its own life, it should practically not be there."[8] No curtain existed in front of the screen, the idea being that all associations with stage theater had to be removed. The lack of a curtain also signalled via the brightly illuminated screen even before the start of the film where viewers had to direct their attention. Kubelka wanted to "make the screen [the viewer's] whole world, by eliminating all aural and visual impressions extraneous to film."[9] As Kubelka put it, the cinema's function was to bring "the filmed message from the author to the beholder with a minimum of loss"; the film should "completely dictate the sensation of space."[10] As a consequence, the ceiling and the walls were covered with black velvet, as were the 90 cinema seats. Black carpeting covered the floor. And the doors were equally painted black. Apart from exit signs and aisle lights installed for safety reasons, everything was dark. Reflections from the auditorium were thus kept to a minimum."[11] As Tom Gunning has pointed out with reference to Siegfried Kracauer's article on

"The Cult of Distraction," the IC's strong focus on the screen stands in stark opposition to the distractive potential of other types of cinema: one need only think of the extravagant interior designs of the movie palaces in the 1920s, which in all likeliness lured the audiences' attention to the periphery.[12]

The most unusual feature of the IC was the design of the partitioned, high-winged seats with blinders at the sides and a small hood-like top. These seats with their "shell-like structure" were designed to shield the viewer's upper body and to make it impossible to see one's neighbors to the sides as well as in the front and in the back. This goal was further supported by the elevated, stadium-like construction of the rows. As Vincent Canby put it in a 1970 review of the cinema: "the rake of the auditorium is so steep that when you sit down, you cannot see the people in front of you."[13] But the purpose of these seats was not only to shield the viewers visually, it also served an acoustical function by blocking the sound from sources other than the screen. This implies that the original IC worked only with *monaural sound*: "The Invisible Cinema was meant for the classic one screen, one sound source cinema. By one sound source I mean one source of sound right behind the screen so that the sound comes from the same place as the image," Kubelka writes.[14] Since the seat partitions would block surround sound coming from speakers at the sides or in the back, the IC in the Austrian Film Museum does not contain partitioned seats.[15]

Last but not least, the cinema implemented explicit and implicit behavioral rules. An *explicit* rule was that no one could enter the auditorium once the film had begun.[16] Again, the goal of this attempt in disciplining the audience was to make another significant part of the cinematic experience—namely the co-viewers—invisible. However, the fact that other viewers were *invisible* did not mean that they were *absent* from one's experience, a point I will return to. Among the *implicit* guidelines was a strong discouragement of talking and producing noises: silence was the rule. Kubelka preferred "a structure in which one is in *a community that is not disturbing to others*."[17] But was it indeed quiet during the screening of the film? In an early report, *The New York Times* cited some of the first attendees of the IC, who underlined the cinema's quiet auditorium: "It's a great little theater with all that quiet" and "To me the very silence was something like music itself."[18]

THE INVISIBLE CINEMA EXPERIENCE

What possible experiences did the design and behavioral rules of the IC make possible for the viewer? Methodologically, we enter problematic territory here, because it is notoriously difficult to describe specific historical viewing experiences. Film historian Frank Kessler even speaks of "the unattainable

audience."[19] I will nevertheless try to provide—or at least hypothesize about—what one could call a phenomenological reception study: What specific viewing experience did the IC enable?

Three aspects recur in a number of audience descriptions in the press at the time but also in contemporaneous comments of the Anthology Film Archives' protagonists. (Somewhat ironically, the very cinema that was supposed to remain "invisible" stimulated more comments and reminiscences than a prototypical cinema. Thus it was more conspicuous than intended by Kubelka.)[20] The first one is the "floating sensation": some viewers remember that viewing films in the IC resulted in a detachment from the concrete space of the cinema and caused a sensation of drifting in darkness. Film critic Vincent Canby, for one, noted that "watching a couple of demonstration movies [...] was rather like floating in a vast, benign space, looking at a rectangular-shaped hallucination of almost drug-induced clarity. It is a trip, one of the best that money can buy [...]."[21] A similar sensation comes across in Stan Brakhage's comment: "generally, people really had a sense of drifting in a black space, a black box, and black ahead of you, nothing visible except the screen."[22] This floating sensation may have been amplified by particular films that were shown in the Anthology Film Archives—especially some of the experimental works by Stan Brakhage and Michael Snow or the flicker films by Tony Conrad and Paul Sharits.

But there might also have been a relation to another consequence of the interior design that I would like to call the "drowsing sensation." P. Adams Sitney describes: "When one sat in the enclosed seats, one generated a great deal of heat. If you stood up the room felt like a refrigerator, but as long as you were sitting in that small box it was very hot. It was an extremely soporific problem, one became very drowsy."[23] The sensations of floating and drowsiness could have reinforced each other, resulting in the drug-like experience Canby spoke about—especially vis-à-vis a hallucinatory flicker film like Paul Sharits's N:O:T:H:I:N:G (1968).

Moreover, it seems a commonplace assumption—and this is the third recurring aspect in audience descriptions—that the primary goal of the IC was to provide an immersive viewing experience. A similar view is shared by several authorities in the field. Kristin Thompson and David Bordwell, for instance, indicate that the IC aimed to "enhance each individual's absorption in the film experience"; Giuliana Bruno points out that the IC ensured a "total perceptual fusion" with the screen; while David A. Cook claims the IC helped "facilitate the viewer's total concentration in complete darkness and isolation."[24] Given the cinema's interior design and rules of conduct as well as Kubelka's expressed intentions, the conclusion that there was an "experience of absorption" seems fair enough.

However, in a next interpretive step, this absorptive experience supposedly results in the viewer's distance to his or her co-viewers and thus leads to an *individualizing* effect. Consequently, Peter Decherney argues: "[Kubelka] designed his 'machine for viewing' to minimize distractions and thus create the most individualized experience possible within the presence of an audience."[25] In her well-known book *Atlas of Emotion*, Giuliana Bruno sheds a rather critical light on this effect. She calls the IC "a modernist sanctuary" that "encapsulated the spectator in his or her view": "Here, one was basically alone in the act of filmic viewing; insulated aurally as well as haptically."[26] No less critical, J. Hoberman and Jonathan Rosenbaum describe the presentation of films in the IC as "fetishistic": it had only the "solitary film spectator in mind" and was "ostensibly constructed to screen out most social distractions and minimize communal responses."[27] Similarly, Barbara Rose wrote in an early review: "Anthology's purist position [...] presupposes that film is as much an individualistic one-to-one communication from artist to viewer as the high arts of painting and sculpture."[28] But are these claims about an individualizing effect truly convincing?

I believe that we are dealing with a misguided reconstruction of the actual viewing experience here. In contrast, I argue that the IC can be considered the ideal type of the specific *collective* viewing experience that elsewhere I call the "quiet, attentive audience," which enables collective intentions, joint attention, and even joint actions among its members of the audience precisely because it is quiet and attentive.[29] In other words, even in the extreme case of quiet attentive absorption we are dealing with a collective experience—albeit a different type of collectivity. This claim may not be easily accepted. Peter Decherney, for one, finds nothing communal about the IC: "The manifesto's justification—that 'the communal spirit is strongest and most effective in the absence of disturbance of one's neighbor'—is unconvincing if not oxymoronic."[30] So where, then, do I find evidence for my claim that the IC enabled a type of collectivity?

First, the viewers were not as isolated from each other as many commentators would have it. While visual and aural contact was strongly reduced, viewers were able to touch each other. In an Austrian television report from October 13, 1970, Kubelka emphasized that the seats were constructed with openings at the sides to precisely allow people to feel and touch each other: "The sense of touch maintains community, as in earlier times."[31] Thus, Giuliana Bruno's claim that viewers were insulated not only visually but also haptically is not correct. Second, as can be seen in figure 49, the viewers were sitting very close to each other in the "compact, comfortable auditorium," as *The New York Times* author Howard Thompson described it.[32] Even though the spectators did not see each other, the co-presence could be felt due to physical close-

ness in a comparatively small cinema. Kubelka himself remembered: "You knew that there were many people in the room, *you could feel their presence*, and you also would hear them a little bit, but in a very subdued way, so they would not disturb your contact with the film."[33] Third, it is quite likely that the viewers not only had a phenomenal sense of co-presence but also carried with them the (possibly tacit) knowledge that they belonged to a specific kind of audience—resulting in a (however vague) in-group feeling of being part of an avant-garde viewership. Thus, precisely because it was such a high-art, purist, modernist sanctuary, its viewers could feel sociologically bound together. This would run counter to a supposed *individualizing* effect.

Last but not least, the "aspect of community" also played an outspoken role in Kubelka's concept. While the sole focus of attention was supposed to be the screen, Kubelka did not conceive of the viewing situation as a *solitary* confrontation with the film. In fact, he had planned the theater with the *collective* aspect in mind. In 1974, shortly after the IC was closed, he described its collective dimension:

A sympathetic community was created, a community in which people liked each other. In the average cinema where the heads of other people are in the screen, where I hear them crunching their popcorn, where the latecomers force themselves through the rows and where I have to hear their talk, which takes me out of the cinematic reality which I have come to participate in, I start to dislike the others.[34]

As Kubelka emphasizes, silence does not necessarily imply a negative absence of communication; it can also involve a valuable auditory situation.[35] In the IC, this absence of verbal communication and expressive non-verbal comments—but also the lack of motor activity of latecomers and scattered foci of attention—were the prerequisites for the *presence* of silence, stillness, and a shared intentional object. I would argue that the audience's silence functioned as a precondition for a synchronized collective experience because it allowed for the tacit sense that the others not only *acted* as oneself but also *experienced* similarly.[36] This is the case because a *collective* aesthetic experience often relies on silence as an important precondition, since expressive reactions—and verbal comments in particular—often bring experiential *differences* to the fore. Even if in actuality we often do *not* think and feel the same, the viewer tacitly takes it for granted as long as this is not contradicted. Hence in aesthetic contexts we often subconsciously "project" our individual experience onto others and thus make it unintentionally and pre-reflectively a temporary norm: cinematic joint action and experience appear in the likeness of our own experience, as long as no one disproves it by doing and feeling some-

thing else. Put the other way round, in collective aesthetic experiences, individual viewers do *not* presuppose that everyone feels *differently* all the time: the likeness of the experience is tacitly taken as a default. The quiet attentive audience in venues like the IC is particularly helpful for this type of collective experience.[37]

Of course, the collectivity of the quiet attentive audience has to be distinguished from the collectivity based on expressive responses and audience interaction. This implies that not all films play equally well in the IC. Singalongs of, say, THE SOUND OF MUSIC (1965) would hardly work due to the separation of the seats. Also, midnight movie screenings of cult films like THE ROCKY HORROR PICTURE SHOW (1975) or EL TOPO (1970) would be out of place, which explains Hoberman and Rosenbaum's aversion.[38] And even though the Essential Cinema canon of the Anthology Film Archives—the repertoire of films to be repeated regularly in the IC—included comedies by Chaplin, Keaton, Laurel and Hardy, and Karl Valentin, one may assume that a collective laughing experience did not come about to the same degree as in other types of cinema.[39] This does not imply, however, that the viewers of the Invisible Cinema were engaged in individual actions that ran parallel to each other. Instead, watching the film with others in quiet attention implied a shared activity based on a collective intention in which the viewers jointly attended to the moving images on the screen.

As I have tried to show in this chapter, the IC can serve to flesh out the intuition that different types of "viewing machines" enable different types of viewing experiences. Taking into consideration interior design and behavioral rules as well as relying on documented viewer comments, my brief phenomenological reception study paid special attention to the bodily and social experiences enabled by this highly experimental historical type of cinema.

10 Adrian Martin, "Turn the Page: From Mise en scène to Dispositif," Screening the Past, http://www.screeningthepast.com/2011/07/turn-the-page-from-mise-en-scene-to-dispositif/.

11 Giovanna Fossati, "Found Footage Filmmaking, Film Archiving and New Participatory Platforms," in Found Footage: Cinema Exposed (Amsterdam: EYE Film Institute Netherlands and Amsterdam University Press, 2011), 178.

12 Erika Balsom, "Around The Clock: Museum and Market," Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media 54, no. 2 (2013): 177-191.

13 EYE Film Institute Netherlands, Welkom in de basement van eye (Amsterdam: EYE Film Institute Netherlands, 2013). Translation from Dutch to English by author: "Kijk rond in het Panorama en vind voorbeelden van een zwart-wit, een met de hand ingekleurde, een film gekleurd in een kleurenbad en een echte kleurenfilm."

14 Jason Malone, in discussion with the author, November 22, 2012.

15 Harbord, The Evolution of Film, 142.

16 Malone, n.p.

17 Ibid., n.p.

18 Giovanna Fossati, From Grain to Pixel: The Archival Life of Film in Transition (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009), 128.

CHAPTER 28

1 Kubelka claims that he had the idea for the Invisible Cinema in 1958 but did not succeed in getting it constructed until 1970. Peter Kubelka, "The Invisible Cinema," Design Quarterly. Special Issue on Film Spaces, no. 93 (1974): 32-36. According to film scholar Sky Sitney, daughter of Anthology Film Archives founder P. Adams Sitney, the IC was built by Giorgio Cavalieri and funded by the art patron Jerome Hill. Sky Sitney, "In Search for the Invisible Cinema," Grey Room 19 (Spring 2005): 102-113. On the role of Jerome Hill, see Peter Decherney, Hollywood and the Culture Elite. How the Movies Became American (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2005).

2 Quoted from Vincent Canby, "Now You Can See Invisible Cinema," The New York Times, November 29, 1970, 1, 38.

3 Quoted from Sitney, "In Search for the Invisible Cinema," 103.

4 Giuliana Bruno makes a convincing case for considering Frederick Kiesler's Film Guild Cinema in New York City (built in 1929) with its absorptive architecture to be a precursor of the IC. Giuliana Bruno, Atlas of Emotion. Journeys in Art, Architecture and Film (London: Verso, 2002), 45-47. At the time, Kiesler's cinema was advertised as "100% cinema." Quoted from David J. Skal, Hollywood Gothic. The Tangled Web of Dracula from Novel to Stage to Screen, rev. ed. (New York, NY: Faber

and Faber, 2004), 148. Kubelka himself mentions another precursor of the IC: "Historically, the closest thing to it was the black tent which cinema distributors used right after the invention of film. They just had a black tent with seats in it." Kubelka, "The Invisible Cinema," 35.

5 The Berlin version was called "black box" and differed insofar as it only had room for one viewer at a time. However, the website of the library cites the IC as the model. "Cinematek," Zentral- und Landesbibliothek Berlin, accessed December 1, 2013, www.zlb.de/fachinformation/spezialbereiche/cinematek/black-box-das-einpersonenkino.html#c5071.

6 This information derives from a personal email by Anna Carey, member of the marketing and communications department of the Whitney Museum, sent on January 6, 2014.

7 In my research I have been trying to pay greater attention to the various collective film experiences that different types of cinema bring forth among its co-present viewers. See, for instance, the chapter "Multiplexperiences. Individualized Immersion and Collective Feelings," in Cinematic Emotion in Horror Films and Thrillers: The Aesthetic Paradox of Pleasurable Fear (New York, NY: Routlegde, 2010).

8 Kubelka, "The Invisible Cinema," 32.

9 Quoted from Sitney, "In Search for the Invisible Cinema," 32.

10 Kubelka, "The Invisible Cinema," 32.

11 Ironically, according to Ken Kelman this goal was not reached fully due to the construction of the seats: "the black hood overhead had a shine. That was a little distracting, because right in front of me was this shine that didn't exactly reflect the movement of the screen. Anything more or less at eye level, you're going to see, and so the Invisible Cinema was not invisible." Quoted from Sitney, "In Search for the Invisible Cinema," 106.

12 Tom Gunning, "Film Studies," in The Sage Handbook of Cultural Analysis, eds. Tony Bennett and John Frow (London: Sage, 2008), 194.

13 Canby, "Now You Can See Invisible Cinema," 38.

14 Kubelka, "The Invisible Cinema," 32.

15 Alexander Horwath in a personal conversation.

16 For an earlier attempt to discipline an audience in a similar way, see Linda Williams, "Learning to Scream," in Horror, the Film Reader, ed. Mark Jancovich (London: Routledge, 2002).

17 Kubelka, "The Invisible Cinema," 34 [my italics].

18 Quoted from Howard Thompson, "Silence Says a Lot for Film Archives," The New York Times, December 4, 1970, 55. Ken Kelman, one of the founding members of the Anthology Film Archives, equally stresses the theater's efficiency in preventing verbal disturbance: "it discouraged people from talking to the person next to them, and in those terms of counteracting certain disturbances the theater largely succeeded." Quoted from Sitney, "In Search for the Invisible Cinema," 106.

19 Frank Kessler, "Viewing Pleasures, Pleasuring Views. Forms of Spectatorship in Early Cinema," in *Film – Cinema – Spectator: Film Reception*, eds. Irmbert Schenk, Margrit Tröhler, Yvonne Zimmermann (Marburg: Schüren, 2010), 61–73.

20 I thank the anonymous reviewer of my essay for bringing this point to my attention.

21 Canby, "Now You Can See Invisible Cinema," 38.

22 Sitney, "In Search for the Invisible Cinema," 108.

23 *Ibid.*, 109. Consider also Ken Kelman's description on the same page: "The dozing off phenomenon, I believe, if I'm not mistaken, can be attributed to a psychological rather than a physiological effect. I think that people in the isolation of this little booth—a kind-of-womb-like thing—sort of had a tendency to drowse off a little more than they would have normally."

24 Cf. David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson, *Film History: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 2003), 594; Bruno, *Atlas of Emotion*, 47; and David A. Cook, *Lost Illusions. American Cinema in the Shadow of Watergate and Vietnam 1970-1979* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000), 454.

25 Decherney, *Hollywood and the Culture Elite*, 198.

26 Bruno, *Atlas of Emotion*, 47.

27 J. Hoberman and Jonathan Rosenbaum, *Midnight Movies* (New York, NY: Da Capo, 1991), 25.

28 Quoted from Kubelka, "The Invisible Cinema," 32.

29 Julian Hanich, "Watching a Film with Others. Towards a Theory of Collective Spectatorship," *Screen* 55, no. 3 (2014): 338-359.

30 Decherney, *Hollywood and the Culture Elite*, 199.

31 Quoted from Stefan Pethke and Stefanie Schlüter, "Sammeln und Vermitteln. Filmmuseen im Film," "Kunst der Vermittlung, accessed February 12, 2014, http://www.kunst-der-vermittlung.de/dossiers/filmvermittlung-und-filmmuseum/museen-im-film/ [my translation].

32 Thompson, "Silence Says a Lot for Film Archives," 55.

33 Kubelka, "The Invisible Cinema," 34 [my italics].

34 *Ibid.* Consider also a text written collectively by the members of the Anthology Film Archives: "What do we want from a film theater? The creation of an audience spirit and the possibility of experiencing intensely the filmic reality. Since the communal spirit is strongest and most effective in the absence of disturbance from one's neighbor, the special features of the new Cinema are tools to this end. One can hear the sound of the audience, but that noise is subdued. [...] The seat hoods make concentration possible without destroying the sense by which a person senses the presence of others in a room, even in the dark." In: P. Adams Sitney, ed., *The Essential Cinema* (New York, NY: Anthology Film Archives and New York University Press, 1975), v-xii; vii. With regard to disliking other viewers due to their noises, see also Barbara Rose's opinion: "I find the viewing situation at

Anthology the best I have ever experienced, but that is because I can live without the communal experience of my neighbor blowing bubble gum in my face." Quoted from Sitney, "In Search for the Invisible Cinema," 108-109.

35 Again, Giuliana Bruno criticizes this silencing effect: "Communication with one's neighbor was discouraged, for it was difficult to achieve through the partition. In theory, talking and touching were not possible during the show. [...] [I]n this view of cinema, architecture must nearly shut up—and shut itself down. The movie house is the house of silence." Bruno, *Atlas of Emotion*, 47.

36 As my term "tacit sense" indicates, this is not something viewers had to *consciously* focus on.

37 For a much more detailed account of the arguments in this paragraph, see Hanich, "Watching a Film with Others."

38 Ironically, after Frederick Kiesler's Film Guild Cinema had changed owners and was renamed 8th Street Playhouse, it became the site of seven-nights-a-week midnight movie screenings. According to commentaries on the wonderful oral-history website *Cinema Treasures*, THE ROCKY HORROR PICTURE SHOW played for 15 years every Friday and Saturday night there. See Cinema Treasures, accessed January 31, 2014, http://cinematreasures.org/theaters/4699.

39 As Kubelka once said: "You can hear [the other people in the auditorium] laugh, but it's subdued. It's as if we were all brothers and sisters in our mother's womb." Quoted from Canby, "Now You Can See Invisible Cinema," 38.

CHAPTER 29

1 Susan Leigh Star and James R. Griesemer, "Institutional Ecology, 'Translations' and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39," *Social Studies of Science* 19, no. 3 (1989): 387-420.

2 Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993). Or as Sybille Lammes phrases it, the interfaces as a Latourian sign-thing "invites users to perform certain actions that are then inscribed in it and become mediated through it." Sybille Lammes, "Destabilizing Playgrounds: Cartographical Interfaces, Mutability, Risk and Play," in *Playful Subversion of Technoculture*, eds. Daniel Cermak-Sassenrath, Chek Tien Tan, Charles Walker (Heidelberg: Springer, forthcoming).

3 Alexander Galloway, *The Interface Effect* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2012).

4 Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar, *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979); Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

FRAMING FILM

GIOVANNA FOSSATI AND
ANNIE VAN DEN OEVER (EDS.)

EXPOSING THE
FILM APPARATUS

The Film Archive as a
Research Laboratory

AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS