FROM THE ARCHIVE TO THE GALLERY. DISPLACING COLONIAL FOOTAGE IN THE WORK OF FIONA TAN

Julia Noordegraaf, Universiteit van Amsterdam

The archive has to be read from below, from a position of solidarity with those displaced, deformed, silenced, or made invisible by the machines of profit and progress.
Allan Sekula[1]

In recent years the archive has become a major trope in the humanities. Rather than as neutral bodies aimed at collecting, ordering and storing our documentary heritage, archives are viewed as cultural artefacts, that actively shape the nature of that documentary heritage and its use. From sites of knowledge retrieval, archives have come to be seen as sites of knowledge production[2]. The documents that archives hold – as those that have been lost or neglected – form the basis for the way we remember the past and thus play a crucial role in the formation of individual and collective identity[3]. In this sense, the archive actively shapes the way we see ourselves and how we situate ourselves between past, present and future. As art historian and critic Hal Foster has pointed out, contemporary artists also have shown a renewed interest in the archive as a source and topic for their work[4]. For these artists, the archive serves as a site for developing alternative memories or reconstructing forgotten pasts. They achieve this by elaborating on the found image, object, and text and presenting them in a new form.

In this article I discuss the reuse of colonial and ethnographic footage from the Dutch East-Indies (present-day Indonesia) in the film and video installations *Smoke Screen* (1997), *Facing Forward* (1999) and *Tuareg* (1999) by the visual artist Fiona Tan. The analysis of these cases aims to investigate how the displacement of film from the archive to the gallery changes the specific nature of the archival image and its meaning. Besides, it investigates the situation of the viewer towards the archival footage and the people and pasts it documents. The central concept that I explore is that of *displacement*, both in the literal sense of displacing film from the archive to the cinema or museum, and in the more conceptual sense of displacing meaning.

Tan's work is of particular interest because it addresses the various aspects of displacement that occur when archival footage is screened in the gallery space. Her reframing of the ethnographic and propagandistic film fragments that are the basis for the above mentioned works come to question the discourse about the colonial enterprise in Indonesia and our contemporary perspective on it. Besides, her installations invite viewers to develop an affective relation with the footage and the subjects it documents; Tan's choice of close-ups or medium shots of people facing the camera stimulates our affective association with the people and their histories. The texts, sounds and new images that she uses at the same time support the formation of this affective relation and emphasise the difficulty of relating these histories to our present-day concerns. Tan's installations thus involve viewers with the archival footage in a way that makes those images productive for understanding ourselves via the unknown other.

Each case serves as starting point for discussing a particular aspect of displacement that occurs when archival footage is moved from the archive to the gallery. First, artists working with archival material literally displace that material from one context to another. In doing so, they reframe it

in a way that plays with earlier readings of the material and that adds new layers of meaning to them. This reframing often takes the form of a compilation – a collage of existing material, possibly combined with new texts, sounds and images. A discussion of Tan's film installation *Smoke Screen* illustrates the displacement of meaning that occurs in such a reframing of archival footage in a compilation film. Second, displacement of archival material to the gallery entails a specific involvement of the viewer. Tan's film and video installations all focus attention on the act of looking, thus making the viewer implicit to the framing of the archival material in the gallery space. This specific positioning of the viewer towards the archival images is the topic of Tan's video installation *Tuareg*, a work that in order to be experienced fully requires the displacement of the viewer in the gallery space. Finally, this displacement in space invites a displacement in time, connecting the present of the viewer to the past documented in the archival images. A discussion of Aby Warburg's *Mnemosyne* (memory) project in relation to Tan's video installation *Facing Forward* serves to show how the displacement of archival images can be a means to establish an affective memory of the past.

Editing as a Window Cleaner

Fiona Tan is a visual artist born in Indonesia in 1966 from a Chinese-Indonesian father and an Australian mother. She was raised in Australia, left for Amsterdam when she was 18 and has been living and working there ever since. In her work, mostly film and video installations, identity is a central theme, especially as it is defined in relation to time and place.

Tan often works with "found footage", that she presents in compilation films that are usually presented as film or video projections in the gallery space[5]. Since compilation films use archival material not as illustrations of real events, but as images that draw attention to the constructed nature of media productions, these films have the potential to critique, challenge and possibly also subvert the power of cinematic representation[6]. As Tan puts it: «The recycling of film fragments or photos breathes new life into the images; they are liberated from the harness of their original context. Recycling makes it possible to see images in a new way. Recycling creates new images. Editing as a window cleaner»[7].

With this particular interest in working with existing footage, Tan can be considered an artist working from what Foster has termed "an archival impulse". In his discussion of Thomas Hirschhorn, Tacita Dean and Sam Durant as exemplars of artists working from this archival impulse, Foster indicates that these artists present their archival materials «as active, even unstable – open to eruptive returns and entropic collapses, stylistic repackagings and critical revisions»[8]. The aim of these works is to «fashion distracted viewers into engaged discussants»[9]. Artists do so by elaborating on the found image, object, and text and presenting them in a new form. Tan's film installation *Smoke Screen* illustrates how the displacement of archival footage from the archive to the gallery can be a means to critically engage viewers with the images and the history they represent.

Displacing Meaning

In 1926, the Dutch cameraman Iep Ochse recorded a fascinating scene on the island of Bali, Indonesia: three toddlers cheerfully smoking a cigarette. The brief shot – it lasts eleven seconds

– shows three naked children that fill the frame; they are seated facing the camera, the youngest sitting on the eldest boy's lap. The latter vigorously inhales and exhales, creating a cloud of smoke that fills the screen. He then passes on the cigarette to the boy on his right and lovingly grooms the lock of hair of the youngest child.

When this shot was used in a film for the Dutch newsreel production company Polygoon in 1940, the scene was accompanied by a spoken commentary, saying «These babies take advantage of the fact that mother went shopping» (*Tropisch Nederland*, 1940). The scene is thus being explained as an example of innocent, naughty behaviour that occurs when mothers leave their children alone.

In her film installation *Smoke Screen* Tan deconstructs this reading of the scene. She edited the shot in a short compilation film that is supposed to be played in a continuous loop. In the beginning, her film uses the traditional documentary format: we see the shot, followed by a title card that explains the place and estimated date of the recording. The second title card repeats the 1940s reading of the shot: babies taking advantage of the fact that mother went shopping. After that, however, the film becomes more ambiguous. Again we see the toddlers, now followed by the enigmatic title card «Boys will be men». This text seems to suggest that smoking is part of a ritual marking the transition from childhood to manhood, and invites reflections on the fact that these children have since grown up to be men.

The uncertainty about the meaning of the shot increases further with the next title card "With my own eyes". Whose eyes have actually witnessed this scene? From the first title card we know that the shot is archival footage – «Indonesia, maybe 1930» – so the scene cannot have been witnessed by the artist herself. But then who saw and recorded it? Or does the text perhaps refer to the viewer, who is confronted with the filmic documentation of the scene and thus sees it "with her own eyes"? Finally, the film shows the artist herself, with a toy camera held before her right eye. She seems to re-enact the recording of the original situation with a toy camera: we are now watching the artist mimicking the cameraman who filmed these three Indonesian children.

Then the film starts over again, and by now the viewer knows the texts and images are highly ambiguous. By constantly repeating the images of the toddlers and alternating them with different texts and the shot of the artist herself, the meaning of what we see becomes increasingly blurred. The contrast between the old, archival footage and the new, self-reflexive texts and images invite the viewer to adopt a more distant standpoint. From this standpoint the relation between the camera, the people filmed, the artist and the viewer is being questioned. Who are these children? Where does the footage come from? To what extent was it staged? What has become of the kids? But also: why are we looking at it now? How do we relate to these images from colonial Indonesia?

As anthropologist and historian Ann Laura Stoler said: «Every document comes layered with the received account of earlier events and the cultural semantics of a political moment»[10]. In this case, that moment was the situation of Indonesia under Dutch colonial rule. Ochse's shot was first used in a propaganda film that was screened in an educational setting, aimed at promoting life in the colony among the people in the homeland. Eventually, that film was incorporated in a state-sponsored archive, the Netherlands Institute of Sound and Vision. Tan directly refers to that previous framing of the shot by including the title card of the original film, explaining the scene as an innocent example of naughty behaviour. However, by using various new texts and images, these previous layers of meaning are accompanied by new ones. The constant reframing of the shot by Tan here functions as a deconstruction of the different layers of meaning that remained unconscious in earlier times (as in the case of a propaganda film like *Tropisch Nederland*) or that have been forgotten. The result is a new, self-reflexive discourse on the past[11].

Displacement in Space

The self-reflexive nature of Tan's work is particularly evident when she combines the archival footage with shots of herself. As literary scholar Ernst van Alphen states with regards to another of Tan's works, *Linnaeus' Flower Clock* (1998): «This striking juxtaposition of obviously old and new footage emphasizes Tan's act of placing herself in the image. Like Alice in Wonderland she has found access to an imaginary world. She appropriates the old images into her present»[12]. The insert of the shot of the artist with a toy camera in *Smoke Screen* similarly serves to emphasise the artist's contemporary, subjective perspective on the footage of the toddlers.

Besides, the shot of the artist directs the viewer's attention to the constructed nature of Tan's film and of cinematic representations in general, as to the viewer's active role in making sense of the images. When looking at the artist "looking" at the shot of the three Balinese children, the viewer comes to question his or her own relation to the material, and to the conditions in which it was originally shot: «Tan's videos and films all reflect on how the medium functions as an agent that creates specific relationships between the viewer and the image»[13]. The viewer is thus invited to actively participate in the artist's montage and to reflect on the possible earlier meanings of the footage that Tan now deconstructs.

The fact that Tan's works are usually presented as film or video projections in the gallery space further underlines the active role of the viewer in the interpretation of the archival material. Contrary to cinematic and televisual spectatorship, where viewers are more or less required to sit still and watch the film as it unfolds over time, in the gallery space both the images and the spectator are mobile. The German thinker Boris Groys explains that «a video or movie installation in a museum neutralizes the ban of motion that determines the viewing of these pictures in a movie system. Pictures and spectators are allowed to move at the same time»[14]. Consequently, compared to the cinema or television spectator, the viewer of film and video installations in the gallery switches «from a passive position to a more interactive one, from an observer separate from the apparatus to a participant»[15]. According to film scholar Raymond Bellour, installations guide the viewer towards composing and recomposing the images and words that are being presented[16]. In the space of the gallery, then, the physical displacement of the viewer is required to make sense of the work[17].

Fiona Tan's video installation *Tuareg* is a case in point. The basis of this work is a filmic portrait of a group of twelve children, ranging in age from baby to teenager, that playfully pose for the camera. The children are laughing, moving about, and bumping into each other, while two of the older boys in the back row are mimicking a fight. They are all wearing white dresses, except one toddler in the front, who is wearing a chequered dress. In the background we see a tent, illustrating the nomadic lifestyle of the Tuareg. The shot lasts about twenty seconds, then fades into freeze-frame for a few seconds before starting again. This work is supposed to be projected on a transparent screen that divides two separate rooms. In that way, the viewer can literally approach the same image from two sides: on the one side you see the image as it is, on the other side of the screen it is reversed. A different soundtrack on both sides – on the one side the sound of birds, flies and the chatter of children; on the other the more ominous sound of howling wind – underlines the changing perspective on the image evoked by the viewer's physical displacement in space.

Displacement in Time

The displacement of the viewer in the gallery space parallels the physical displacement of the footage, from the geographical location where it was shot, to the archive, and then to the gallery space. This displacement in space also entails a displacement in time: from the moment of recording to the inclusion and storage in the archive and the subsequent appropriation of the material in the artist's and viewer's presence. One of the attractions of working with archival material is that it presents the opportunity to investigate the relevance of past events for our present and future. As Foster indicates, the archival elements reused in contemporary visual art works serve as «found arks of lost moments in which the here-and-now of the work serves as a possible portal between an unfinished past and a reopened future»[18]. This connection between past, present and future is achieved through «affective association»[19]. In that sense, archival art works refer to the past in a way similar to how memory works: images of past people, places and events are combined and recombined in constantly changing constellations. As a consequence, our interpretation of the objects and events from the past is constantly changing too; each time we approach them from a different perspective.

The German art historian Aby Warburg (1866-1929) developed a method for analysing the historical development of art that reflects this same dynamic. In his vast library, which was moved from Hamburg to London in 1933 and is now part of the Warburg Institute, Warburg collected thousands of books. The organisation of these books was not a static arrangement – Warburg constantly regrouped them in order to reflect new ideas about the interrelation of facts. He thus used the physical arrangement of the books as an objectification of his thought; a method that helped him to fathom the psychology of artistic creation[20].

Warburg also collected thousands of black and white photographs of sculptures, paintings, prints, tapestries and other forms of imagery. For his *Mnemosyne* project, which aim was to create an atlas in images (an «art history without a text», as he himself described it), Warburg arranged these photographic reproductions on black panels, in order to find new and unanticipated interpretations of the relationships between works from different times and places[21]. In this way, he used the technique of montage «to activate dynamic properties [of individual art works] that would be latent if considered individually»[22]. The result is similar to the effect of cinematographic montage: «The *Mnemosyne* panels function as screens on which the phenomena produced in succession by the cinema are reproduced simultaneously»[23]. According to art historian Georges Didi-Huberman, what was characteristic for Warburg's photographic panels was their exchangeability: the photographs could always be taken off the panels and endlessly be recombined with other images, thus keeping their meaning open and avoiding a final point of interpretation[24].

As art historian and film curator Philippe-Alain Michaud argues, Warburg used the changing constellations of his books and photographs in his library as a means to elaborate «a type of thought that espoused the movements of intuition, […] a thought inseparable from the body and the encounters affecting it»[25]. Warburg's method of studying recurring motifs in the arts thus emphatically included the observing subject and its association with the subject observed, in a way similar to how Tan uses self-reflexive images and texts in her work.

Warburg was principally concerned with the "survival" of gestural expressions from Antiquity in the art of the Renaissance. In 1895 he converted this historical quest «into a geographical and ethnological displacement to the sierras of New Mexico», where he studied the rituals of the *pueblos*[26]. As Michaud argues, after this trip Warburg understood that:

The experience of otherness is necessary to interpret the familiar, that geographical distance is a metaphor of the past – one that is intimate and personal as much as historical and collective – and that traveling is a technique of anamnesis. The exotic motif […] ceased to be simply the object of research and became its reflection, opening knowledge up to the consciousness of otherness[27].

It is exactly this metaphorical relation between distance in space and distance in time, and the engagement of the contemporary viewer with otherness, that is addressed in Tan's video installation *Facing Forward*.

Facing Forward with Found Footage

For *Facing Forward* Tan chose ethnographic footage from the collection of the Netherlands Filmmuseum and edited it into a film of eleven minutes, that is usually projected on a gallery wall. The film opens with a black and white shot of a large group of non-western (Indonesian?) men who face the camera as if they were having their portrait taken. In the middle, three white men (missionaries?) are seated, flanked by other white men in army suits and leisure wear. This opening shot is followed by other shots of (Indonesian) men and women staring silently in the camera. The flicker and the scratches in the images, as well as the fact that they are in black and white, suggest that we are watching archival footage.

The images are accompanied by a soundtrack consisting of a gong and a violin-like one-tone sound. We then see the title of the film, underscored by a five-tone piano sound that suggests mystery and anticipation. This minimalist soundtrack continues throughout the film. The film then takes us on a car ride to an unidentified Indonesian city where the passers-by are looking curiously into the camera lens. We hear a voice-over reading a passage from Italo Calvino's *Invisible Cities* – a text about travelling through time and place[28]. The voice-over cites Marco Polo, who explains to Kublai Khan that:

What he sought was always something lying ahead, even if it was a matter of the past. Arriving at each new city, the traveller finds again a past of his that he did not know he had: the foreignness of what you no longer are or no longer possess lies in wait for you in foreign, unpossessed places[29].

In the rest of the film, this scenario is repeated. We see different shots of people from various parts of the world who appear to be made to pose in front of the camera. This impression is reinforced by the inclusion of shots of a white man operating a film camera who is wearing a headband decorated with four feathers. A shot of two African women wearing face masks epitomises the contrived nature of the footage: women who do not want their faces to be seen are being forced to "face forward".

At the end of the film, the images from the opening sequence are repeated, accompanied by the voice-over that resumes the narration from Calvino's text: «By now, from that real or hypothetical past of his, Marco is excluded; he cannot stop; he must go on to another city, where another of his pasts awaits him, or something perhaps that had been a possible future of his and is now someone else's present»[30]. The film ends with a shot of two young girls shyly smiling towards the camera.

Like the insertion of the shot of the artist filming in *Smoke Screen*, the inclusion of the shot of the cameraman in *Facing Forward* focuses attention to the role of the camera in constructing a relation between the viewer and footage. Tan here not only stimulates spectators to develop a specific interpretation of the images, but also to reflect on the gaze with which they regard the people portrayed: «The cultural other is subjected to observation; but the observing self is also included»[31]. Because she here mostly uses medium-shots or close-ups of people staring into the camera, she allows those who are subject to observation to look back: being forced to face forward here turns into scrutinizing the observing subject. It is through this gazing at each other that contemporary viewers are invited to establish an affective relation with the people portrayed in the films Tan re-presents.

In order to make this affective association productive, the work also invites reflection on the relation between present-day viewers and the past as documented in these images. Tan achieves this by including the hypothetical conversations between the traveller Marco Polo and the emperor Kublai Khan taken from Calvino's book. In Marco Polo's view, past, present and future no longer form a linear continuity: «The past is something which in fact can only be reached in the present or the future»[32]. There is a conflation between places from the past and places in the present; in each new city, he finds a past that he did not know he possessed. Marco Polo's reflection on his travels can be seen as metaphoric for the displacement of the footage from the archive to Tan's video installation. Tan uses archival material from other times and places in order to stimulate critical reflection on the viewer's contemporary perspective on the past, and its relevance for his or her future. In that sense, *Facing Forward* demonstrates how «relating to the past as well as to distance is always a matter of alterity (times as well as spaces are different) and a matter of identity (the past, the distance as such, being part of our present culture)»[33].

Conclusion

The discussion of Fiona Tan's film and video installations served to show how the displacement of archival footage from the archive to the gallery can be a means to actively engage viewers with images of distant places and times, and to stimulate reflection on how encounters with otherness are inextricably linked to the formation of one's own past, present and future identity. As I have argued, this transfer of archival material from one context to another couples the *physical* displacement of both archival objects and viewers (displacement in space) to a displacement in *time*, resulting in a displacement of *meaning*. Displacement seems a useful concept to describe this process because, rather than emphasising the dislocation of archival materials, it stresses a shift or transference of these materials from one context to another. In this sense, «every "displacement *from*" is always also a "displacement *to*" a new context […] and a displacement *in time*»[34]. Therewith, the travel of archival documents through different contexts remains "grounded" in a specific space and time.

Since it does not obliterate the place and time from which the material originates, the displacement of colonial footage from the archive to the gallery is a means to physically and emotionally connect present-day viewers to the past as evoked by the footage. Paradoxically, the more one emphasises the distance in space and time that separates the observing subject from the subjects observed by the camera, the stronger the connection between the two becomes. The further Marco Polo travels, the more he is being confronted with his past, the less he understands who he is: «Elsewhere is a negative mirror. The traveller recognises the little that is his, discovering the

much he has not had and will never have»[35]. In this sense, *Facing Forward* invites us to reflect on who we are, where we came from and where we are going: we have to look back in order to face forward.

1 Allan Sekula, *Reading an Archive*, in Brian Wallis (ed.), *Blasted Allegories: An Anthology of Writings by Contemporary Artists*, MIT, Cambridge MA 1989, p. 127.
2 Ann Laura Stoler, "Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance", in *Archival Science*, Vol. 2, nos. 1-2, 2002, pp. 87-109. The seminal reflection on the archive as a cultural phenomenon is Jacques Derrida's *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, translated from the French by Eric Prenowitz, University of Chicago, Chicago 1996.
3 As archival scholar Eric Ketelaar contends, «archives are spaces of memory-practice, where people's experiences can be transformed into meaning» (Eric Ketelaar, *The Archives of the United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY): A Joint Heritage, Shared by Communities of Records*, unpublished paper presented at the *I-Chora 2* conference, Amsterdam, August 31-September 2, 2005).
4 Hal Foster, "An Archival Impulse", in *October*, no. 110, Fall 2004, pp. 3-22.
5 Jay Leyda was the first to distinguish archive-based films as "compilation films", see Jay Leyda, *Films Beget Films*, George Allen & Unwin, London 1964. These films are also referred to as "found footage films", or "archival films". Michael Zryd distinguishes between "found footage films" – based on non-archived material, literally "found" in private collections, commercial stock shot agencies, garbage bins, etc. – and "archival films" – based on material from archival institutions. I do not share Zryd's distinction because I actually doubt whether, as he claims, «the archive is an official institution that separates historical record from the outtake» (Michael Zryd, "Found Footage Film as Discursive Metahistory", in *The Moving Image*, Vol. 3, no. 2, 2003, p. 41). Besides, film programmer Gertjan Zuilhof has remarked that the use of the term "found footage" is not always appropriate, because most artists are actively searching for specific material rather than just accidentally finding it (Gertjan Zuilhof, *Welt Spiegel Kino/World Mirror Cinema: Gustav Deutsch*, in *Catalogue 34th International Film Festival Rotterdam*, IFFR, Rotterdam 2005, p. 226).
6 William C. Wees, *Found Footage and Question of Representation*, in Cecilia Hausheer, Christoph Settele (eds.), *Found Footage Film*, Viper/Zyklop, Luzern 1992, p. 39.
7 Fiona Tan, *Kingdom of Shadows*, in Mariska Van den Berg, Gabriele Franziska Götz (eds.), *Scenario. Fiona Tan*, Van den Berg & Wallroth/NAi, Amsterdam-Rotterdam 2000, p. 127.
8 Hal Foster, "An Archival Impulse", cit., p. 17.
9 *Idem*, p. 4.
10 Ann Laura Stoler, "Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance", cit., p. 92.
11 See Sharon Sandusky's discussion of Daniel Eisenberg's compilation film *Displaced Person*: «*Displaced Person* asks the audience to consider that since the film material isn't gone, perhaps the meaning behind it also remains. This leaves the audience with the project of confronting the underlying meaning, precisely because earlier generations did not» (Sharon Sandusky, "The Archaeology of Redemption: Toward Archival Film", in *Millennium Film Journal*, no. 26, 1992, p. 16). This search for earlier meanings in displaced footage is a means to retrieve what Mary-Ann Doane has called "subjective residues" of cinematic texts that remain beyond the initial viewing. See Anne Friedberg, *Window Shopping: Cinema and the Postmodern*, University of California, Berkeley CA 1994, p. 134.
12 Ernst van Alphen, "Imagined Homelands: Re-mapping Cultural Identity", in *Thamyris/Intersecting*, no. 9, 2002, p. 54.
13 *Idem*, p. 59.
14 Boris Groys, "Media Art in the Museum", in *Last Call*, Vol. 1, no. 2, 2001, http://www.belkin-gallery.ubc.ca/lastcall/past/pages2/page2.html, January 13, 2006. See Boris Groys, "Medienkunst im Museum", in Id., *Topologie der Kunst*, Hanser, München-Wien 2003, pp. 59-76.
15 Anne Friedberg, *Window Shopping: Cinema and the Postmodern*, cit., p. 144. While Friedberg here discusses the impact of virtual reality devices on cinema and televisual spectatorship, I think her argument also applies to the context of the gallery space.

16 Raymond Bellour, “D’un autre cinéma”, in *Trafic*, no. 34, 2000, p. 8.
17 My view on spectatorship as constructed by film or video projection in the gallery space is thus more dynamic than that of David Joselit’s, who argues that compared to closed-circuit video installations, «in video projection the viewer is made more passive both in her consumption of spectacular imagery and in her ability to intervene within the space of the screen» (David Joselit, “Inside the Light Cube”, in *Artforum*, Vol. 42, Fall 2004, p. 156).
18 Hal Foster, “An Archival Impulse”, cit., p. 15.
19 *Idem*, p. 21.
20 Philippe-Alain Michaud, *Aby Warburg and the Image in Motion*, Zone Books, New York 2004, p. 235.
21 *Idem*, p. 240.
22 *Idem*, p. 253.
23 *Idem*, p. 260.
24 Georges Didi-Huberman, *L’Image survivante. Histoire de l’art et temps des fantômes selon Aby Warburg*, Minuit, Paris 2002, pp. 459-60.
25 Philippe-Alain Michaud, *Aby Warburg and the Image in Motion*, cit., p. 232.
26 Georges Didi-Huberman, *Knowledge: Movement (The Man Who Spoke to Butterflies)*, foreword to Philippe-Alain Michaud, *Aby Warburg and the Image in Motion*, cit., p. 10.
27 Philippe-Alain Michaud, *Aby Warburg and the Image in Motion*, cit., p. 35.
28 Italo Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, Harcourt, San Diego 1978.
29 Voice-over commentary in *Facing Forward*; after Italo Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, cit., pp. 28-9.
30 *Ibidem.*
31 Ernst van Alphen, “Imagined Homelands: Re-mapping Cultural Identity”, cit., p. 64.
32 *Idem*, p. 66.
33 Hubert Damisch, quoted in Yves-Alain Bois, Denis Hollier, Rosalind Krauss, “A Conversation with Hubert Damisch”, in *October*, no. 85, Summer 1998, p. 16.
34 Marie-Aude Baronian, Stephan Besser, Yolande Jansen (eds.), *Diaspora and Memory: Figures of Displacement in Contemporary Literature, Arts and Politics*, Rodopi, Amsterdam-New York 2007, p. 14.
35 Voice-over commentary in *Facing Forward*; after Italo Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, cit., p. 29.