

JOŠ JEDAN EKSPERIMENTALNI FILM

YET ANOTHER EXPERIMENTAL FILM

-

IZLOŽBA / AN EXHIBITION

AUTOR – HARIS REKANOVIĆ

TEORIJSKA ELABORACIJA / KONTEKSTUALIZACIJA

ŠEFIK TATLIĆ

GRADSKA GALERIJA BIHAĆ, 28.11. – 13.12.2019.

JOŠ JEDAN EKSPERIMENTALNI FILM

Govoriti o filmu danas ne znači govoriti o (dominantnoj formi) vizualne umjetnosti, nego o vizualnosti kao ekonomskoj i industrijskoj kategoriji. To ne implicira da film (kao oblik organizacije vizualnosti) nekad nije bio produkt ili dio industrije, nego da se kolaps njegove *mainstream* iteracije u vizualni oblik robe mora interpretirati kao inherentno povezan s transformacijom dominantnog kapitalističkog môda proizvodnje. Drugim riječima, tematizirati pitanje smisla, funkcije i značenja filma ili stanja kinematografije danas prije svega znači tematizirati pitanje vrste i smisla industrije, ali i dominantne ideologije unutar kojih film, ali i modeli organizacije vizualnosti, evoluiraju ili kolabiraju.

Naime, upravo u momentu kada se ustvrdi da je film reduciran na puku kakofoniju vizualnosti, čemu paradigmska *hollywoodska* produkcija svjedoči, ili pak na *wannabe* artistsko sranje, nastaje i potreba za izložbom koja će tematizirati "smrt" filma kao umjetničke forme. *Još jedan eksperimentalni film* je stoga izložba koja, s jedne strane, ubrzava "smrt" filma svodeći ga doslovno na njegove sastavne komponente – film (kao filmsku vrpcu), slike, ton i tekst – te koja s druge strane, daje *homage* filmu pokušavajući naglasiti važnost upravo ovih komponenti u filmu kao djelu, a ne proizvodu. Drugim riječima, ovakvim pristupom autor Haris Rekanović dekomponira ili dekonstruira film na njegove sastavne dijelove, kritizirajući u tom procesu svođenje filma na puku vizualnu robu te naglašavajući važnost svih onih komponenti filma koje su u procesu prevođenja filma u proizvod negirane. Ova dva momenta, dekonstrukcija i ponovno sastavljanje filma, zapravo čine dva ključna tj. konstitutivna momenta koja ovu izložbu pretvaraju u još jedan (eksperimentalni) film. Da bi se ovaj proces elaborirao, genealogija umjetničkog pretvaranja filma i videa u umjetničke objekte; genealogija historijskog procesa miješanja vizualnog i industrijskog te kontekstualizacija značenja ove izložbe u suvremenom historijskom momentu ujedno moraju činiti i bazne komponente na kojima se temelji ovaj tekst.

Film kao avangarda umjetnosti i industrije – historijska genealogija

Tokom 1930-ih godina u New Yorku, galerist Julien Levy, ujedno i vlasnik istoimene galerije, je bio poznati promotor nadrealističke, dadaističke te općenito avangardne umjetnosti/filma iz Europe, ali i američkih fotografa. Levy je, između ostalog, na tlu SAD-a, a kako podsjeća američka teoretičarka Erika Balsom: "(...) organizirao i prve projekcije filma *Un chien andalou* – *Andaluzijski pas* (Luis Buñuel, 1929) 17. novembra, 1932. Izlagao je radove poput *Rose Hobart* (Joseph Cornell, 1936) i *Anemic Cinema* (Marcel Duchamp, 1926). 1932. i 1933. Levy je bio predsjednik Filmskog društva New York-a (*Film Society of New York*), neprofitne organizacije koja je promovirala nekonvencionalni film neatraktivan široj publici" (Balsom 2013, 97). Kao dodatak Levy-jevoj biografiji, važno je napomenuti da je izložba "Surréalisme" (9.-29. januara 1932.) prikazala rad vodećih europskih umjetnika nadrealista - Salvadora Dalíja (uključujući njegovu sada već ikoničnu sliku *Upornost sjećanja*), Jean Cocteaua, Maxa Ernsta, Josepha Cornela i mnogih drugih nikada prije viđenih umjetnika u SAD-u. Naime, ono što je važno za Levy-jev galeristički i umjetnički opus u ovom kontekstu je njegova tendencija da izlaže filmsku vrpcu kao sliku/platno u kapacitetu umjetničkog djela. Levy je, dakle, percipirao samo vrpcu ili medij na kojem je film isprintan kao umjetničko djelo samo po sebi. Kako Balsom argumentira:

On je vidio ovaj model prodaje kao esencijalan za valorizaciju filma kao umjetničkog medija, a kako je sam Levy u svojim memoarima potvrdio: "Napravio sam kolekciju filmova isprintanih na 16 milimetarskoj vrpici s dvije namjere: filmovi koje su radili slikari poput Duchampa, Legera ili Dalija trebaju biti smatrani isto vrijedni kao i platno koje koriste za slikanje, a ako bi kolekcionarsko tržište bilo zainteresirano ili se bude dalo organizirati, razmišljao sam da bi mogao ubjediti i druge slikare da eksperimentiraju u ovom mediju." (Ibid)

Bez obzira na osobne motive, čini se da je Levy-jeva namjera rezonirala Waltera Benjamina koji je tvrdio da: "Čak i najperfektnija reprodukcija umjetničkog djela nema jedan element: svoje prisustvo u vremenu i prostoru, svoju jedinstvenu egzistenciju na mjestu na kojem se nalazi" (Benjamin 1969, 3). Iako se Levy-jev pristup može tumačiti kao odraz tendencije ka očuvanju vrijednosti nekog djela u kolekcionarskom smislu, isti se pristup također može interpretirati i kao onaj koji primarno ne adresira samo puki medij na kojemu se djelo

"nalazi," nego upravo važnost korelacije između života djela i historijskog momenta, ali i prostora te vladajućih hijerarhija moći koje diktiraju kako i koje djelo nastaje te šta promovira, reproducira ili pak kritički rezonira. U tom smislu Balsom navodi da:

Levy-jeva inicijativa može biti shvaćena kao participirajuća u kontekstu dva naizgled kontradiktorna impulsa koji su obilježili eru; prvo, kroz želju da za kinematografiju izbori status umjetnosti, kao nešto asocirano sa francuskim impresionističkim teoretičarima filma i redateljima, kao i sa rastućim pokretom filmskih društava u Francuskoj i SAD-u; i s druge, kroz želju da iskoristi kinematografiju, sa svojom bazom u registru mehaničke reprodukcije i masovne kulture da izazove instituciju umjetnosti koja se može povezati sa filmskom produkcijom historijske avangarde. (Balsom 2013, 98)

Iako je mehanička reprodukcija umjetnosti u Levyjevo doba bila tek u povojima, Levy-jeva redukcija filma na galerijski kontekst jeste na neki način kritici otvorila institucije umjetnosti i već postojeće hijerarhije moći koje su diktirale doseg, funkciju i smisao filma ili tehnološki posredovane vizualnosti uopće. Dakle, ova gesta redukcije filma na fizički medij i prostor unutar kojeg se kritički artikulira ujedno je, namjerno ili ne, bila i gesta propitivanja i filma kao medija, ali i logike moći koja je u filmu kao mediju "širenja" svijeta vidjela ogroman potencijal. Masovna proliferacija filma kao ultimativnog oblika organizacije vizualnosti u drugoj polovini 20. i početkom 21. stoljeća, a s obzirom na to da film kao sadržaj ili sekvencirana vizualnost nije limitiran fizičkim ograničenjima i prostorom prezentacije, dakle jeste bila oblik "otvaranja" svijeta svakom subjektivitetu čija je konzumacija kulture do tad bila uvjetovana striktnim konturama prostora. Kako argumentira Walter Benjamin:

(...) fokusirajući se na poznate objekte, istražujući poznata mjesta i miljee pod ingenioznom vodstvom kamere, film, s jedne strane, proširuje naše razumijevanje nužnosti koje vladaju našim životima; a s druge strane, film nas ubjeđuje u postojanje ogromnog polja mogućnosti djelovanja. Kada se činilo da su *coffee* barovi i metropolitanske ulice, kancelarije i sobe, željezničke stanice i tvornice potpuno zagušili našu egzistenciju pojavio se film i uništio ovaj svijet-zatvor... u smislu da nam je dao mogućnost da smireno i avanturistički nastrojeni nastavimo putovati. Sa zumiranjem, prostor se sužava; sa *slow motion*-om, pokret se proširuje. Otvaranje

objektiva kamere čini preciznijim ono što je već bilo vidljivim, iako nejasnim: ali ono otvara i potpuno novu strukturnu formaciju subjektiviteta. (Benjamin 1969, 15-16)

Drugim riječima, film, tj. njegova masovna proliferacija u ultimativni (post)moderni instrument tzv. masovne kulture je omogućio da se svijet koji je u 20. i 21. stoljeću ostao određen rigidnim kolonijalnim, klasnim i rasnim hijerarhijama reprezentira kao socijalno, klasno i politički vitalan prostor u kojemu je navodno sve moguće. Iako je jedna od prvih, sofisticiranih upotreba filma kao sredstva masovne propagande (i to upravo tokom 1930-ih u kojima je Levy djelovao), a kako je pokazao slučaj nacističke Njemačke, bila pokušaj još ekstremnijeg produblivanja i etabliranja spomenutih hijerarhija, to je ujedno bila i prezentacija mogućnosti te potencije filma, tj. organizirane vizualnosti, da se infiltrira u kognitivni prostor mase.

Dakle, ono što je bitno primijetiti u ovom kontekstu je to da je proliferacija filma u "masovni medij" ujedno bila i proliferacija mogućnosti da se svijet podređen rigidnim hijerarhijama i logici kapitala "otvori," tj. predstavi kao svijet mogućnosti. To ne znači da je masovna proliferacija filma u kulturni *mainstream* maskirala neku inherentnu autentičnost ili predeterminiranu istinu o svijetu – svaka reprezentacija i svako maskiranje je također sastavni dio autentičnosti svijeta. Naime, spomenuta proliferacija filma je dovela do maskiranja svijeta *kao* sistema. Tu se radilo o procesu maskiranja prostora kao *spacijalnosti* kroz koju se prožimaju političke i ideološke matrice koje esencijalno djeluju na format, smisao i funkciju neke umjetnosti i kulture općenito. A u tom se smislu spomenuta kontradiktornost Levy-jeve redukcije ili "zatvaranja" filma u galerijski prostor zapravo uprizoruje kao gesta otvaranja prostora u kojemu film nastaje dodatnoj reartikulaciji. Metaforički rečeno, redukcija filma na puki medij je na neki način i *kontra-zoomiranje* širih odnosa moći u kojima film funkcionira.

Dakle, isto kao što film nikad nije bio ultimativno separiran od industrije, tj. dominantnog môda proizvodnje, na isti je način razvoj filma i/ili kinematografije u organiziranu, linearnu vizualnost koja nadilazi svoje komponente u obliku slike, teksta i zvuka eksponirao "nove strukturne formacije subjektiviteta" kao neodvojive od konzumacije sadržaja kao industrijskog/eksploatacijskog procesa. Stoga, "oslobađajuće" karakteristike filma sadržane u njegovoj potenciji da "otvori svijet," u suvremenosti su zapravo dovele do potpune

infiltracije dominantne ideologije u intimni misaoni prostor svakog subjektiviteta te uključivanju cijelog društva u proces proizvodnje, tj. eksploatacije – iako je do svega, u doba neoliberalnog globalnog kapitalizma, došlo pod krinkom oslobađanja istog subjektiviteta od "ralja" ideologije.

Fordizam, postfordizam i razvoj vizualne industrije

Kako je već rečeno, film je uvijek bio oblik industrije koji je sadržajno, organizacijski i reprezentacijski pratio osnovne principe môda organizacije proizvodnje. Američki teoretičar Jonathan Beller u tom smislu argumentira:

(...) organizacijska uloga vizualnosti i transformacija moda proizvodnje dolazi direktno iz industrijske produkcije. Posljedice ove transformacije i način organizacije vidljivog od strane vizualnih tehnologija je dio trajućeg procesa kalkuliranja vidljivog. Materijalistički govoreći, industrijalizacija ulazi u vizualno na sljedeći način: rani oblici kinematografske montaže su ekstenzirali logiku proizvodnje na pokretnoj traci (u smislu sekvenciranja diskretnih, programatskih operacija koje izvode ljudi) u senzorijske su prevele industrijsku revoluciju oku. Kinematografija na neki način upisuje ljudsku čulnu aktivnost, u smislu onoga što je Marx zvao "čulnim radom" u kontekstu proizvodnje robe, na celuloidnu traku. (Beller 2006, 9)

Razvoj kinematografije, a dakle i filma kao njene generičke supstance, ne treba shvatiti kao "paralelan" razvoj dva odvojena sektora ljudske djelatnosti unutar okvira tzv. modernog razvoja, nego zapravo kao efekt već postojećeg môda proizvodnje, ali i kao proces transformacije kinematografije i filma u novi môd proizvodnje. Naime, da bi se ovaj transfer razumio u relevantnom obima potrebno je shvatiti osnovne karakteristike transformacije fordističke u postfordičku proizvodnju.

Fordistička proizvodnja ili fordizam (po američkom industrijalcu Henry Fordu) je način organizacije masovne proizvodnje koji je naslijedio taylorizam i koji u Prvom svijetu kapitala postaje dominantan u okvirnom periodu između 1920-ih i 1970-ih. Radi se, govoreći u rudimentarnim terminima, o proizvodnji serijske trake u kojoj je mjesto proizvodnje fizički locirano u specifičnom prostoru; u kojoj je proizvod materijalno opipljiv ili konkretan i kojemu su i klasne hijerarhije i "upravljačke strukture" tj. institucije moći, akumulacija

kapitala te direktan utjecaj kapitalističke države na organizaciju proizvodnje eksplicitno vidljivi. Fordistički môd organizacije proizvodnje se primjenjuje i u modernim državama nekapitalističkog i nezapadnog svijeta u smislu organizacije tehnologije, a uz određene aberacije vezane za organizaciju rada, definiranje svrhe proizvodnje itd.

Postfordizam, s druge strane, nasljeđuje fordizam i, uz određene aberacije, postaje dominantan način proizvodnje u industrijskim državama Prvog svijeta kapitala u okvirnom periodu između 1970-ih do danas. Radi se načinu proizvodnje u kojemu mjesto proizvodnje *nije* fizički locirano na jednom mjestu; koji isključivo ne proizvodi opipljiv, konkretan proizvod ili robu i koji primarno operira u domenu tzv. kognitivno-kulturne ekonomije. Postfordizam je, dakle, *deteritorijalizirao* tvornicu kao mjesto proizvodnje, ali i proizvodnju samu u smislu da ju je *apstraktificirao*, tj. transformirao u apstraktnu proizvodnju koja proizvodi cijeli spektar apstraktnih roba, označitelja i kontejnera/nositelja vrijednosti. Koncepti poput *branda*, logoa itd., koji danas predstavljaju ogroman dio vrijednosti neke kompanije su jedan primjer primjene ove proizvodnje, ali se ona referira i na način na koji je eksploatacija radnika konfigurirana; na koji se ekstrahira višak vrijednosti; kako se logika profita integrira u razne oblike pojavnosti sada apstraktnog proizvoda; kako se razni psihološki i kognitivni benefiti asociraju s proizvodom itd. Kako je spomenuto, postfordizam je apstraktna ili kognitivno-kulturna proizvodnja zato što se domeni kulture i kognicije tretiraju kao "tržišni prostori," prostori cirkulacije robe, ali i kao prostori apstraktno proizvodnje.

Naravno, iako se postfordistički môd proizvodnje u periodu nakon Drugog svjetskog rata nadalje od strane tada rastućeg neoliberalizma kontinuirano reprezentira kao navodni raskid s eksploatacijom radnika te kao radikalno demokratski oblik organizacije proizvodnje koja ne počiva na eksploataciji, postfordistička proizvodnja je samo oblik modernizacije tipično kapitalističke eksploatacije rada koja se isključivo temelji na logici profita, ne na širim interesima društva. Postfordizam je, u tom smislu, jednostavno operativni môd sadržan u neoliberalizmu kao ekonomskoj paradigmi i kao ideologiji. Tu je nužno primijetiti da je postfordistički môd proizvodnje etabliran primarno u Prvom svijetu kapitala, na Zapadu, dok je s druge strane kolonijalne podjele, u ostacima Drugog svijeta te posebno u Trećem svijetu i dalje dominantan eksplicitno eksploatacijski fordistički môd – na koji se postfordizam sa Zapada i dalje masovno oslanja kao proizvodni pogon. Jednostavno rečeno, fizički dio

proizvoda se uz nisku cijenu rada kompilira u Trećem svijetu, dok se kulturno značenje te oblici identiteta koje komunicira proizvod razvijaju u prozračnim, *fancy* kancelarijama na Zapadu. Iako je ova segregacijska logika kontinuirano prisutna unutar postfordizma, ovaj je môd proizvodnje tvornicu kao mjesto eksploatacije proširio na cijelu globalnu populaciju; na sve segmente društva te u sve domene ljudske fizičke, kulturne i kognitivne, tj. intelektualne aktivnosti, posebno one za koje se čini da s radom kao takvim nemaju nikakve veze. Talijanski teoretičar kulture Paolo Virno u tom smislu argumentira:

U fordizmu, kako je argumentirao Gramsci, intelekt ostaje izvan proizvodnje; tek kad se posao završi radnici čitaju novine, odlaze na sastanke (...) razmišljaju, razgovaraju. U postfordizmu, međutim, a s obzirom da je "život uma" potpuno uključen u vrijeme-prostor produkcije, esencijalna homogenost odnosi prevagu. Radno i neradno vrijeme se razvijaju u identičan oblik produktivnosti baziran na prakticiranju urođenih ljudskih kapaciteta: jezika, memorije, društvenosti, etičnosti, estetskih inklinacija kapaciteta za apstraktno razmišljanje i učenja. Iz perspektive pitanja "šta" se uradi i "kako" se uradi, nema više supstancijalne razlike između zaposlenosti i nezaposlenosti. Može se reći da je nezaposlenost rad bez naknade, a da je rad nezaposlenost s naknadom. (Virno 2004, 103)

Sve to znači da je danas svaki aspekt svakodnevnog življenja oblik proizvodnje vrijednosti, rad. Na jednoj razini govoreći, razgovor i međusobna interakcija, naravno, uvijek sadrže komponentu prenošenja određenih ideoloških predkonceptija ili slika svijeta koje nešto valoriziraju ili devaloriziraju, ali u postfordizmu samo prakticiranje ovih kapaciteta predstavlja rad i proizvodnju samu po sebi. Iz perspektive pitanja "šta" se proizvede, primjetno je da je krajnji rezultat rada razvijenih ekonomija koje mobiliziraju desetine milijuna radnika često samo novi model mobilnog telefona s tri, četiri ili pet kamera ili novi set aplikacija koje omogućavaju povišeni stupanj ljudske interakcije, tj. koje omogućavaju dalji rad kroz ekonomiju pažnje, gledanja kao oblik proizvodnje vrijednosti virtualnom sadržaju.

Također, iako je postfordizam načelno postmoderna paradigma, ona se intenzivno aplicira i na/prožima kroz korumpirane matrice organizacije i valorizacije rada na, recimo, Balkanu. Rad onih koji rade može biti viđen kao oblik nezaposlenosti s mizernom naknadom u smislu

prekarnosti istog rada te u smislu pitanja višeg smisla istog rada koji je obično reduciran na puko održavanje ionako žalosne uslužno/servisne infrastrukture. Oni koji *ne-rade* unutar ili izvan margina institucionalnog sistema su obično obilno kompenzirani, ali je ovaj "rad" u ogromnoj većini slučajeva rad za interese kapitala, ne za šire interese društva. S druge strane, oni koji ne rade; koji su nezaposleni bez naknade, također cijelo vrijeme rade konzumirajući, tj. dodajući svojom pažnjom višak vrijednosti raznom medijski posredovanom sadržaju, društvenim mrežama, apstraktnim industrijama ili pak uključujući se u razne socijalne ili mikrosocijalne interakcije unutar kojih se odvija valorizacija/devalorizacija određenih koncepta, uvida, mišljenja, *brandova*, politika itd. Dakle, u postfordizmu je sama ljudska interakcija, tj. ono što Virno zove "intelektualnošću mase" koji svakog može proizvesti u javnu figuru koja ima nešto za reći, a čemu svjedoče i fenomeni raznih *celebrity-ja*, *influencera* i slično, postala i oblik rada i resurs u smislu mobilizacije same cirkulacije sadržaja, misli, mišljenja u oblik ekonomije. Govoreći o strukturnoj povezanosti postfordizma s kulturnom, i konzekventno komunikacijskom industrijom, Virno navodi sljedeće:

Moja hipoteza je da je komunikacijska industrija (ili preciznije spektakl, tj. kulturna industrija) industrija kao i sve ostale, sa svojim specifičnim tehnikama, procedurama, profitom, itd.; a s druge strane, ona je također industrija proizvodnje sredstava proizvodnje. (...) u situaciji u kojoj sredstva proizvodnje nisu deduktibilna na mašine nego se sastoje od lingvističko-kognitivnih kompetencija neodvojivih od živog rada, legitimno je ustvrditi da se primjetan dio tzv. "sredstava proizvodnje" sadrži od tehnika komunikacijskih procedura. (Virno 2004, 61)

Može se dakle primijetiti da je proizvodnja samih sredstava proizvodnje odnosi na cijeli spektar tehnologija i tehnološki posredovanih oblika interakcije i reprodukcije "intelektualnosti mase," a što je rezultiralo u tome da su lingvističko-kognitivne kompetencije samih subjektiviteta pretvorene u "sredstvo" (reprodukcije) proizvodnje. Drugim riječima, postfordizam, tj. suvremeni kapitalizam je uzimajući u obzir sve navedeno, zapravo izbrisao demarkacijsku liniju između robe i njenog konzumenta, pretvorio subjektivitet u oblik robe, a robu u oblik subjekta koja funkcionira kao biološka mašina.

Drukčije rečeno, jedna od lingvističko-kognitivnih kompetencija koja igra najveću ulogu u postfordizmu je upravo pažnja mobilizirana u oblik resursa. Naime, pažnja investirana u konzumaciju nekog sadržaja, za ili van radnog vremena, je u postfordizmu oblik dodavanja viška vrijednosti nekom faktoru koji producira sadržaj, ali i faktor koji značajno utječe na isti sadržaj, njegov širi društveni smisao i funkciju. Preciznije govoreći, upravo je pogled ta ljudska kompetencija koja igra jednu od ključnih uloga u postfordističkom proizvodnom procesu i čija je reartikulacija ključna za analizu evolucije i kolapsa filma kao umjetnosti. Po Jonathanu Belleru:

(...) gledati znači raditi. To ne znači da su svi oblici gledanja nužno produktivni za kapital, ali gledanje je bilo to koje je prvo bilo izloženo kao produktivno za kapital u ranom 20. stoljeću, te se i danas tretira kao takvo. *Kinematografizacija* ili *kinomatizacija* vizualnog, fuzija vizualnog sa setom socijalno-tehničkih institucija i aparatusa, je dovela do rasta naprednih formi umrežene eksproprijacije koje su karakteristične za današnju eru. Kapitalistički mašinizirani *interface*-i vrebaju vizualno. (Beller 2006, 2)

Naime, evolucija kinematografije u industriju, tj. industrijalizacija vizualnosti općenito nije proizvela niti proizvodi neku "lažnu" sliku svijeta, ona predstavlja organiziranu formu transformacije gledanja u generatora vrijednosti; oblik rada za kapital te u ritual pristanka na organiziranu vizualnost kao kategoriju nadređenu kritičkoj interpretaciji svijeta. Naime, tu je bitno napraviti distinkciju i reći da je industrijalizacija vizualnosti primarno, ali ne i isključivo, proizvod Prvog svijeta kapitala, tj. Zapada jer zamjena interpretativnosti vizualnošću pomaže sistemu moći ne nužno da sakrije, već da konvertira širu totalnost socijalnih odnosa u *image*, sliku odvojenu od sociopolitičke stvarnosti eksploatacije. Kako tvrdi Beller:

Proizveli smo nove robe intenzificirajući određene aspekte starih, intenzificirajući njihovu *image* komponentu. Kinematografija je u velikoj mjeri hiper-razvoj fetišizma robe, tj. odvajanje poluautonomnog, psihički napunjenog *image-a* od materijalnosti robe. Fetišistički karakter robe crpi svoju energiju iz entalpije represije – čuvenog nepojavljivanja šire totalnosti društvenih odnosa. S određenim modifikacijama, situacija radnika na pokretnoj traci na neki je način bila preteča gledatelja. (Beller 2006, 9)

Sve to nema nikakve suštinske veze s razlikama između komercijalnog filma, *mainstream* filma i tzv. umjetničkog filma. Tzv. *mainstream* ili komercijalni film može, ako ništa drugo svojom banalnošću, biti puno bolja (auto)kritika sistema koji ga je proizveo, kao što i "umjetnički" ili općenito *ne-mainstream* film može biti katastrofalni oblik doprinosa dominantnoj normi. Drukčije rečeno, jedan od najvećih problema s industrijalizacijom vizualnosti je u tome da se tzv. "produksijska vrijednost," ne samo u tehničkom nego i umjetničko-dramskom smislu, reprezentira kao nadređena interpretaciji (što je i razlog zašto je tzv. *trash* film uvijek bio interpretativno sofisticiraniji od *mainstream* i umjetničkog filma). Kako u sličnom smislu navodi meksička teoretičarka kulture Irmgard Emmelheinz:

Slike koje cirkuliraju u infosferi su napunjene afektom, eksponirajući gledatelja senzacijama koje nadilaze svakodnevnu percepciju. Hollywoodski film, primjerice, isporučuje čistu senzaciju i intenzitet koji nema nikakvo značenje. U Alfonso Cuarón-ovom *Gravity*-ju (2013), protagonisti pokušavaju preživjeti rješavajući praktične i tehničke stvari. Ovaj film zapravo uspostavlja takvu točku gledišta i teren vizije koji idu u prilog imersiji: transformirajući slike u fizičke senzacije mobilizirane vizualnošću i zvukom (posebno u 3D verziji) – proizvodeći afekt. (Emmelheinz 2015, 137)

Naime, tu se ne radi o tome da industrijalizirana vizualnost nije oblik interpretacije, već o tome da se spomenuta vizualnost, koliko god umjetnički, dramski, socijalno-senzibilno itd. bilo sofisticirana, predstavlja kao interpretativni aparat sam po sebi, a što zapravo zamagljuje ili konvertira sociopolitičko porijeklo društvenih odnosa i esencijalnu ulogu moći. Kao primjer, opća kakofonija slike, zvuka i besmislenih diskursa koja se u regiji bivše Jugoslavije može doživjeti, bilo konzumacijom medijski posredovanog sadržaja, bilo pukim boravkom u javnim mjestima, je ekstremno problematična ne samo zato što se tu (u većini slučajeva) radi o atavističkom "narodnom" izričaju poput turbo-folka, nego zato što se radi o ekstremnoj fizičkoj senzaciji, zaglušujućoj buci koja prenosi gargantuoznu količinu besmislenih informacija. Drugim riječima, ova kakofonija, kako se da primijetiti i u nizu ugostiteljskih objekata u Bihaću u kojima intenzitet buke onemogućava bilo kakvu konverzaciju, zapravo i funkcionira kao blokada bilo kakve konverzacije kao procesa interpretacije svijeta, ali i kao oblik kompenzacije za prikrivanje manjka interpretacije kao sadržaja socijalne interakcije. Na globalnoj je razini situacija, naravno, ista, a što

hollywoodsku produkciju ili općenito kakofoniju prouzročenu masovnom cirkulacijom organizirane vizualnosti čini oblik globalnog turbo-folka.

Ono što je u ovom smislu važno je to da je industrijalizacija vizualnosti proizvela cijeli novi kognitivno-kulturni prostor akcelerirane, industrijalizirane *vizualnosti* koji se predstavlja kao da nadilazi separatne komponente koje čine vizualno (poput odvojene slike, zvuka i teksta) te kao da nadilazi samo vrijeme-prostor i odnose moći koje ih proizvode.

Prostornost filma i filmičnost izložbe/prostora

Naime, pored toga što se do neke mjere izložba *Još jedan eksperimentalni film* konceptualno "kači" na prethodno elaboriran slučaj Julien Levy-ja, njena prva dimenzija funkcionalnosti je oličena upravo u auto-ironičnom prefiksu "još jedan." Ovdje se radi o tome da prefiks "još jedan" eksperimentalni film predstavlja namjernu redundanciju filma na serijski proizvod te njegovo eksponiranje kao proizvoda. Ova se redundancija, dakle, ironijski referira upravo na *overload*, kakofoniju i komodifikaciju filmske produkcije (uključujući tu i proces *festivalizacije*) koja ne uspijeva dovesti u pitanje ni funkciju filma danas; ni već uspostavljene matrice proizvodnje i prezentacije; ni odavno izgubljen "avangardni potencijal" filma i njegovu umjetničku relevanciju. Stoga, ovoj izložbi autor Haris Rekanović pristupa iz pozicije da je film danas jednostavno mrtav i kao konceptualni format i kao umjetnost. Jedino što u takvoj situaciji ostaje je, dakle, napraviti "obdukciju" filma te izložiti njegove sastavne dijelove kao zasebne eksponate. U usporedbi s prethodno elaboriranom dominacijom vizualnosti, ova izložba dakle direktno dekomponira vizualnost na njene sastavne dijelove te funkcionira kao oblik radikalnog usporavanja industrijalizirane vizualnosti te njenog vraćanja u prostor ili galerijski kontekst. *Još jedan eksperimentalni film* je na neki način "fordistička" izložba koja naglašavanjem industrijskog porijekla filma eksponira postfordizam kao kontinuitet istih logika (profita) koje su bile dominantne i u fordizmu.

Konzekventno, druga dimenzija funkcionalnosti ove izložbe se manifestira upravo u tome da se prostoru, tj. galerijskom prostoru, vraća značaj koji je imao ili bi trebao imati u kontekstu organizacije pristupa umjetnosti. To ne znači nužno da ova izložba ima namjeru glorificirati "statične," fizički opipljive iteracije umjetnosti, već se radi o tome da se film kao organizirana vizualnost spušta u prostor iz kojeg proizlazi. U vezi s prethodnom analizom postfordističke industrije kao industrije apstraktnog, *Još jedan eksperimentalni film* je zapravo izložba koja

deapstraktificira ili konkretizira važnost vremena-prostora i koncepta galerije kao mjesta kritičke interpretacije neke umjetnosti. Virno je argumentirao sljedeće: "(...) ako javnost intelekta ne dovodi do proizvođenja javne sfere, političkog prostora u kojemu mnogi mogu artikulirati zajedničke teme, onda producira zastrašujuće efekte. Javnost bez javne sfere" (Virno 2004, 40). Ovaj se argument aplicira i se na ovaj kontekst. Naime, redukcija filma na javni prostor galerije upravo manifestira tendenciju ka proizvodnji javne sfere, javne refleksije značenja ili propasti neke umjetnosti ili same javne sfere "progutane" dislokacijom umjetnosti u domenu privatnog kognitivnog interijera. Pozicionirajući se na taj način, ova izložba zapravo negira navodnu strukturnu odvojenost tehnološki posredovane stvarnosti i sociopolitičke stvarnosti. Izložba *Još jedan eksperimentalni film*, u vezi s evolucijom industrije vizualnog koja je "otvarala" svijet, zapravo nanovo "zatvara" svijet, eksponirajući simulirano kao samo još jedan aspekt ili produžetak stvarnog svijeta. U istom kontekstu, ova je izložba ujedno i demontaža filma kao medija i montaža, oblik *editinga* koji se ne reducira na intervenciju na celuloidnu traku ili digitalni zapis već uključuje i materijalni prostor te odnose koji ga proizvode u proces *editinga*. A ovaj uvid zapravo otkriva i treću dimenziju funkcionalnosti ove izložbe.

Ona se sastoji u tome da je i ova izložba oblik filma ili film sam po sebi, ali onog tipa koji funkcionira tako da nije ni linearan ni nelinearan, već *anti-linearan* ili multidimenzionalan. Bez obzira na klasifikaciju, ono što je tu bitno je da se ovako proizveden film separira od već etabliranog načina na koji se sistematizira organizirana vizualnost. To znači da ova izložba predstavlja otklon od načina na koji se film kao organizirana vizualnost proizvodi, snima, montira, masterira i prezentira, kao i otklon od "robovanja" tzv. produkcijskim vrijednostima koje su ništa drugo do dio neoliberalne ideologije. Izložba *Još jedan eksperimentalni film* je dakle "eksperimentalni" film ne samo u smislu da eksperimentira s filmom, nego s prostorom kao integralnim dijelom filma ili njegovom dodatnom dimenzijom. Ova izložba nije bazirana samo na izlaganju sastavnih dijelova filma; ona je oblik filma koji prostor galerije i širi društveni prostor izlaže kao dinamičke kategorije koje industrijalizirana vizualnost zapravo "guši." Drugim riječima, ovu izložbu u onom kapacitetu u kojemu funkcionira kao film se ne može i ne treba gledati kao linearnu sekvencu vizualnih elemenata ili kongregiranu vizualnost. *Još jedan eksperimentalni film* je film koji se ne može "gledati" samo gledanjem, nego (re)interpretiranjem svih aspekata koje adresira.

YET ANOTHER EXPERIMENTAL FILM

To speak about film today does not only mean speaking about the (dominant form) of visual art but about visuality as an economic or industrial category. This is not to say that film (as a form of the organization of the visual) should be seen as if it "once" was not a part or a product of industry, but that the evolution of film and the collapse of its mainstream iteration into a visual form of commodity, must be interpreted as inherently linked to the transformation of the dominant capitalist modes of production. In other words, to thematize the question of the meaning, function and meaning of film or the state of cinema today means first and foremost to question the meaning of dominant industry in which it exists, as well as to question the dominant ideologies within which film as a model of the organization of visuality evolves or collapses.

Namely, at the moment when it is stated that film has been reduced to a mere cacophony of visuality, to which the paradigmatic Hollywood production testifies, or to the wannabe artistic crap, there comes a need for an exhibition that will thematize the "death" of film as an art form. *Yet another experimental film* is therefore an exhibition that, on the one hand, accelerates the "death" of film by reducing it literally to its constituent components – film tape, images, tone and text – and which, on the other hand, gives homage to film by trying to emphasize the importance of precisely of these components in film as a work of art, not a product. In other words, by this approach, author Haris Rekanović decomposes or deconstructs film into its component parts, criticizing in this process the reduction of film to mere visual merchandise, as well as emphasizing the importance of all those film components that have been negated in the process of translating film into a product. These two moments, the deconstruction of film and its reassembly in a form of exhibition, actually make two key, that is, constitutive moments that are turning this exhibition into (yet another) experimental film. In order for this to be elaborated, the genealogy of the conversion of film and video into artistic objects; the genealogy of the historical process of mixing the visual and industrial, as well as the contextualization of the meaning of this

exhibition in contemporary historical moment will have to constitute the components on the basis of which this text is based.

Film as an avant-garde of art and industry – a historical genealogy

During the 1930s in New York, gallerist Julien Levy, the owner of the eponymous gallery, was a well-known promoter of Surrealist, Dadaist, and generally avant-garde art/film from Europe, as well as American photographers. Levy, among other things, was the first who was on US soil, as American theorist Erika Balsom recalls: "(...) hosting the first American screening of *Un chien andalou* (Luis Buñuel, 1929) on November 17, 1932. He exhibited works such as *Rose Hobart* (Joseph Cornell, 1936) and *Anemic Cinema* (Marcel Duchamp, 1926). In 1932 and 1933, he served as the president of the Film Society of New York, a not-for-profit organization that aimed to show films that might be too unconventional to attract a broad public" (Balsom 2013, 97). In addition to Levy's biography, it is important to note that the exhibition "Surréalisme" (January 9-29, 1932) showcased the work of Europe's leading surrealist artists – Salvador Dalí (including his now-iconic painting *Persistence of Memory*), as well as Jean Cocteau, Max Ernst, Joseph Cornell, and many other never-before-seen artists in the US. Specifically, what is important about Levy's gallery and artistic work in this context is his tendency to exhibit film tape as a painting/canvas in the capacity of a work of art. Levy, therefore, perceived only the tape or medium on which film was printed as a work of art in itself. As Balsom argues:

He saw this model of sale as essential to the valorization of cinema as an artistic medium: "I had formed a collection of films reprinted on 16mm stock, with two purposes in mind: films conceived by such important painters as Duchamp, Leger, or Dali should command much the same value as a canvas from their hand, and if a collector's market could be organized, I thought to persuade other painters to experiment in this medium." (Ibid)

Regardless of personal motives, Levy's intent seems to resonate with Walter Benjamin, who claimed that: "Even the most perfect reproduction of a work of art is lacking in one element: its presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place where it happens to be. This unique existence of the work of art determined the history to which it was subject throughout the time of its existence" (Benjamin 1969, 3). Although Levy's approach can be

interpreted as reflecting a tendency to preserve the value of a work in a collectible sense, the same approach can also be interpreted as one that primarily addresses not only the mere medium on which the work is "located," but the very importance of a correlation between life the work and the historical moment, as well as the space and the ruling hierarchies of power that dictate how and what works are created and what they promote, reproduce or critically resonate. Balsom in that sense notices that:

Levy's initiative may be understood as participating in two seemingly contradictory impulses that marked the era: first, the desire to claim for cinema the status of art, something associated with French impressionist film theorists and filmmakers, as well as burgeoning film society movements in France and the United States; second, the desire to use cinema, with its basis in mechanical reproducibility and mass culture, to challenge the institution of art, something one might align with the filmmaking activities of the historical avant-garde. (Balsom 2013, 98)

Although mechanical reproduction of art in the Levy era was only in its infancy, Levy's reduction of cinema to a gallery context did in some ways critique the institutions of art and pre-existing hierarchies of power that dictated the reach, function, and meaning of film or technologically mediated visuality in general. So, this gesture of reducing film to the physical medium and the space within which it is critically articulated was, either intentionally or not, also a gesture of questioning film as a medium, but also of the logic of power that saw enormous potential in film as a medium of the "expansion" of the world. The mass proliferation of film as the ultimate form of visual organization in the second half of the 20th and early 21st centuries, given that film as content or sequenced visuality was not limited by physical limitations and space of presentation, therefore it was a form of "opening" the world to any subjectivity whose the consumption of culture by then was conditioned by the strict contours of space. As Walter Benjamin argued:

By close-ups of the things around us, by focusing on hidden details of familiar objects, by exploring common place milieus under the ingenious guidance of the camera, the film, on the one hand, extends our comprehension of the necessities which rule our lives; on the other hand, it manages to assure us of an immense and unexpected field of action. Our taverns and our metropolitan streets, our offices and

furnished rooms, our railroad stations and our factories appeared to have us locked up hopelessly. Then came the film and burst this prison-world asunder by the dynamite of the tenth of a second, so that now, in the midst of its far-flung ruins and debris, we calmly and adventurously go traveling. With the close-up, space expands; with slow motion, movement is extended. The enlargement of a snapshot does not simply render more precise what in any case was visible, though unclear: it reveals entirely new structural formations of the subject. (Benjamin 1969, 15-16)

In other words, film, i.e. its mass proliferation into the ultimate (post)modern instrument of the so-called mass culture enabled the world, which remained in the 20th and 21st centuries, determined by rigid colonial, class, and racial hierarchies, to be represented as a socially, class, and politically vital space in which everything was supposedly possible. Although one of the first, sophisticated use of film as a means of mass propaganda (precisely during the 1930s in which Levy operated), as Nazi Germany demonstrated, was an attempt to further deepen and establish these hierarchies, it was also and the presentation of the possibilities of the potency of film, i.e. organized visuality to infiltrate the cognitive space of the mass.

So, what is important to note in this context is that the proliferation of film into the "mass medium" was at the same time the proliferation of the possibility of "opening," that is, representing the world ruled by rigid hierarchies and the logic of capital as a world of possibilities. This is not to say that the mass proliferation of film into the cultural mainstream has masked some inherent authenticity or predetermined truth about the world – every representation and every masking is also an integral part of the "truth" about the world. Namely, the aforementioned proliferation of film as a medium led to the disguise of the world as a system. It was a process of masking of space as a form of *spatiality* through which political and ideological matrices permeate, which essentially affects the format, meaning and function of some art and culture in general. And in this sense, the aforementioned contradiction of Levy's reduction or "closure" of film into the gallery space can actually be interpreted as a gesture of opening the space in which film is created to additional articulation. Metaphorically speaking, the reduction of film to the mere medium is, in a way, the counter-zooming of the broader power relations in which film operates.

So, just like film has never been ultimately separated from the industry, i.e. the dominant mode of production, in the same way, the development of film and/or cinematography into organized, linear visuality that goes beyond its components in the form of image, text and sound has exposed "new structural formations of subjectivity" as inseparable from the consumption of content as an industrial/exploitative process. Therefore, the "liberating" characteristics of film contained in its potential to "open the world" in modern times have actually led to the complete infiltration of the dominant ideology into the intimate thought space of every subjectivity and the involvement of the whole society in the production process, i.e. exploitation – although in the age of neoliberal global capitalism it all came under the guise of liberating the same subjectivity from the "jaws" of ideology.

Fordism, post-Fordism and the development of the visual industry

As already stated, film has always been a form of industry that has substantially, organizationally and representatively followed the basic principles set by a dominant mode of production. The American theorist Jonathan Beller argues in this regard that:

(...) the organizational role of visuality, and the transformation of the mode of production arise directly out of industrial production. The ramification and organization of the visible by visual technologies is part of the emergent calculus of the visible. Materially speaking, industrialization enters the visual as follows: Early cinematic montage extended the logic of the assembly-line (the sequencing of discreet, programmatic machine-orchestrated human operations) to the sensorium and brought the industrial revolution to the eye. Cinema welds human sensual activity, what Marx called "sensual labor," in the context of commodity production, to celluloid. (Beller 2006, 9)

The development of cinema, and therefore of film as its generic substance, is not to be understood as a "parallel" development of two separate sectors of human activity within the framework of the so-called modern development, but in fact as an effect of the already existing mode of production, but also as a process of transforming cinema and film into a new mode of production. Namely, in order to understand this transfer to a relevant extent, it is necessary to understand the basic characteristics of the transformation of Fordist into post-Fordist production.

Fordist manufacturing or Fordism (named after American industrialist Henry Ford) is a way of organizing mass production that inherited Taylorism and which became dominant in the First World of Capital in the framework period between the 1920s and the 1970s. It is, in rudimentary terms, the production of a serial strip in which the place of production is physically located in a specific space; in which the product is materially tangible or concrete and to which class hierarchies and "management structures", i.e. institutions of power, the accumulation of capital, and the direct influence of the capitalist state on the organization of production are explicitly visible. The Fordist mode of production is also applied in the modern states of the non-capitalist and non-Western world in terms of the organization of technology, and with certain aberrations related to the organization of labor, defining the purpose of production, etc.

Post-Fordism, on the other hand, inherits Fordism and, with certain aberrations, becomes the dominant mode of production in the industrial nations of the First World of Capital in the period between the 1970s and the present. It is a mode of production in which the place of production is not physically located in one place; which does not exclusively produce a tangible, concrete product or commodity and which operates primarily in the so-called cognitive-cultural economics. Post-Fordism, therefore, deterritorialized the factory as a place of production, but it also did the same to production itself in the sense that it abstractified it, i.e. transformed it into abstract production that produces the full range of abstract goods, markers, and containers/holders of value. Concepts such as brand, logo, etc., which today represent a huge part of the value of a company, are one example of the application of this mode of production, but this also relates to the ways how worker exploitation is configured; how excess value is extracted; how profit logic integrates into the various forms of appearance of the now abstract product; how various psychological and cognitive benefits are associated with the product, etc. As mentioned, post-Fordism is abstract or cognitive-cultural production because the domains of culture and cognition are treated as "market spaces," spaces of circulation of goods, but also spaces of abstract production.

Of course, although post-World War II production by then growing neoliberalism continued to represent itself as a supposed break with labor exploitation and a radically democratic form of production organization that did not rest on exploitation, post-Fordist production is

merely a form of modernization of the typically capitalist labor exploitation, which is based solely on the logic of profit, not on the broader interests of society. Post-Fordism, in this sense, is simply an operational mode contained in neoliberalism as an economic paradigm and as an ideology. It is necessary to note here that the post-Fordist mode of production is established primarily in the First World of Capital, in the West, while on the other side of the colonial division, in the remnants of the Second World, and especially in the Third World, the explicitly exploitative Fordist mode is still dominant and practically serves as a production facility for the needs of the West. Simply put, the physical part of the product is compiled in the Third World at a low cost of labor, while the cultural meaning and the forms of identity communicated by the product are developed in the airy, fancy offices in the West. Although this segregationist logic is continually present within post-Fordism, this mode of production has expanded the factory as a place of exploitation to the entire global population; to all segments of society and to all domains of human physical, cultural and cognitive, i.e. intellectual activities, especially those that seem to have nothing to do with labor. As Italian cultural theorist Paolo Virno argues:

In Fordism, according to Gramsci, the intellect remains outside of production; only when the work has been finished does the Fordist worker read the newspaper, go to the local party headquarters, think, have conversations. In post-Fordism, however, since the “life of the mind” is included fully within the time-space of production, an essential homogeneity prevails. Labor and non-labor develop an identical form of productivity, based on the exercise of generic human faculties: language, memory, sociability, ethical and aesthetic inclinations, the capacity for abstraction and learning. From the point of view of “what” is done and “how” it is done, there is no substantial difference between employment and unemployment. It could be said that: unemployment is non-remunerated labor and labor, in turn, is remunerated unemployment. (Virno 2004, 103)

This means that every aspect of everyday life in present time is a form of value production, labor. Speech and interaction have, of course, always had a component of transmitting certain ideological pre-conceptions or images of the world that are valorizing or devaluing, but in post-Fordism, only practicing these capacities is work and production in itself. From the perspective of the question of what is being produced, it is noticeable that the early

result of the development of economies that mobilize tens of millions of workers is often just a new three, four, or five camera mobile phone model or a new set of applications that allow for an increased degree of human interaction, i.e. that allow further work through the economics of attention, of viewing as a form of value production for virtual content.

Also, while post-Fordism is, in principle, a postmodern paradigm, it is intensely applied to and permeates through corrupt matrices of organization and valorization of work in the Balkans. The work of those who are working can be seen as a form of unemployment with meager compensation both in terms of the precarity of such work and in terms of a question of the purpose of that work, which is usually reduced to the mere maintenance of an already deplorable service-based infrastructure. Those who are *not-working* within or without the confines of the institutional system are usually very well compensated, but this "work" is in the majority of cases work for the interest of capital, not wider society. On the other hand, those who do not work, who are unemployed without compensation, also work all the time consuming, i.e. adding by their attention surplus-value to various media-mediated content, social networks, abstract industries, or engaging in various social or micro-social interactions within which the valorization/devaluation of certain concepts, insights, opinions, brands, policies, etc. takes place. So, in post-Fordism, human interaction itself, i.e. what Virno calls the "intellectuality of the masses" that can produce anyone into a public figure who has something to say, and which is witnessed by the phenomena of various celebrities, influencers and the like, has become both a form of work and a resource in terms of mobilizing the very circulation of content, thought, opinions in the form of economics. Speaking of the structural connections among post-Fordism, culture industries and consequently communication industries, Virno states the following:

My hypothesis is that the communication industry (or rather, the spectacle, or even yet, the culture industry) is an industry among others, with its specific techniques, its particular procedures, its peculiar profits, etc.; on the other hand, it also plays the role of industry of the means of production. (...) in a situation in which the means of production are not reducible to machines but consist of linguistic-cognitive competencies inseparable from living labor, it is legitimate to assume that a conspicuous part of the so-called "means of production" consists of techniques and communicative procedures. (Virno 2004, 61)

It can be observed, therefore, that the production of the means of production itself refers to the whole spectrum of technologies and technologically mediated forms of interaction and reproduction of the "intellectuality of the masses", which resulted in the linguistic-cognitive competencies of the subjectivities themselves being transformed into the "means" of (reproduction) of production . In other words, post-Fordism, i.e. contemporary capitalism has, in the light of all of the above, actually erased the demarcation line between commodity and its consumer, transformed subjectivity into a form of commodity, and converted commodity into a form of entity that functions as a biological machine.

In other words, one of the linguistic-cognitive competencies that play the largest role in post-Fordism is precisely the attention mobilized into a form of resources. Namely, the attention invested in consuming some content, whether on or off working hours, is in post-Fordism a form of adding excess value to a factor that produces content, but also a factor that significantly influences the same content, its broader social meaning and function. More precisely, the look or gaze is that human competence that plays one of the key roles in the post-Fordist production process and whose re-articulation is essential to analyzing the evolution and collapse of film as a form of art. According to Jonathan Beller:

(...) to look is to labor. This is not to say that all looking is necessarily productive for capital, but looking first was posited as productive by capital early in the twentieth century, and currently is being presupposed as such. The cinematicization of the visual, the fusion of the visual with a set of socio-technical institutions and apparatuses, gives rise to the advanced forms of networked expropriation characteristic of the present period. Capitalized machinic interfaces prey on visibility. (Beller 2006, 2)

Specifically, the evolution of cinema into industry, i.e. the industrialization of the visual has not generally produced, nor it produces some "false" image of the world; it is an organized form of transforming the view into a value generator; a form of work for capital and a ritual of consent to organized visibility as a category superior to critical interpretation of the world. Namely, it is important to make a distinction here and to say that the industrialization of the visual is primarily, but not exclusively, a product of the First World of Capital, that is, the West, because the substitution of interpretativeness with the visual

helps the power system not necessarily to hide, but to convert the broader totality of social relations into an image separate from the sociopolitical reality of exploitation. As Beller states:

We manufactured the new commodities by intensifying an aspect of the old ones, their image-component. Cinema was to a large extent the hyper-development of commodity fetishism, that is, of the peeled-away, semi-autonomous, psychically charged image from the materiality of the commodity. The fetish character of the commodity drew its energy from the enthalpy of repression—the famous non-appearing of the larger totality of social relations. With important modifications, the situation of workers on a factory assembly line foreshadows the situation of spectators in the cinema. (Beller 2006, 9)

All this has nothing to do with the differences between commercial film, mainstream film and so-called art film. The so-called mainstream or commercial film can, if nothing else, be a much better (auto) critique of the system that produced it, as well as "artistic" or generally, non-mainstream film can be a disastrous form of a contribution to the dominant norm. In other words, one of the biggest problems with the industrialization of the visual is that the so-called "production value," not only in technical but also in artistic-dramatic terms, is being represented as superior to interpretation (which is why the so-called trash film has always been interpretively more sophisticated than mainstream and artistic film). Mexican cultural theorist Irmgard Emmelhainz states in a similar vein:

Images circulating in the infosphere are also charged with affect, exposing the viewer to sensations that go beyond everyday perception. Hollywood cinema, for instance, delivers pure sensation and intensities that have no meaning. In Alfonso Cuarón's *Gravity* (2013), the main characters try to survive in outer space by solving practical and technical matters. The movie repudiates a point of view and a ground for vision in favour of immersion: transforming images into physical sensations mobilized by the visual and auditory (especially in its 3D version)—and thus into affect. (Emmelhainz 2015, 137)

Namely, this is not to say that industrialized visuality is not a form of interpretation, but about that the aforementioned visuality, however artistic, dramatic, socially sensible or

sophisticated it is, is being represented as an interpretative apparatus in itself, which actually obscures or converts the sociopolitical origins of social relations and the essential role of power. As an example, the general cacophony of image, sound and meaningless discourse that can be experienced in the region of the former Yugoslavia, whether through the consumption of media-mediated content or through mere public presence, is extremely problematic not only because this is (in most cases) expressed in a form of atavistic turbo-folk, but because it is an extreme physical sensation, a deafening noise that conveys a gargantuan amount of meaningless information. In other words, this cacophony, as can be observed in a number of catering establishments in Bihać in which the noise intensity impedes any conversation, actually functions as a blockage of any conversation as a process of the interpretation of the world, but also as a form of compensation to cover up the lack of interpretation as a content of social interactions. At the global level, the situation is, of course, the same, which makes Hollywood production, or the cacophony in general caused by the mass circulation of organized visuals, a form of global turbo-folk.

What is important in this sense is that the industrialization of visibility has produced a whole new cognitive-cultural space of accelerated, industrialized visibility, which *seems* to transcend both the separate components that make up the visual (such as separate image, sound, and text) and the space-time, as well as the power relations that produce them.

The spatiality of film and film-like nature of the exhibition/space

In relation to the fact that *Yet Another Experimental Film* conceptually "attaches" itself to the previously elaborated case of Julian Levy, its first dimension of functionality is embodied precisely in the auto-ironic prefix "yet another." The point here is that the prefix "yet another" (experimental film) represents the intentional reduction of a film to a serial product and its exposure as a product. This redundancy, therefore, ironically references precisely the overload, cacophony, and commodification of film production (including the process of *festivalization*) that fails to question the function of film today; the already present matrices of production and presentation; as well as the long lost "avant-garde potential" of film and its artistic relevancy. Therefore, the author Haris Rekanović approaches this exhibition from the position that film is today simply dead, both as a conceptual format and as art. The only thing left in such a situation, then, is to do an

"autopsy" of film and expose its constituent parts as separate exhibits. Compared to the previously elaborated dominance of visuality, this exhibition therefore directly decomposes visuality into its constituent parts and functions as a form of radical reduction of industrialized visuality and its return to space or a gallery context. *Yet Another Experimental Film* is actually a "Fordist" exhibition that, by emphasizing the industrial origins of film, exposes post-Fordism as a continuity of the same logics (of profit) that were dominant in Fordism.

Consequently, the second dimension of the functionality of this exhibition is manifested precisely in the fact that space, i.e. gallery space, restores the significance that it had or should have in the context of organizing access to art. This does not necessarily mean that this exhibition is intended to glorify "static," physically tangible iterations of art, but rather that it facilitates descend of organized visuality into space from which it arose. Related to the previous analysis of the post-Fordist industry as an industry of the abstract, *Yet Another Experimental Film* is actually an exhibition that *de-abstractifies* or *concretizes* the importance of time-space and the concept of the gallery as a place of critical interpretation of art. Virno argues the following: "(...) if the publicness of the intellect does not yield to the realm of a public sphere, of a political space in which the many can tend to common affairs, then it produces terrifying effects. *A publicness without a public sphere...*" (Virno 2004, 40: emphasis in the original). This argument also applies to this context.

Specifically, the reduction of film onto the public space of the gallery precisely manifests a tendency towards the production of a public sphere, a public reflection of the meaning, or collapse, of an art and the public sphere itself "swallowed up" by the dislocation of art in the domain of the private cognitive interior. By positioning itself in this way, this exhibition actually negates the alleged structural separation of technologically mediated reality and sociopolitical reality. The exhibition, regarding the evolution of the visual industry that "opened" the world, actually "closes" the world anew, exposing the simulated as just another aspect or an extension of the real world. In the same context, this exhibition is also disassembly of film as a medium and a form of editing that does not reduce itself to interventions on the celluloid tape or in digital files, but that includes material space and the relationships that produce it in the editing process. And this insight actually reveals a third dimension to the functionality of this exhibition.

The point is that this exhibition is also a form of film or a film in itself, but of a type that functions so that it is neither linear nor non-linear but *anti-linear* or multidimensional. Regardless of the classification, what matters is that the film produced in this way is separated from the already established way of organizing organized visuals. This means that this exhibition represents a departure from the way film is produced, recorded, edited, mastered and presented as an organized visuality, as well as it is a departure from the so-called "slavery" to "production values" that are nothing else but part of neoliberal ideology. *Yet Another Experimental Film* is, therefore, an "experimental" film not only in the sense that it is experimenting with film, but that it experiments with space as an integral part or additional dimension of film. This exhibition is not, therefore, only an exposition of film reduced onto its constituent parts; it is a form of film that exposes gallery space and the wider social space as dynamic categories that industrialized visuality actually "suffocates." In other words, this exhibition, in the capacity in which it functions as a film, cannot and should not be viewed as a linear sequence of visual elements or congruent visuals. Another experimental film is a film that cannot be "watched" only by watching, but by (re)interpreting all the aspects it addresses.

Reference/references

Balsom, Erika. 2013. "Original Copies: How Film and Video Became Art Objects." *Cinema Journal* 53, No 1, Fall. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Beller, Jonathan. 2006. *The Cinematic Mode of Production – Attention Economy and the Society of the Spectacle*. Hanover, New Hampshire: Dartmouth College Press, Hanover, London: University Press of New England.

Benjamin, Walter. 1969. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations*, Ed. Hannah Arendt. New York: Schocken Books.

Emmelheinz, Irmgard. 2015. "Images Do Not Show: The Desire to See in the Anthropocene." *Art in the Anthropocene – Encounters Among Aesthetics, Politics, Environments and Epistemologies*, Eds. Heather Davis, Etienne Turpin. London: Open Humanities Press.

Virno, Paolo. 2004. *A Grammar of the Multitude - For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*. Trans. Isabella Bertoletti, James Cascaito, Andrea Casson. Los Angeles, New York: Semiotext(e).
