Looking Backwards into the Future:
Steadicam Cinematography, Urban Regeneration and Artists' Cinema
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In recent years, public-art programmes associated with urban redevelop-
ment have emerged as an important context for the production and
exhibition of artists' cinema in Ireland. Breaking Ground (the Per Cent for
Art Scheme of Ballymun Regeneration Ltd) has commissioned a number
of moving-image works, including short films and video installations by
Christine Molloy and Joe Lawlor, Graham Parker and Grace Weir, and
Adam Chodzko, among others. More recently, the Dublin Docklands
Development Authority has also become involved in the financing or co-
financing of several visual-art projects that incorporate moving-image
production or exhibition. These projects include Jesse Jones's "12 Angry
Films" (2006), a temporary drive-in cinema commissioned by Fire Station Artists'
Studios and situated in the Pigeon House and Video Apartment (November
2007), an exhibition of video art within a domestic setting in the
Docklands area, which formed part of the bodysity project devised by
Shelagh Morris, Cliodhna Shaffrey and Nigel Rolfe. Some public-art
commissioning programmes, such as Breaking Ground, favour an overly
'site-specific' approach in which artists are required to engage directly with
the local context, whether understood in terms of physical landscape,
history or community. Yet these commissions often give rise to works that
circulate beyond the local context, particularly if they take the form of film
or video projects. This article examines the relationship between site-
specific art practice, public-art commissions and contemporary artists'
cinema through reference to the work of Christine Molloy and Joe Lawlor:
(also known as 'desperate optimists').

The term 'artists' cinema' is used here in preference to 'artists' film and
video' because it signals a particular concern with the institutional and cul-
tural history of cinema, in addition to the material and technological
aspects of film-making. My discussion focuses on Molloy and Lawlor's self-
consciously 'cinematic' strategies of production and exhibition, particularly
the use of steadicam cinematography in several films from their Civic Life
series, including Moore Street (2004) and the Breaking Ground commission
Leisure Centre (2005). While both of these works are loosely concerned
with displacement, the latter is directly concerned with the transformation
of both self and community. It is also shot and set within a newly built
gymnasium and swimming pool, one of the most prominent symbols of the
regeneration process in Ballymun. The first part of the article explores the
relationship between visual spectacle and cinematography in these works,
drawing upon Richard Kirkland's analysis of Elephant (Alan Clarke, 1989),
while the second part addresses some broader critical issues surrounding
site-specific practice and artists' cinema.

Christine Molloy and Joe Lawlor left Dublin to study and work in the
UK in the late 1980s and first became established within the field of experi-
mental theatre and live art, incorporating elements of video into their
performances, before moving into video and subsequently 35mm film
production. Outlining this trajectory, Ben Slater notes that they 'belong to a
roughly defined generation of British "live artists" in the 1990s, creating
experimental performance for theatres . . . informed far more by filmic
imagery, editing and mise-en-scène than . . . by the traditions of the stage'.
As desperate optimists, they extended their collaborative approach from the-
to moving-image production, 'frequently opening up their process to
include other artists, schools and community groups'. They directed and
released seven short films as part of the Civic Life series, followed by
Daydream (2006), which was commissioned as part of the 'Made in
Liverpool' programme of the Liverpool Biennial in 2006. More recently,
they have made two linked films, a short entitled Joy (2007) and a feature-
length narrative entitled Helen (2008), which share a common storyline,
characters and cast.

Molloy and Lawlor typically set and shoot their films within urban loca-
tions that are either public or semi-public in some way; these include city
streets, parks, community centres and hotel function rooms. Some of these
locations incorporate highly recognisable landmarks (such as public mon-
uments) while others are more ambiguous or generic. Each shoot features a
large and predominantly non-professional cast of performers, often includ-
ing members recruited from the local community of residents. Molloy and
Lawlor also favour a non-naturalistic mode of address in which performers
sometimes demonstrate an awareness of the camera, glancing directly at it
when delivering their lines. Each film is shot on 35mm stock, using an
anamorphic lens, and the action is staged and recorded as a continuous

to offer the illusion of visual mastery, the production process tends to make the grain of the 35mm film stock more visible, while the lens itself creates obvious optical distortions, particularly when used within a confined interior space.

The combination of a long take and highly fluid cinematography is well established within classical narrative cinema, sometimes serving as the mark or signature of a particular auteur. It is also possible to identify precedents within the avant-garde tradition, most obviously in the form of Michael Snow's *La Region Centrale* (1971), which was filmed in northern Quebec with a specially constructed device that would allow the camera to pivot rapidly and smoothly through a range of axes. At certain points, the cinematography seems to suggest the mapping or measurement of an apparently uninhabited landscape but as the pace of the camera movement increases, the coherency of both landscape and viewing subject is destabilised. *La Region Centrale* is one of a number of films referenced by Stephen Heath in his influential theorisation of 'narrative space' and it forms part of a shift within avant-garde practice away from the investigation of perception and the material properties of film, towards an exploration of narrative structure and form.10

Jonathan Whalley has analysed this shift, highlighting a crisis within structural film in the late 1960s and early 1970s linked to the insistence on 'medium-specificity' within modernist critique. Amongst multiple and inter-related responses to the perceived limits of this position, Whalley identifies the emergence of a form of 'paracinema' concerned with 'cinematic properties outside the standard film apparatus'.11 The best-known example of this paracinematic current is probably Anthony McCall's *Long Film for Ambient Light* (1975). This work is not a 'film' in the conventional sense but instead could be described as a durational event, unfolding over twenty-four hours and taking the form of an empty Manhattan loft with its windows covered by diffusion paper, lit by a bare light bulb hanging from the ceiling. According to Whalley, this exploration of cinema beyond the apparatus of film was informed both by the general tendency towards 'dematerialisation' in contemporary art and by an overtly historicised concept of the medium of film, indebted to Bazin and Eisenstein. Animated by Bazin's 'Myth of Total Cinema' and Eisenstein's analysis of montage and modernity, paracinema was premised on the notion that 'the film medium . . . is not a timeless absolute but a cluster of historically contingent materials'.12

Although the term 'paracinema' cannot be extended to the work of Molloy and Lawlor, the *Civic Life* series is characterised by an exploration of the various ways in which cinema extends beyond the materiality of film. Firstly, the combination of anamorphic cinematography and steadicam...
technology clearly evokes a tradition of visual spectacle that extends from proto-cinematic entertainments, such as the diorama, to contemporary visual effects. It is also possible to identify certain parallels with early cinema modes of production and exhibition; when Molloy and Lawlor invite non-professional performers to see themselves and their cities through the lens of the film camera they are operating within a tradition that can be traced to the early cinematographic entrepreneurs, even though the dynamics of economic exchange may be less direct. The exploration of narrative form in the Civic Life series is also obviously indebted to the tradition of stage melodrama, while many of the settings (such as city parks) seem to hint at the relationship between early cinema and other forms of public entertainment.

In recent years, some theorists of the 'projected image' within contemporary art have critiqued the dominance of narrative and video installation within the gallery, emphasising the need to foreground mechanisms of display within the space of exhibition as a counterpoint to the overly immersive qualities of cinema. Molloy and Lawlor, however, embrace the technological and industrial convention of commercial film exhibition and the history of cinema as a public cultural form. In addition, they do not share the fascination with industrial obsolescence that is evident in the work of some artists working with 16mm film, such as Tacita Dean. They shoot, print and exhibit in 35mm precisely because it is currently the industrial standard and they rarely exhibit their films in galleries; instead preferring to screen their work in cinemas and often favouring commercial multiplexes over arthouse venues. But even though Molloy and Lawlor are not primarily interested in the materiality of film this does not mean that the indexical qualities of the medium are necessarily irrelevant to their practice. They are drawn towards natural lighting effects and often shoot at the 'magic hour' just before the sun sets. In addition, their exploration of 'real time' through the long take articulates a fascination with the evidential qualities of the photographic image. Ben Slater hints at this dynamic when he suggests that their films constitute a 'spectral documentation' of a performance that is usually hidden; 'the marshalling of camera, crew, actors, space and time [which] needs to be performed with the utmost precision and confidence'. Some of the 'spectral' qualities of these films are also integrally linked to the use of steadicam cinematography, and I will return to this point at a later stage.

Subjectivity, spectatorship and the address to the body

The 'address to the body' that is characteristic of spectacular attractions has been widely theorised in relation to early and post-classical cinema, experimental film and the broader domain of visual culture. Scott Bukatman integrates insights from all of these fields in order to theorise a 'technological sublime'. In keeping with the genealogy outlined by Jonathan Crary, among others, Bukatman acknowledges that the address to the body in nineteenth-century spectacular entertainments may serve as 'a means of inscribing new, potentially traumatic phenomena onto the familiar field of the body'. Yet he emphasises that this process may also be necessary:

While the incorporation of the body into a range of primarily visual entertainments constitutes Crary a colonization of the body, it represents a compensation for the declining centrality of sensory experience; a valid (that is, useful) means of recentering one's experience of a decentred world. If this was, in some ways, complicit with dominant ideological agendas, it is also, irreducibly, a necessary means of being in the world. Bukatman notes a recurrence of this address to the body within avant-garde and experimental film and he cites various theorists, including Tom Gunning, who have identified continuities between the early 'cinema of attractions' and the exploration of perception in certain avant-garde and experimental film practices.

The overly 'presentational' or frontal framing employed by Molloy and Lawlor, whereby characters address themselves towards the camera, is certainly indebted to early cinema, but also offers a point of connection with avant-garde theatre, most notably the work of Brecht. Valerie Connor has emphasised the importance of Brecht for Molloy and Lawlor, noting that Leisure Centre 'flaunts a range of alienating effects', including the visual distortions that are created by the cinematography. The film centres on a young man (Rob) who has recently become a father and is visiting the local leisure centre for the first time since the birth. The camera follows him as he moves through the interior of the building, on his way to meet his girlfriend Amy, and the camera lens creates certain visual distortions, as noted by Connor:

From our point of view, as Rob goes forward, so we move backward. The camera faces squarely away from the direction we are all moving in. As we watch Rob, centred in the frame, it becomes noticeable that the camera lens is having an extreme effect on the surrounding architecture. Before our eyes, the edges of the walls, the corridors, appear to bend, curving in Rob's wake.

The cinematography amplifies the sense of anxiety and enclosure suggested by Rob's words and gestures and also creates an acute awareness of off-screen space. 'We' move backwards with the camera operator through the corridor, unable to see the space that lies ahead of Rob, while his occasional glances at the camera betray the fact that his view is also obscured.

By calling attention to the existence of off-screen space in this way,
Leisure Centre disrupts many of the conventions of classical narrative cinema and could even be said to offer an example of the 'fourth look' that has been theorised by Paul Willemen through reference to the films of Steve Dwoskin. Willemen's concept of the fourth look is of course partly informed by the notion of the 'fourth wall' in theatre, but it also draws upon and seeks to extend a body of theory developed in relation to film spectatorship. In particular, it references Laura Mulvey's typology of 'looks', which includes the look of the camera at the pro-filmic scene, the spectator's look towards the screen and the intra-diegetic looks exchanged by characters. Willemen, however, introduces the possibility of a fourth 'look' aligned to the Lacanian concept of the gaze, noting that 'Jacques Lacan described this fourth look as being "not a seen gaze but a gaze imagined by me in the field of the Other"'.

In the filmic process, this look can be represented as the look which constitutes the viewer as visible subject.

Willemen goes on to emphasise that even though this fourth look is no: of the same order as the other looks, because its subject is 'an imaginary other', it is nonetheless continually present, even though institutional conventions of production and exhibition may 'conspire to minimise its effects'. It could be argued, however, that steadicam cinematography introduces yet another 'look', involving the mediation of the pro-filmic scene. An insight into this process is offered by Richard Kirkland in his analysis of Alan Clarke's television film Elephant (1989). This film, which has directly informed the work of Gus Van Sant, as well as Molloy and Lawlor, consists solely of a sequence of steadicam shots, each of which follows a lone male who locates and shoots an unidentified individual at close range. There is no dialogue or explication of the narrative, and this action is simply repeated again and again with variations in terms of location, cast and framing, at a pace that is both monotonous and relentless. Kirkland situates Elephant in relation to a tradition of 'spectacular' representations of violence in Northern Ireland but suggests that it may offer a somewhat different perspective on this violence, largely as a consequence of the multiple subject positions associated with the use of steadicam. He states that the steadicam's ability to provide a seamless shift from POV to other subject positions constitutes a mode of contingency, the potential to adopt whatever position is strategically necessary according to the shifting terrain of implication and denial that the film's subject matter impels. Although he concludes that Elephant is a highly ambivalent text, he also finds evidence of an 'ethical' process of contemplation in both the multiple subject positions implied by the use of the steadicam and in the silence that dominates the film.

Kirkland's discussion of the steadicam highlights the crucial dissonance between the point of view of the operator and that of the camera. He emphasises that the camera is fitted to the body of the operator and then balanced on springs so as to eliminate any jolts. The operator does not use an eyepiece to frame the shot but instead relies on a monitor also attached to the body, while the focus is adjusted (remotely) by another crew member. This effectively means that the smoothness of the steadicam image is both the product and the sign of various hidden 'looks' directed at monitors, including those of the steadicam operator and the focus puller. It is here that the notion of the film as 'spectral documentation' offered by Ben Slater seems to acquire renewed meaning, suggesting the possibility that the films of Molloy and Lawlor bear the trace of the various hidden 'looks' associated with the production process.

Collaborative and site-based modes of production

At present, Molloy and Lawlor operate within a funding model that is different (although not necessarily wholly separate) from that associated with the commercial gallery system. Many artists working with 16mm film produce a limited edition of prints and in general they do not make these works available to buy on domestic formats such as video or DVD. As these editions film works are usually sold through the commercial gallery system, their circulation and exhibition is carefully managed by the artists or their gallery representatives. By contrast, the various publicly funded agencies that have commissioned projects by Molloy and Lawlor are often concerned to promote the status of these projects as public-art works. Rather than controlling the exhibition of the film, or seeking a direct return on investment through sales, these agencies often produce and release a relatively large DVD edition, sometimes incorporating an essay or other contextualising material.

In addition, many of the films in the Civic Life series were screened in cinemas on 35mm for invited audiences that included the participants as well as press and have since been widely exhibited in film festivals. But this does not mean that the work of Molloy and Lawlor circulates entirely outside the frame of contemporary art. Mouse Street, the second film in the series, formed part of the official Irish representation at the 26th Biennial de Sao Paulo and it was funded by the Cultural Relations Committee at the Department of Arts, Sport and Tourism and the Arts Council, and Project Arts Centre in partnership with the British Council in Ireland. Leisure Centre is arguably more representative of the series as whole in that it was commissioned by Breaking Ground but, as is common in low-budget film-making, the production received funding from many different sources, including Arts Council England, Film London, British Council Ireland and Project Arts Centre.
As this list suggests, Molloy and Lawlor operate as film producers as well as artists, both in terms of securing funding and in their ongoing interactions with creators and performers. Ben Slater specifically describes them as 'curators' and 'performers', highlighting the significant role they play in the curatorial and performative aspects of their work. Their collaboration exemplifies the convergence between artist and Blur, including their engagement with the community and the role of the producer in the creative process. They are recognized for their ability to merge art and commerce, creating a unique form of exhibition and performance that is both innovative and accessible. The role of the producer in this context is not only about funding but also about facilitating the exploration of new forms of collaboration and the development of new artistic practices. Through their work, they challenge traditional boundaries between art, film, and community engagement, creating a space where art, film, and social interaction are inextricably linked. This approach not only enhances the educational and cultural value of their projects but also provides a platform for diverse voices and perspectives. The commitment to community involvement and the integration of local knowledge and histories in their work demonstrate their dedication to creating a space that is both inclusive and transformative. Overall, the collaborative approach of Molloy and Lawlor serves as a model for how art and film can be used to engage with and transform local communities, fostering a sense of shared ownership and participation. Through their work, they have demonstrated the power of art to bring people together and to create meaningful and lasting change. The full description of the activities and the role of the producer in the creative process is available in their own words in the link provided.
specifically interested in the various ways in which heterogeneous values associated with art and organisation get 'locked in' to these practices. Writing in 2004, he suggests that the culture of Liverpool, whether produced through the biennale or through related initiatives such as the 'Capital of Culture' (assigned to Liverpool for 2008), may in fact be the organisation of these events; as such it may be impossible to either pull apart or fully represent this intertwining of culture and organisation. This relationship can only be made visible by 'regarding the experience and meaning of the biennial as the relationship between the exhibition as process of display and the local and global elements that it articulates. Such an object would be without spatial or temporal limit and thus impossible to represent'. As the work of Kwon would suggest, it is this very unrepresentability that seems to prompt the recovery of site in the form of a pre-existing totality aligned to the body of the artist.

Looking backwards

Molloy and Lawlor do not evade these issues; rather, their work seems to perform this act of recovery by staging an ephemeral (perhaps even 'spectral') scene of communality for the audience, albeit in a scene that is highly constructed. In both Leisure Centre and Daydream they explore themes of longing for a better life, as well as experiences of alienation and loss. The central characters in Leisure Centre (Rob and his girlfriend Amy) have recently become parents and the first part of the film focuses on Rob's fears and anxieties in his new role as a father. As he walks through the depopulated interior of the new building, both the setting and the smooth movements of the camera are strongly reminiscent of The Shining (1980), a well-known exploration of paternal alienation. Unlike Jack in The Shining, however, Rob can at least express his fears to his partner and she responds by asking him to imagine the future, five years from now. Specifically, she asks him to look back on the present from a time in which he, his family and the wider community have found happiness, comfort and security. Amy speaks, however, from a position that is outside the diachrony and she describes this alternative present in a voice-over. As she speaks, the action shifts from real time to slow motion and she and Rob enter the swimming pool, pausing to collect their child from another family member. With Amy now carrying the baby in her arms they walk through the pool area, which is flooded with sunshine in stark contrast to the subdued artificial lighting of the gym and changing room. As Amy continues to speak, her words seem to dictate the movement of the camera, which alights upon children, teenagers and older people at play; the awkward social interactions of the gym have now been replaced by unrestrained physicality and they are surrounded by idyllic images of communality.

This combination of fluid cinematography and visual plenitude is so seductive that Amy's imagined world quickly acquires solidity and coherence, resolving and banishing many of the ambiguities generated by Rob's journey. But this closing section is not simply an embrace or endorsement of the ideology of urban regeneration. Instead, it suggests the exploration of a conceptual position that is integral to the work of Brecht. According to Darko Suvin, the basic strategy of Brecht's aesthetics involves the observation of the present from a point that is located in another epoch, such as an imagined future, so that even the everyday events of the present acquire renewed significance and meaning. For Suvin, the strategy of the 'backward look' towards the present creates 'tension between a future which the author's awareness inhabits, and a present which his audience inhabits: this tension is at the root of the most significant values of Brecht's work'. The words spoken by Amy at the close of Leisure Centre seem at first to suggest an application of this aesthetic strategy but they actually effect a reversal of the dynamic that is described by Suvin. This is because even though the final scene is framed (by Amy's words) as an image of an alternative present it is also open to another interpretation, as the spectacle of utopian collectivity to be achieved through the process of regeneration. The problem does not necessarily lie in the 'backward look' towards the present, however, and may be partly a consequence of continuities in action between the earlier and latter parts of the film. This is because although the use of slow motion and voice-over in the swimming-pool scene signals an altered temporality, it also implies the continuation and conclusion of Rob's journey through the gym. As a consequence, the reunification of the young family in the pool provides a wholly satisfying narrative resolution to the anxieties and uncertainties generated by Rob's journey.

Conclusion

Elsewhere, in both Daydream and Joy, Molloy and Lawlor actually explore the theme of the narrative 'quest' or journey directly. Daydream is largely concerned with change or transition and it stages a series of scenarios in which individuals and groups reflect upon their desires, fears and aspirations. These scenarios are framed within a meta-narrative, set in a forest where a group of children have become separated from their teacher and classmates. Although the 'lost' children eventually appear in the final scene they are not reunited with their friends; instead, it would appear that their own journey or quest has actually just begun. So even though Daydream is
very specifically concerned with change and regeneration, it withholding an aspirational image of the future, focusing instead on the potential that may be inherent in the experience of dislocation and disorientation. Moore Street is also concerned with themes of separation and recovery, but structured very differently. The cast is primarily African, drawn from a theatre group, and the action, which is filmed as a single steadicam shot, takes place long after the Moore Street fruit and vegetable markets have closed.

Much of the light in Moore Street seems to come from within the restaurants, video shops and other businesses established by local immigrant entrepreneurs, and the scene opens with a single young woman, who walks slowly through the street. Her movements are accompanied by a voice-over in which she (or someone else) describes her present life to an absent lover, shifting between English and Shwahili. She asks him to join her yet she clearly remains deeply ambivalent about her new home, questioning whether it is possible, or even desirable, to ever fully 'belong' in this place. This ambivalence is echoed in the movements of the camera as it circles around the central figure and seems to double back on itself several times. Towards the end, the woman is joined by a group of young men and women, who fall smoothly step with her without any sign of dislocation and disorientation. At the close, they advance towards and then past the camera, turning the corner and heading out into the city. So while Leisure Centre is characterised by progressive forward motion, the route taken by the central character in Moore Street is far more circular. The relationship between the onscreen performers and voice-over narrator in the latter film betrays the screenwriter's extensive experience in evoking aspects of the possible contingency that is theorised by Kirkland in relation to Elephant.

Ultimately, it is impossible to deny that Molloy and Lawlor are operating within territory that is fraught with difficulty, as a consequence of the local and contextual dynamics that have been theorised by Kwon and Valentine, among others. A full exploration of these issues would need to extend beyond the film set to address the various forms of collaboration between the various forms of collaboration and negotiation within their practice yet, given the impossibility of finding a position that is somehow 'outside' these dynamics, their work seems both distinctive and significant for its overt thematic engagement with the discourse of transformation in urban-regeneration projects. In addition, by operating at the shifting intersection of public and commercial structures of film production and exhibition, their practice offers an insight into the history and possible future of cinema as a public cultural form.
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MIEKE BAL, SIÚN HANRAHAN, NIAMH-ANN KELLY
and EMMA-LUCY O’BRIEN

2move: Ireland was a large exhibition of video work by twenty-seven international artists that sought to explore the connections between video, mobility, migratory culture and our contemporary world. The exhibition is part of a wider international touring project, 2move: Ireland, curated by internationally renowned critic Mieke Bal and art historian Miguel Hernández-Navarro (www.doublemovement.org). Brought to Ireland by Niamh-Ann Kelly and Siúin Hanrathan, with the generous support of the Arts Council, the exhibition was hosted between Belfast Exposed Gallery (Northern Ireland) and Solstice Arts Centre (Navan) and expanded to include a number of Irish artists.

Bringing together the work of international artists from different generations and origins, 2move: Ireland explores a contemporary multiple sense of movement, both through the use of the moving image and the exploration of impacts of social movement and migration. A key premise of the exhibition is that, today, our encounter with the traces of migration creates a range of sensory experiences that affect our everyday life and experiences that are themselves ‘aesthetic’. The medium of video not only records these experiences, but also contributes to them.

Migration is a timely and urgent subject for reflection. It is one of the main concerns of our contemporary society and of socio-cultural and artistic thought, although it is usually considered from a pessimistic point of view. The displacement and movement of people, either voluntary or not, is creating complex social realities and relationships. These are frequently controversial, and always challenging to received ideas and assumptions that form the basis for coexistence on which our new mixed societies rest. Composing new experiences that enable understanding of this multifaceted phenomenon can help us to approach and look into it without prejudice.
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