

To become images, to be images

Barbara Sainza Fraga

ABSTRACT: Beginning with the zero production as a procedure of substitution of the camera operator, this text tries to make a path in which appear some magnitudes of the socialized and industrialized images derived from the above mentioned disappearance. Since the idea that turns out our ordinary acts into movie action, it is an intention of this text to develop the idea that inherent in the above mentioned affirmation, is carried out another displacement because of which is caused another conversion, a second faint, that of the spectator: emergent point, field of practical actions of an imaginary dimension -of a life away from life- transferred, dreaming, hallucinated because of which we do not make images, but we become images ourselves, we are images.

KEYWORDS: zero production, unearned increment, to see, hallucination



In two videos directed by Bruce Nauman in 1973, we watch a woman lying on the floor, face up and a man lying on the floor face up and face down.

Recorded in color and sound, the images are presented in a static shot with duration of 60 minutes in loop.

They are almost still; we can slightly and occasionally perceive some respiratory difficulties, movements of the head and hands hardly visible.

The titles *Elke Allowing the Floor to Rise Up Over Her, Face Up and Tony Sinking into the Floor, Face Up and Face Down* refer to the names of the persons we are watching and also to the expressing part which describes the action that is neither included in our field of visibility, nor in the recording possibilities of the camera; in any case the titles are the instructive elements which permit us to “intuit” what is happening.

The static shot of the rooted camera reminds us the first videos recorded by Nauman from 1968 to 1969 in which registers his activity in the studio. The static camera is used in these videos as a neutral witness of the actions he executes in front of it; it is the indifferent and direct presence of what takes place in there. These titles are similar to a proposition which verifies that what we watch is what Nauman does and what we read underneath each image; *Walking in Exaggerated Manner around the Perimeter of a Square* is one of the examples of a circular relation of evidences among action, image and text.

From 1963 to 1964, Warhol produces the *Minimal or Silent films*. In these films Warhol also chose a rooted camera using a recording mechanism in which the intervention of the operator becomes partial and dissolves till it almost disappears. The script's, the cameraman's and the film editor's disappearance is an intentional, gradual process which starts in *Sleep* and culminates in *Empire*.

Virilio locates «this solemn farewell to the man behind the camera» in a chronology in which photography was still supposed to be an objective media, an unimpeachable testimony of life which lets its fact of being to be captured;

«This solemn farewell to the man behind the camera, the complete evaporation of visual subjectivity (...) a sort of permanent pancinema which, unbeknown to us, turns our most ordinary acts into movie action, into new visual material, undaunted, undifferentiated (...) With the interception of sight by the sighting device, a mechanism emerges that no longer has to do with simulation (as in the traditional arts) but with substitution» [Virilio, 1998a, p. 47]

In the beginning, *cold filming* [1] is not only part of a methodology but also a form of a common consensus based on the faith about the “objectiveness of the camera's objectives” and the enthusiasm for the capacities of the technological media;

«The image is no longer solitary (subjective, elitist, artisanal); it is solidary (objective, democratic, industrial). There is no longer a unique image as in art, but the manufacture of countless prints, a vast panoply of an imagery synthetically reproducing the natural restlessness of the spectator's eye» [Virilio, 1998b, p. 52,53]

Objectivity, democracy and industry are connected by a concept of solidarity based on the substitution of subjectivity, ideology and irrationality, also by a massive production of socialized images that as Virilio indicates «turns our most ordinary acts into movie action». In this way the ordinary turns into movie action or as it happens with pop, it transforms «vulgarity into beauty».

From the first interpretations related to the substitution as a form of scientific objectivity, —even Benjamin notices the capacity of the mechanical eye to see -reveal- something we cannot—, the «zero production» travels through the related

arguments to a direct connection with life like Godard and Warhol in a different sense, because Warhol used to record everything; a haircut, kisses, someone sleeping, eating, being.

This is how the Screen-Test were (1964 and 1966) in which he asked people to remain in front of the camera without doing anything –without acting– rather to tolerate the scrutiny of the camera's objective during the three minutes which was the duration of the film.

Cameras are the substitutes prepared as autonomous presences; they are «the sleepwalker's eyes of automatic cameras, sightless vision» defined by Virilio [1998c, p. 50], «vision absolutely submissive, impersonal, kind and tolerant of a stunned observer, immune to boredom» [Tyler, 1967a] [2].

In addition the absence of the script, of the editing and of the operator as a way to get connected with reality with no mediations, also draws the contradictory profile which derives to the intimate relation between cinema and factory as Gonzalo Abril [2003] indicates; «it is not a coincidence that both semantic contexts, cinema and industrial work, refer immediately to the term montage» [3].

Therefore, zero production is insufficient and dysfunctional. This is how Warhol shows that without montage there is also industry, because however, people feel uncomfortable, fascinated, seduced in front of the presence of the camera of the Screen-Test... they pass from the state of human beings to icons and his more than 500 portraits ended up forming part of a film accumulation, a collection of fragments which he would reuse later in other projects under different titles and formats.

So that, there is no disposable image but only «viewing matter recyclable within the film industry itself» [Virilio, 1998d, p.67] and the remains, the leftovers pass to be part of a model of economy in which everything is useful, everything is worth in an uninterrupted and accumulative productivity and at the same time points to the ways of saving through the recovery of everything lost, in which the surplus is the raw material, the available material to be used, virtualities and therefore, possibilities.

«When I see an old Esther Williams movie and a hundred girls are jumping off their swings, I think of what the auditions must have been like and about all the takes where maybe one girl didn't have the nerve to jump when she was supposed to, and I think about her left over on the swing. So that take of the scene was a leftover on the editing-room floor—an out-take—and the girl was probably a leftover at that point—she was probably fired— so the whole scene is much funnier than the real scene where everything went right, and the girl who didn't jump is the star of the out-take». [Warhol, 1975, p. 101]

Warhol's obsession about recording everything, about registering everything that was happening around him announces a system of images beyond the contemporaneity of serial images. This is the reason why he had had a project for a 6-hour TV program, which would be called Nothing Special [or The Nothing Special] and would imitate videos of surveillance cameras, that would consist of nothing but people passing by the camera.

«Warhol had installed a quite intimidatory video set (...) this carriage would travel from here to there in order to film the visitors and the activities in the studio (...) This device was similar to the surveillance cameras of the banks;

immobile, with the objective of the camera still and constantly operating. (...) “Andy”, said Vincent, “would wish that the camera never stopped filming”»[Hanhardt, 1991, p. 84]

On one hand, the static shot seems to try to counteract the idea of montage with an object to register principally the modern *nude life* [Agamben, 1995] [4], but on the other hand, will not stop to be part of the uninterrupted increase of the enormous conglomeration of our flowing, continuous and irregular imaginary.

*

And maybe “in this that exceeds”, in everything that goes beyond of what is shown and stated but also of what is perceived and experimented is where we can meet the most productive, suggestive and conflictive relations with the images.

Because the question lies in; what is expected to happen? Or what are we expected to do in view of a movie with a duration of eight hours in which the only thing we see will be the Empire State Building at night and the sparkles emitted every single moment by the building next to it? or in the view of some infinite videos in which the only thing we see and listen to will be the imperceptible movements and sounds of a man and a woman lying on the floor?

*

Nauman and Warhol share the same assumptions so the duration [5] can produce singular perceptive events, sensitive phenomena of behavior. Time as excess, the repetitive and insistent duration in Nauman is linked to a tensed aspect; on the contrary in Warhol, the physical accumulation of cinematographic time is also a proof of resistance, but operates in accordance to a placid passivity.

Knowing that the images of Elke y Tony had been recorded in a TV set could make us think about the medium, that equally to cinema certain amount of narrativeness is required, in the case of TV an informative and entertaining character is required, but according to Virilio [1997, p. 49]: «This image constantly reproduced is no longer information but a suggestion which the telespectator makes it subjective. Representing it, reproducing it is the nature of autosuggestion. This means that there is something more to say than demonstrating reality».

When what we see and what is stated shows a fundamental deficit, the saturation and insistence of the mentioned inactivity, either repetitive or extensive, indicates the lack of satiety of watching. And it is in this “excess of the same” — or in this “exaggeration” as Warhol would say— and in this time excess generated by the deficit of narrativeness and information where a “surplus of seeing” is produced, of which we cannot tell if it is the image that appropriates it, or if it is the availability of the spectator’s body and mind.

The debt Nauman constructs is related to a promise that he announces, which we will never be able to see it, as well as the instructions given to the participants that he does not reveal them to us either.

JB. —I sense that you do, but I am not sure it is possible to really understand what is happening in that piece.

BN. —There is great danger there and I will explain why. I was working on these exercise in the studio for a while and wanted to make a tape of it, a record, to see if you could see what was happening [Nauman, 1975a, p.176]

Something similar happens in the Silent Film *Blow Job* whose title announces explicit sex and what he shows us is a close-up of an anonymous young boy's head without ever descending from his shoulders and in which we only see his face, looking up, looking down and looking forward, from one side to another.

All the information of what is “apparently” happening is put ahead in the title, however, what occurs, “occurs entirely off-screen”, restricting already what the camera captures and subtracts the event leaving a shadow of doubt and a frustrated expectation for whom who “wanted to see more”.

To see beyond the evidence and duration as a phenomenon can construct suggestion or fascination in the case of Warhol, and in the case of Nauman they situate us before a dilemma linked with tension or frustration, in which «the intention to represent the impossible is nourished by the pointlessness of the same aim» [Hoffmann, 2003, p. 57] —like in the double exposure photograph *Failing to levitate in the studio* of 1966—.

So it is not a matter of representation but a matter of functioning durations, situations, events, forces, emotions, tensions, rhythms and behaviors, because the ongoing visual accumulation has an impact on the varied spectrum that can produce by saturation, by its excesses and debts; Keep looking what for? Keep doing what for?

And this way of permuting the time of projection is also a possible way of permuting our own perception, we could talk about a conflict among what is registered, what we see and we what we perceive, even between the option to stay or to leave; the very extensive time of “nothing in particular” —no action, neither narration, nor peaks, no climax—, this time is the duration of some superficial films where we can leave and do not come back, come back, stay, sleep.... and everything will continue to be more or less the same; a minimum change of position, a reflection, a sparkle, a little movement or light respiration.

«Its attitude of I don't give a damn, its impassive and obstinate imperturbability on screen, seem to reject or to absorb everything that is thrown to them.» [Mekas, 1970, p. 314]

To talk about images as holders of an attitude, of a specific autonomy, as well as about a “capacity of absorption”, permits us to think about the possibility to consider what sort of relationship we establish with them, despite its impassivity or absence of relation with what we are supposed to see. We could think of a way of masochism shaped by a restricted vision field, a limited action and an attention which is limited to wait, but the second part of this disposition is interpreted by Parker Tyler as the base of the modern temperament away from unpleasant occupations.



«The very peacefulness of just watching a man eat a mushroom (even though, as if on purpose, he takes forty-five minutes to bite, masticate, and swallow it all) has its exclusive charm: an exclusive charm that makes it easy for the watcher to feel both chic and peaceful. What I mean is that the idea of peace is directly related to the ultrapassivity of the cinephile relaxed and predetermined». [Tyler, 1967b, p. 327]

Tyler describes really well the situations that Warhol achieves to configure based on the traditional cinephile, where ultrapassivity, charm, chicness, peacefulness, peace... make visible the permutation of «vulgarity into beauty» and one step beyond, where the suggestion describes the excellent pop spectator; carefree and flipped out «like a rabbit charmed by a snake» [Tyler, 1967c, p. 327]

The permutative character of an imaginary emplacement configured by the instruction that Nauman gives to Tony and Elke, is produced by an effectiveness related also to a way of resistance, in this case not produced by the pop peace and elegance but is produced by a hard exercise of concentration and attention, by a procedure of dreaming [6] from which images, objects, paths and sensitivities of a fine body are elaborated.

Because the carefree, charming, chic and peaceful of pop, or the frustration, the uselessness, the limiting and difficult in Nauman, are neither looks nor representations, but visions, states of being, behaviors, lines of forces, fine perceptions, psychic life, mental images.

The proof of the power of an artist and of his idea resides in his ability to create a mental situation that could, at least in the conscience of the participants, modify the substance to the point that they themselves physiologically and psychologically experiment their "projection".

Bruce Nauman

There is not any image that is not at the same time a mental image, the episode of a psychic life.

Jose Luis Brea

To derive from the spheres of sense or from the information towards the parameters of fascination and attraction of the cinematographic and television images, —magnetic, blinding, hypnotic— permits us to accede to an imaginary dimension of «autoimpregnation without end» as Parker Tyler [1967d] says, of a transfer and «lacanian variegation» [7].

The time-images of Warhol have vehicular capacities which permit us to go through them; like a node they are part of those structures of interconnection that in fact the only thing they do is “sidestep us through” indicating to a virtual functioning of the images. Nauman also does this when he points out the insufficiency not only of the mechanism of recording but also of our senses to perceive what is “really” taking place in that TV set.

«It made the whole exercise what it turned out to be. It became extremely tense: the guy who was trying to sink into the floor started to choke, and almost got the dry heaves. I got pretty scared, and didn't know what to do. I didn't know if I should “wake him up” or what, or if he was kind of sleepwalking. I didn't know if he was physically ill, or if he was really gasping and choking. He finally sat up and kind of controlled himself and we talked about it. The tape was running but unfortunately the microphone did not pick it up, but I wish it had because it was really beautiful -he was really scared. He said, “I just tried to do it too fast, and I was afraid I couldn't get out”. What had happened was that as his chest began to sink through the floor, it was filled up and he just couldn't breathe anymore, so he started to... to choke. We started to kind of talk it out. We had been watching his hand and it turned out that we were watching the wrong hand. He was thinking about the right one and we were watching the left one, but he said, “I was afraid to move my hand, because I thought if I moved it some of the molecules would stay there and I would lose it -it would come all apart and I couldn't get it out”. Interestingly, the night before, the same thing had happened to the girl in the other tape. She broke out into an incredible sweat, and she couldn't breathe. It was pretty scary. It was, first of all, amazing that someone else could do this exercise, that they could even get into it. It was such an intense experience that it was really frightening for both of them to do. As nearly as I can tell, the tapes don't show any of that, which I thought was also interesting». [Nauman, 1975b, p.177]

Images are produced out of frame, their functions and effects do not depend on the mediums which support them not even on their visibility, but they depend on matters such as the time or the instructions that are addressed to the participants, and their effects configure behaviors, imaginaries, those «episodes of a psychic life» [8] [Brea, 2007].

The above mentioned virtual character is a potential character that as Aristotle theorized, had nothing to do with updating, neither with presence as the ultimate basis of art, but with the possibility that this can happen or not, because its presence and function are only possibilities. This virtual character is a character of availability and utility that in Greece was supposed to be part of the field of technical handmade production which was never poetic. However, in this case the relation precisely consists of a mutual availability because of which we give up and we are beside ourselves, images and spectators or participants who are not maintained on the basis of showing and seeing, but are maintained on a basis of seeing and be seen.

It works like this, if we stay, if we follow it, we accept the rules. Because what we consider to be fascination, it is a problem of transfer in which we give up a property or a right. Because to transfer means to deliver a part of one's self and in the same way that Elke and Tony are transferred and projected by the instructions of Nauman, in the Minimal Films the effect is found in the availability to the projection's duration.

This is how the unidirectional relation between emitter and receiver ends up disappearing in the same way as its producer previously faded. The link between image and spectator is configured according to vehicular relations, images pass us through and we pass through them in a way that what used to separate us both in polarities turns out to be the dimension of time and behavior, the magnitude of an interpolated tension, of a vibrant relation which produces sensitive states.

Just as Warhol achieves this effect, Nauman inscribes his images in different ranges and considers the possibility to generate them according to the parameters of an image, which like a matryoska, contains a flow of time-images constituted as an instruction that does not depend on its visibility but on its capacity to create this «mental situation, this projection from which we can experiment by modifying physiologically and psychologically the substance.» [Nauman, 1975c, p. 175].

All the above is in the same semantic camp, where “fascination” is related to “alienation” and to a way of transfer. Going through images can be one of the functions because of which both image and spectator disappear in the emergence of an intensive magnitude, because of which we project instructions to construct a dynamic mental space where we become images, where we permute towards a fine perceptiveness up to the point of modifying even the material.

To surrender passively ourselves to Warhol or tensionally to Nauman, is similar to the functionality of the extensive, silent and minimal images of the first one and the concentrated, attentive and difficult images of the second one, the functionality mentioned generates a performative space where virtuality becomes act, as Nauman affirms, «certain degree of mental activity is linked with a certain degree of perceptible activity». [Schimmel, 1993, p. 56].

And in this “not patent perceptiveness” where the conflict of “talking to create the situation that is named” is produced, because, are we able as spectators of a man’s and a woman’s image lying on the floor, to reconstruct the sinking of the bodies in the floor only by its statement and in this way to establish a real condition, to legitimate an identity and a particular subjectivity? Or is Nauman who alludes to a position in which the spectator disappears in this conflict in order to propose forms of an instructed participation, the ways to do image and to become image?

As proofs of resistance both Warhol and Nauman have in common a dimension that is developed by systematizing tedium; through passivity or difficulty they both indicate to an irritating process which derives to a hidden dimension that the obstination of “continuing to look” can produce; hallucination, suspension, flotation... as in the sequence of *Arrebato* [Rapture, 1979] in which Pedro says to José Sirgado: «— Tell me, how much time could you have spent looking at this picture card? Do you remember?... And at this one?... And at this border?... And at this page?... Years, centuries... All day long! Impossible to know, you were in plain flight... ecstasy... spaced up in a plain pause...! RAPTURED! LOOK!» *All paragraphs of the Arrebato’s script [Arrebato. Guión cinematográfico de Iván Zulueta], were translated by the writer from the original text in spanish to english*

Time in Warhol is also a narcotic time (infantile and fascinated), empty of events, where zero production can lead us to the disappearance of the polarities between the operator of the camera and what is recorded, between what is recorded and what is edited, between what is edited and what is projected, between what is projected and the spectators. By eliminating production, it seemed that the great objective to register life just as it is would have been accomplished, however Parker Tyler asserts for once more

«Those formal restrictions superexploited by Warhol's original style (soporific time) involve an almost puritan distancing from life; the fabulous and unexpressing dream of reality (...) Is it the "behavior" of the hallucinated subjects that has always been the secret reason for Warhol? Has he always intuited the psychological tension between torpor and drugs, till he decided to manipulate them?

Psychologically, it is possible that sober people get the physiological principle contained in drugs' consume and transfer their consequences in terms of visual perceptions to a movie objectively disposed as a trip. Because of that, the primitive films of Warhol could operate as dialectical oppositions, demonstrating that the outrageously boring and trivial reclaims the proper formula of the spectator's conversion» [Tyler, 1967e, p. 332]

In Nauman's images the issue on which is paid attention is also out of screen; Nauman elaborates the conditions of an exercise in which he questions attention and concentration, he argues: «—The problem was to make the exercise take up a full hour -which I had never been able to do. (I was able to concentrate for maybe fifteen to twenty minutes at the most; then you simply find out that you are not thinking about it, or you become distracted)». [Nauman, 1975d, p.176]

To stop interior dialogue, mental fluctuation, to go over the initial, irritating difficulty to «get into it», to «insert you in a function whose exercise seizes you» [Lacan, 1978] to reach the configuration of a hallucinated, away from life, beside oneself, stay out of a life, dreaming, transferred, converted, a life given up to the promise through the appearance of two persons lying on the floor, as if they were sleeping, like absents, something really intense is happening, an imaginary state.

In the movie of *Arrebato* something similar happens also, when the camera's objective stops recording everything to be converted to a look which is a trip, and we become an image which permits us or makes us to disappear: it begins with a red frame that foretells the film will end with red frames and ends with a whole film of red frames. Warhol uses a different option: the «bip» or «stroboscopic cut» which in the middle of the dreaming trip makes a warning: they are only images, we are only images.

It is well-known the link that Iván Zulueta establishes between the approach and the experimented forms of the New York's underground movement and Nouvelle Vague, *Arrebato* summarizes in its own script many of the points of view of Virilio about the disappearance of the man behind the camera — «Pedro takes off his coat (or not?) and ritualizes his ultimate delivery, with a long look of farewell to the movie camera included» [9]— , the spectator's disappearance as a result of the emergence of the devices' autonomy — «... The camera..., the film..., the camera's objectives!...They didn't refuse to pick up anything...They were precisely the authors of what was happening» [10]— , the conversion of the producer into an actor, of the spectator into an image — «...although unexpectedly and I refer to the fact that I wasn't the videographer, nor the spectator...I was the actor» [11]— , the childhood or the narcotic character of the images — «...I don't remember anything of what I dreamed of, but I know that I did it... when I woke up that night, I knew it had happened again...I was feeling that kind of ...abandonment» [12]— or — «...Neither was I who had chosen the theme to film, nor was I ecstasised at all by watching me to sleep in the projection...Pleasure was on the other side... and I was feeling so good that I stayed for four days more as if it was for ten minutes» [13]—

In many ways *Arrebato*'s script resumes the derivations from which zero production makes disappear to all the traditional agents of production and the reception of the images traveling through the register of the nude life — «...if it hadn't

been for you, I would be still filming my aunt knitting...»— , the devices' life and images that reveal an nearly biological autonomy with that "click-click-click" which is repeated without stopping in the script, till that surrender, that conversion, that definite abandonment of doing in order to let oneself to become image.



Isn't it a fact that it is no longer life what is left to the image to capture, but it is the image which is converted into an object of nude life?

Because the disappearance of the realization permits us to become image at any moment, even unconsciously, we are a potential image, we are "live and direct" images, the binary numeral system of the automatic camera. Because its virtual character and its up to the moment support, which are screens, makes us permanently to be a potential image, a virtuality that at any moment can be updated and after a while can turn to a lethargic state of possibility in which as images that we are, we can plunge ourselves into a new updating.

(Translated by Maria Niki Niraki)

BIBLIOGRAFÍA

- Abril, G. (2003). «Cortar y pegar. La fragmentación visual en los orígenes del texto informativo», Cátedra, Madrid
- Agamben, G. (1998). «Homo sacer. El poder soberano y la nuda vida», Pre-Textos, Valencia
- Brea, J. L. (2007). «Cultura_RAM mutaciones de la cultura en la era de su distribución electrónica», Editorial Gedisa, Barcelona, también en http://www.joseluisbrea.net/ediciones_cc/c_ram.pdf
- Butterfield, J. (1975). «Bruce Nauman: The center of yourself» in Janet Kraynak, (Ed.), (2003) «Please pay attention please: Bruce Nauman's Words, Writings and interviews», The Mit Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge
- Castaneda, C. (1993). «El arte de ensoñar», Seix Barral, S.A., Barcelona
- Hanhardt, J. G. (1991). «Andy Warhol: vídeo y televisión» en Callie Angell, (Ed.), (1991) «Andy Warhol: vídeo y televisión», Whitney Museum of American Art, New York
- Hoffmann, C., (2003). «Think-Thank» in «Bruce Nauman. Theaters of Experience», Deutsche Guggenheim, [31.10.2003 - 18.1. 2004] Guggenheim Museum Publications, New York
- Mekas, J. (1970). «Apuntes tras un repaso a las películas de Warhol» en Callie Angell, (Ed.), (1991) «Andy Warhol:

vídeo y televisión», Whitney Museum of American Art, New York

- Sarikartal, Ç. (2005). «Shock, mirada y mimesis: la posibilidad de un enfoque performativo sobre la visualidad» [Primera Parte. El cambio de paradigma en los estudios de la historia del arte y estética] en José Luis Brea, (Ed.), «Estudios Visuales. La epistemología de la visualidad en la era de la globalización», Estudios visuales I, Madrid, Akal
- Schimmel, P. (1993). «Pon atención» en Bruce Nauman, catálogo MNCARS, [Madrid, 30 noviembre de 1993 - 21 de febrero de 1994], exposición organizada por el Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota
- Sharp, W. (1971). «Bruce Nauman», in Janet Kraynak, (ed.), (2003) «Please pay attention please: Bruce Nauman's Words, Writings and interviews», The Mit Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge
- Tyler, P. (1967). «Dragtime and Drugtime or, Film á la Warhol», en Callie Angell, (Ed.), (1991) «Andy Warhol: vídeo y televisión», Whitney Museum of American Art, New York
- Virilio, P. (1998). «La máquina de visión», cap. Candorosa cámara, Madrid, Ediciones Cátedra.
- Virilio, P. (1997). «El cibernmundo, la política de lo peor. Entrevista con Philippe Petit», Madrid, Ediciones Cátedra.
- Warhol, A. (2008). «Mi filosofía de A a B y de B a A», Barcelona, Ediciones Tusquets.
- Zulueta, I. (2002). «Arrebato. Guión cinematográfico de Iván Zulueta», Madrid, Ocho y Medio, Libros de cine.

Footnotes

[1] Rosellini, Roberto in Virilio, extracted of «*Fragments d'une autobiographie*», París, Ramsay, 1987. p. 69

[2] All paragraphs of the catalogue Andy Warhol's Video & Television, were translated by the writer from the original text in spanish to english

[3] This paragraph were translated by the writer from the original text in spanish to english

[4] *Nude life* is a concept developed by G. Agamben in which he questions the character of biopolitics as the political management of a life devoid of any qualities(...) The fundamental contribution of the sovereign power is the production of a nude life like the original political element and as a threshold of joint between nature and culture, *zoé* y *bios* (...)

[5] Repetition and duration were in the decade of the 60s two elements with which, musicians such as John Cage, Terry Riley, La Monte Young, Philip, Glass, Steve Reich, Meredith Monk, etc. experimented to construct singular perceptive events; the duration generated on the basis of repetition was achieving sensitive phenomena as those of flotation, suspension, etc

[6] Carlos Castaneda treats the matter of dreaming like a field of practical actions, as a procedure of don Juan Matus's lessons, an indian yaqui. Here follow some extracts that clarify some of the questions raised by Bruce Nauman in «*Elke Allowing the Floor to Rise Up Over Her, Face Up*» and «*Tony Sinking into the Floor, Face Up and Face Down*»:

(...) *Dreaming can only be experienced. Dreaming is not just having dreams; neither is it daydreaming or wishing or imagining. Through dreaming we can perceive other worlds, which we can certainly describe, but we can't describe what makes us perceive them. Yet we can feel how dreaming opens up those other realms. Dreaming seems to be a sensation-a process in our bodies, awareness in our minds (...)*

(...) *Sorcerers view dreaming as an extremely sophisticated art," he said, "the art of displacing the assemblage point at will from its habitual position in order to enhance and enlarge the scope of what can be perceived."*(...)

(...) *As a preamble to his first lesson in dreaming, don Juan talked about the second attention as a progression: beginning as an idea that comes to us more like a curiosity than an actual possibility; turning into something that can only be felt, as a sensation is felt; and finally evolving into a state of being, or a realm of practicalities, or a preeminent force that opens for us worlds beyond our wildest fantasies (...)*

(...) *Intent or intending is something very difficult to talk about. I or anyone else would sound idiotic trying to explain it. Bear that in mind when you hear what I have to say next: sorcerers intend anything they set themselves to intend, simply by intending it (...)*

This is related to Nauman's indications about the difficulty of the exercise, because you can get easily distracted and about the difficulty in "getting into it" always related to that "Fail again, fail better" Beckett said.

[7] Lacan in Çetin Sarikartal (...) *According to Callois, Lacan refers to the camouflage as an essential aspect of mimetism to describe the process because of which the subject places itself in the picture as a spot. Lacan underlines that "It is not a question of putting oneself in accordance with the background, but in accordance with a variegated background, to be variegated" similar to the warlike tactics/ imitating means" to insert you in a function whose exercise seizes you"*(...)

[8] This paragraph were translated by the writer from the original text in spanish to english

[9] «Arrebato. Guión cinematográfico de Iván Zulueta», op. cit.: SEC. 38 / APT. PEDRO/ INT./ DAY, p. 97

[10] Ibid.: SEC. 26 / APT. PEDRO/ INT./ DAWN. CASSETTE VOICE(OFF), p. 89

[11] Ibid.: SEC. 22/ APT. PEDRO/ INT./ DAY and NIGHT. CASSETTE VOICE (OFF), p. 80

[12] Ibid.: SEC. 22/ APT. PEDRO/ INT./ DAY and NIGHT. CASSETTE VOICE (OFF), p. 79

[13] Ibid.: SEC. 24/ APT. PEDRO/ INT./ DAY and NIGHT. CASSETTE VOICE (OFF), p. 81