CHAPTER 1

Introduction

to say you will remember is to say you will not forget. (Ricoeur 2004, 87)

The departure point for this book is the phenomenal rise of the moving image in contemporary art since the early 1990s. Featuring moving image installations by Chantal Ackerman, Stan Douglas, Steve McQueen, Runa Islam, Mark Leckey, Jaki Irvine and others, it considers the role of memory in their work, a preoccupation which is a defining characteristic of the twentieth-century fin-de-siècle. The moving image is at the centre of contemporary art practices that mobilize memory in relation to contested histories and the disjunctive temporalities of globalized capitalism. What is at stake in these practices is the balance between remembering and forgetting and the innovative ways in which artists tackle the politics of memory. The selected artists are of a generation who have lived through the transition from analogue to digital and the increased mediatization of memory in media technologies. The emergent intermedial aesthetics of their artworks foreground the memory of analogue media in digital media. While artists’ moving image has been largely theorized in relation to cinema, this study situates it in the context of digitalization meaning digital technologies and their infrastructures such as the increased availability of personal computers, software, the World Wide Web and the internet from the 1990s onwards.¹ This consideration of moving image art against a background of technological change is not undertaken in a spirit of techno-determinism but with
the aim of analyzing how artists have drawn on the techno-aesthetics of moving image media to express memory. The emphasis here is on work featuring an intermedial aesthetics of film, analogue video and digital media, rather than the exclusive cultivation of film by artists of whom Tacita Dean would be the leading example. While film undoubtedly possesses its own unique texture and relationship to both recorded indexical time and cinema, analogue video and digital media equally bring other temporalities such as instantaneity, televisual networks and modular asynchronicity into play. The technical and cultural interrelationships between media are the ground from which the selected moving image artworks harness the force of memory. The hybrid, constantly evolving intermediality of contemporary artists’ moving image underscores the fact that their mnemonic preoccupations are not reductive exercises in retrospective nostalgia or cinephilia but active repositionings of the past in relation to the present and future as memory intersects with history and personal experience meets collective experience.

Organized around five overlapping modes of ‘critical nostalgia’, ‘database narrative’, the ‘echo-chamber’, ‘documentary fiction’ and ‘mediatized memories’, which correlate to the individual artists’ practices, this study aims to show how the selected works bring viewers into encounters with the agency of memory. My discussion draws on Gilles Deleuze’s philosophy of the ‘time-image’ in exploring the capacity of the moving image to disclose the potential of memory as a circuit between the actual present and the virtual past and future (Deleuze 2005). Each mode highlights different ways in which memory is mediated in moving image media and how these technologies of time modulate our understanding of time and memory. The first mode of ‘critical nostalgia’ featuring work by Chantal Akerman and Stan Douglas deals with the conundrum of memory as an injunction not to forget but also raising the question of how to live with the ghosts of the past. Their very different artworks were each made in response to the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the breakup of the Eastern Bloc. These historical upheavals alongside the rapid development of computerized information technology contribute to the phenomenon of the ‘memory boom’ in the 1980s and 1990s and an attendant anxiety in relation to memory, forgetting and the temporalities of postmodernity as post-communist discourse proclaims a vaunted ‘end of history’. Ackerman’s and Douglas’s installations along with the other artworks presented in this book participate in the significance of memory as a subjective practice that recalls the past through
temporal overlaps and reverberances in the present. These temporal over-
laps are constituted in intermedial combinations where digital formats
intersect with older media, such as Douglas’s recombinant ‘database
narratives’ and the documentary fictions of Pierre Huyghe and others.
The last mode ‘mediatized memories’ looks at moving image works by
Leckey, Irvine, James Richards and Elizabeth Price in relation to changing
models of memory in a digital era. As artists engage with the mediatiza-
tion of memory, they also contribute to memory culture, the object of
the burgeoning and interdisciplinary field of memory studies.

**Memory Culture**

The notion of memory culture originates in Maurice Halbwachs’s prewar
study of social frameworks where individuals absorb history in school and
from information passed down by older generations, gradually partici-
pating in what he calls a ‘collective memory’ (Halbwachs 1992). Memory
culture can thus be understood in terms of three dimensions, the material,
the social and the mental, in which different aspects of memory intersect
and constitute ‘cultural memory’ (Erll 2011, 102). However, the Second
World War and the Holocaust challenge the stability of Halbwachs’s social
frameworks and shared memory, affecting memory culture across the
nation states of postwar Europe and contributing to the formation of
a ‘global memory’. Memory studies have expanded in conjunction with
what Andreas Huyssen describes as a cultural ‘obsession with memory’
and a ‘crisis of temporality’ (Huyssen 1995, 6). Writing in the mid 1990s,
Huyssen finds a ‘mnemonic culture’ that is symptomatic of the need for
new forms of temporal orientation in the face of accelerated computer
technology, and the instant availability of information. He perceives a
cultural fear of amnesia that paradoxically arises alongside the ‘waning
of history and historical consciousness’ and the expansion of data storage
(Huyssen 1995, 9). In Germany, as Huyssen notes, the process of reuni-
fication brought up diverse views on the historical past and reactions to
the unstable effects of socio-economic change just as the generational
memory of Nazism and the Second World War began to fade away in the
1990s.

The French historian Pierre Nora also identifies a shift in the relation-
ship between collective memory and history, contributing to what, in his
view, has become a culture of commemoration that reduces history to a
series of heritage sites. In a major study conducted between 1984 and
1992, Nora differentiated the emergence of ‘les lieux de mémoire’ (places
of memory), such as sites, material objects and concepts in which traces of memory reside, from ‘milieux de mémoire’ (environments of memory) rooted in rural traditions and social structures of school, church and family (Nora 1989). Stating that: ‘we speak so much of memory because there is so little of it left’, Nora finds that the traditional cohesive relationship between past and future has been displaced into ‘indirect’ memory in the form of accumulated archival material (Nora 1989, 7, 13). Yet Nora’s pessimism is countered by Huyssen who finds new paradigms of memory in the aftermath of technological and historical upheavals. Despite the ‘synchronicity’ of networked technological systems, he asserts that the actual experience of change is ‘non-synchronous’:

rather than moving together, if at different paces, into the future, we have accumulated so many non-synchronicities in our present that a very hybrid structure of temporality seems to be emerging, one that has clearly moved beyond the parameters of two or more centuries of European-American modernity. (Huyssen 1995, 8)

In these circumstances, Huyssen emphasizes that the act of memory is a creative forging of the past constituted in relation to the present in contradistinction to the traditional function of the archive as a repository for storage and retrieval (Huyssen 1995, 3).

Replacing what Jean-François Lyotard styles as the ‘grand narratives’ of history, the ‘memory boom’ inaugurates a multiplicity of ‘little narratives’ in which memory is privileged as a different way of narrating the past (Lyotard 1984). The emphasis on memory marks the ways in which memory and history are interrelated and also distinct. History denotes both what has happened and quasi-scientific accounts of past events while memory is affective, subjective and virtual. Yet without memory there is no history as historiography depends on the transmission of memory in documents and testimony. The distinction between memory and history can be defined in terms of ‘different forms of knowing’ and ‘different concepts of temporality’ (Arnold-de Simine 2013, 19). Memory, by definition is selective and ambivalent, as significant as much for what it occludes as what it foregrounds. In memory studies, the emphasis shifts from the truth status of historical accounts to an interest in what motivates differing narratives and versions of events.

At issue throughout the consideration of memory in this book is what the historian Reinhart Koselleck defines as the ‘experience of history’ and
‘historical time’. Koselleck dates the conceptualization of history as a ‘collective singular’ to the beginnings of the modern era in the late eighteenth century. Understood as a ‘collective singular’ history is a universalizing force gathering together individual and collective memory with historical events. In contrast to pre-modern eras where it was not expected that the future would be vastly different to the past, in modernity the relationship between past, present and future shifts to an opening up of the future in the name of progress. The modern temporalization of history is driven by concepts like acceleration and delay. Koselleck specifies ‘historical time’ as the balance between a ‘space of experience’ and a ‘horizon of expectation’ where experience is the ‘present past whose events have been incorporated and remembered’ and expectation is ‘the future made present’ (Koselleck 2004, 259). If modernity focuses on the present and future, by implication rendering the past inferior, post-modernity features an asynchronous experience of time as technological development advances while the understanding of history as a ‘collective singular’ comes under pressure. The experience of ‘time-space compression’ in postmodernity is distinguished by the disjunctive gaps between accelerated neoliberal globalized capitalism and the temporalities of local places (Harvey 1989, 240). It is in these gaps that contemporary artists explore historical time through the multiple temporalities of the moving image.

Aftermath
A difficulty with historical time is evident within the discourses of contemporary art as temporal categories such as the modern, the postmodern and the avant-garde become exhausted. Although it has superceded the postmodern as a descriptor of advanced art, the ‘contemporary’ is in many ways as deceptive and polyvalent a term as the postmodern. 2 Both the contemporary and the postmodern pose the question of the temporalities of art and the relationship of current art to art of the past. 3 The increase in moving image practices with their uniquely tempo-spatial axes during the 1990s and 2000s is symptomatic of the need for art to re-establish temporal and historical co-ordinates after the so-called ‘end of art’ and Hegelian history (Danto 1997). As Hal Foster expresses it, writing in 2002: ‘contemporary art no longer feels “contemporary”’ meaning that contemporary art no longer seems to have a sense of its own historicity as the dialectical relationships between the historical avant-gardes and the
postwar neo-avant-gardes have come to an end along with the implosion of postmodernism as a critical framework (Foster 2002, 124–25). Within this apparently posthistorical condition of ‘aftermath’, Foster finds a set of overlapping strategies in contemporary art: the ‘traumatic’, the ‘spectral’, the ‘nonsynchronous’ and the ‘incongruent’ which ‘restore a mnemonic dimension to contemporary art’ (Foster 2002, 130). The traumatic here refers to experiences which are not assimilated and are returned to belatedly while the spectral invokes Jacques Derrida’s ‘hauntology’, a meditation on how ghostly entities such as Marxist thought persist and return (Derrida 1994). As Foster’s categories imply, contemporary art participates in a wider cultural turn in which historical experiences are dealt with through processes of mourning and haunting associated with memory. Film’s status as an outmoded medium is key to the ‘nonsynchronous’ with Foster comparing contemporary artists’ interest in early cinema to the fascination the outmoded held for the Surrealists and Walter Benjamin (Foster 2002, 138–39). However, I would argue that the ‘mnemonic dimension’ of contemporary art derives not only from film’s ‘nonsynchronous’ status but as it continues to exist in a spectral afterlife within the reconfigured and intermedial aesthetics of contemporary moving image art.

Intermediality

Digitalization is often associated with media convergence but as outlined in this study, it has actually engendered an intermedial aesthetics as hybrid combinations of film, video and software applications have developed in artists’ moving image. Intermediality is understood here as the diverse relations between specific media and their historical and critical contexts. As recent studies in intermediality have shown, the question of what constitutes a medium is not simply its technological or physical characteristics but is also related to the way a medium is perceived and thought of over time (Pethö 2011; Houwen 2017; Kim 2016). This book takes the view that media are dynamic and evolving combinations of materials, conventions and technical bases. It focuses primarily on the intermedial aesthetics involved in the remediation of film with video within artists’ moving image installations. In the intermedial exchange between film and video both analogue and digital, a mnemonic dimension emerges as film is remembered through video and digitalization affects cultural memory. These exchanges are unique to the transitionary period of the 1990s and 2000s as a chiasmic crossing of film and video occurs on the levels of
aesthetics and technology. Within this process the temporalities associated with film and video are reconfigured. The declining status of film as an incipient outmoded media is a key factor within the mnemonic aesthetics of the 1990s with film becoming a gateway to the past as the centenary of cinema precipitates a reflection on the simultaneous passing of film with the ascendance of digital imaging. In the intermedial aesthetics of film and video the ‘ruins’ of film coexist within the reconstructions of digital video, bringing different mediatized temporalities together.

The relatively recent use of the term ‘moving image’ within art criticism as a descriptor for artist’s video and film installations has emerged in the aftermath of the technological upheavals of the 1990s. Within film studies by contrast, the moving image is not a recent term and denotes the origins of cinema in scientific as well as artistic experiment. In the art world, the category of moving image is indicative of the ways in which digital technologies have superseded and modified older technologies of analogue film and analogue video giving rise to hybrid combinations of media. The moving image is a catch-all term that both indicates and obscures the diverse media formats that can be involved in producing moving image artworks. On the one hand, the term moving image represents a liberating alternative to the historical and political legacies associated with the traditions of artists’ film and video. On the other hand, the term can mask and occlude the nuances of the intermedial aesthetics articulated in different artworks. Nonetheless, the concept of moving image keeps at the forefront the idea that artists’ moving image engages with the unique status of the moving image as a technology that is not solely defined in relation to cinema but is also involved in science, the military–industrial complex, communications and media industries.

It is worth noting that artists’ film and video has been relatively under theorized and peripheral to the dominant historical accounts of twentieth-century art. Over the 1990s, artists’ moving image installations have moved from the margins to the centre of art practice with a corresponding transformation of the discursive field of artists’ film and video and a renewed attention to their histories. It should also be acknowledged that the rise of artists’ film and video in the 1990s has led to a unique economy around the funding and distribution of these works. In contrast to artist led organizations like the London Filmmakers Co-operative (founded in 1966) and Anthology Film Archives (founded in 1970) which historically took an ideologically low budget, artisanal approach to the production and distribution of artists’ film, the
involvement of galleries, museums and biennials in commissioning and funding artists’ moving images has created a vastly different production model. Artists’ films are typically produced as limited editions and access to viewing copies is strictly guarded. Recognizing this economy, LUX, the current agency that supports and promotes artists’ moving image in the UK now distributes artists’ film and video in liaison with the gallery system through ‘artists’ copies’ of films, online viewing and rental. The art world economy of artists’ moving image paradoxically confers them with an auratic scarcity in contrast to the reproducibility and availability of films made for cinema. Thus the late film curator and artist Ian White states that on the one hand the reproducibility of film and video poses new questions for museums in relation to their traditional role as custodians of the values of ‘originality, authenticity and presence’ while on the other hand the museum becomes: ‘perversely, where film and video as potentially infinitely reproducible objects make these same terms manifest in moving-images considered as works of art’ (Sperlinger and White 2008, 13–14). The moving image installations discussed in this book exist in a more problematic space than traditional artworks. After their initial exhibition they pass into storage and in order to be re-experienced they have to be reconstituted as installations or viewed in reduced form as on-screen films. Therefore in a real sense they exist in a quasi-invisible world of remembered exhibitions and documentation and are only intermittently on view in curated selections from museums and private collections.

The restricted access to artists’ film and video which results from the limited edition economy in which they circulate has both advantages and disadvantages for artists and their audiences. Limited editions allow artists’ film and video to operate within the art world economy which has always been based on scarcity and collectors, both private and public in contrast to the mass market economy of cinema. Outside the gallery system, artists’ film and video would remain in an underground sphere, perhaps in principle freely accessible to all as in the non-commodified experimental film practices of the 1960s and 1970s but in reality existing with scant funding and less visible in public museum collections. It is also important to remember that moving image installations have to be experienced through embodied spectatorship and are not primarily made for cinema or DVD distribution. As such they are positioned in an anomalous relationship to today’s media world where consumers are given the impression that everything can be accessed on a variety of platforms. Moving image installations, by their very nature, draw attention to the
fact that some experiences cannot be easily represented and distributed as audiovisual ‘product’. The restricted access to artists’ moving image arguably allows artists to retain some control over the conditions in which their work is shown and experienced. Nonetheless the limited distribution of artists’ films raises serious issues of access from the point of view of scholarship and the teaching of artists’ moving image which regularly surface in discussions of these works.7

As artists’ moving image moves between the venues and the economies of both museum spaces and cinema auditoriums a cultural interface occurs between the ‘white cube’ spaces of museums and galleries and the darkness of the cinema auditorium. There is an inherent irony in the fact that many moving image installations reflect on the collective experience of cinema from within the very different conditions of reception in the gallery and museum. Yet within the embodied spaces of installation, artists’ moving image generates new ways of reflecting on both cinema and the mnemonic qualities of the moving image. The artworks that I discuss exist within the circuit of exhibitions, biennials and major survey shows that constitute the North American and European art world. I focus on artists who led the expansion of moving image installations in museum and gallery spaces as opposed to other public sites and situations. The discussion takes in significant international exhibitions where many of these works were first exhibited, sometimes alongside each other. These include ‘Documenta 10’ (1997), ‘Documenta 11’ (2002), the fifty-first ‘Venice Biennale’ (2005) and numerous survey exhibitions on the relationship between art and cinema.

From a theoretical perspective, this study addresses the interstitial position of artists’ moving image between the discursive frameworks of art criticism and screen studies. It draws on media theory which values the material histories and the temporalities peculiar to technological media in order to enrich the discussion of moving image practices that stretch the terminology and boundaries of traditional art history and criticism. Thus, Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin’s theory of ‘remediation’ and Lev Manovich’s theorization of ‘new media’ and ‘softwarization’ are brought to bear on the intermedial aesthetics of artists’ moving image installations (Bolter and Grusin 1999; Manovich 2013). In pursuing two axes of investigation, the intermedial and the mnemonic, the book also creates its own readjusted ‘memory’ of the divergent genealogies of artists’ film and video. From a retrospective viewpoint, at the turn of the twenty-first century, the emphasis on ‘presentness’ within modernist avant-garde
film is made visible through the emphasis on ‘pastness’ in contemporary moving image.Valorized in modernist discourse as a technology of the new, film has become a deeply mnemonic medium in which the history of cinema is intertwined with major historical events, while video, television and radio are equally indexed to history. Part of the argument of this book is that contemporary moving image art uncovers resonances between itself and the historical avant-gardes as well as the avant-gardes of the 1960s and 1970s in its mnemonic trajectories.

The theoretical and historical frameworks to the themes of memory and intermediality in artists’ moving image are established in Chapter 2. It begins by surveying the role of the moving image as a media of memory and reflecting on the key concepts of Deleuze’s ‘time-image’ and Henri Bergson’s virtual memory which inform the discussion of artists’ moving image (Bergson 1991; Deleuze 2005). Intermediality is defined in relation to the theory and practice of artists’ moving image and the diverse genealogies of artists’ film and video. The following chapters present the five modes of moving image installations that emerge from the selected artists’ investigations of memory: ‘critical nostalgia’, ‘database narrative’, the ‘echo-chamber’, ‘documentary fiction’ and ‘mediatized memories’. Within each chapter, the singularity of the artworks forms the basis of a journey into different dimensions of memory and specific historical and sociopolitical contexts.

The third chapter’s theme of ‘critical nostalgia’ is developed from Svetlana Boym’s distinction between reflective and recuperative nostalgia (Boym 2001). Boym defines nostalgia as an impossible and thwarted longing to bring incommensurable temporalities together, often occurring at times of historical upheaval. In Ackerman and Douglas’s installations, made in 1995, the ‘impossible’ temporality of nostalgia is located in the aftermath of the dissolution of the Eastern Bloc. Both installations signal the entry of film into the gallery and museum space and the role of these institutions in reconfiguring and reflecting on the past of cinema and artists’ film. The chapter concludes with an assessment of the ‘cinematic’ as a form of ‘critical nostalgia’ as 1995 also marks the centenary of cinema celebrated in numerous exhibitions.

In Chapter 4, I address the ‘database narrative’ as a mnemonic mode and an emblematic form of intermedial aesthetics. Identifying the emergence of a ‘database narrative’ mode in the work of Douglas, Harun Farocki, Candice Breitz and Christian Marclay, I argue that it marks a transition from film as the dominant cultural metaphor for memory
towards an intermedial memory model that combines the collective
memory of cinema with the affordances of digital media. ‘Database narrative’ is a memory mode for the twenty-first century in which the modular
logic of software transforms the traditional association of film with the
representation and documentation of historical events. These recombina-
tive strategies are related to the changing paradigms of memory in the
post-digital era.

Chapter 5 titled the ‘echo-chamber’ proposes a reading of Islam and
Steve McQueen’s work in the mid to late 1990s as a return to the
aesthetics of the historical avant-garde of the 1920s. The metaphor of
the echo-chamber conveys the reverberation of historical film aesthetics
within the space of artists’ moving image installations. Both McQueen
and Islam’s work appears to replay and return to film form from avant-
garde practices and historical cinema. This chapter locates McQueen and
Islam’s cinephilia in the historical context of the diverse and dissoci-
ated genealogies of artists moving image practices. It shows how their
work synthesizes these fragmented traditions, reading them as a return
to historical avant-garde film practices which developed in tandem with
narrative cinema not in opposition to it. The chapter argues that the
‘unfinished business’ of the avant-gardes is taken up again in the 1990s
through artists’ dual engagement with both narrative cinema and the
embodied spectatorship of artists’ film. In their mnemonic trajectories,
McQueen and Islam’s installations connect a virtual memory of film with
the time and space of the viewer.

Chapter 6 examines the emergence of a ‘documentary fiction’ mode
in artists’ moving image installations. Documentary fiction is defined
with reference to Jacques Rancière’s view of the creative and selective
force of memory which overrides binary distinctions between documen-
tary and fiction (Rancière 2006). In a discussion of the work of Pierre
Huyghe, Omer Fast and Clemens von Wedemeyer the chapter considers
why artists have chosen to engage with memory and historical events
through aesthetic formats derived from cinema. By playing with the
slippage between filmic mise-en-scène and profilmic reality, their work
problematises the role of cinema and television in contributing to collec-
tive memory and underscores the contemporary experience of historical
time as mutable and chimerical. A recurring trope in these scenarios is the
multivalent uncertain status of the film extra who becomes emblematic of
the mediatization of historical experience in cinema and television.
As moving image media are associated with both the recording of events and their fictionalized representation they are deeply embedded in cultural memory. Throughout this book the interplay between memory, history and fiction is mined in artists’ investigations of memory through the moving image and their appropriation of material from cinema, television and latterly, the internet. The sensation of experiencing memory through film has been controversially theorized by Alison Landsberg as ‘prosthetic memory’, suggesting that popular cinema can engender an empathetic ‘taking-on’ of other people’s memories, transcending race, class, gender and other social divides (Landsberg 2004, 2). Critiquing ‘prosthetic memory’, Susannah Radstone argues that it underestimates the imbrication of media memories with personal experience and the distinction between representation and events (Radstone 2010, 335). Silke Arnold-de Simine also points out that the notion of ‘adopting’ memories overlooks the ideological and political implications of memory communities who claim the right to certain memories (Arnold-de Simine 2013, 34). However, ‘prosthetic memory’ is useful in acknowledging the reality of mediatized memories while alerting us to consider the multiple contexts that contribute to the politics of memory. As we will see, in the work of Huyghe and others, the idea that media representations have to a large extent overtaken the direct experience of events is pursued and exploited as a means of rerouting the flow of images from within the capitalist spectacle of mass media.

Mediatized memories are the subject of Chapter 7 which considers the impact of digital technologies and the Web 2.0 on artists’ approaches to memory and the moving image. This chapter draws partly on ‘The Memory-Image’ screening programme I curated in Dublin, 2019 in association with aemi. It explores how artists work with a memory of media and through moving image media to produce mediatized ‘memory-images’ that trigger the experience of memory. I begin by examining Leckey’s autobiographical work Dream English Kid, 1964–1999 AD (2015), a video installation partly constituted from fragments of audiovisual media gleaned from the internet and Leckey’s personal ‘memory-images’ which are enmeshed in his experiences of technology and the affective power of images and sound. Leckey’s browsing of YouTube reflects the transformative effect of the Web 2.0 on the archive as it moves from a static repository into a digitalized archive that is dynamic and endlessly variable but also requires new methods of navigation and
narrativizing. Artists like Leckey, Lucy Raven, James Richards and Elizabeth Price have developed an archival approach, collecting and navigating their way through the contemporary sea of data. As highlighted by Price and Irvine, the intertwined politics of archives and memory continues to revolve around what the archive represses or disavows. In an analysis of their work I focus on their use of black-and-white and desaturated imagery, indicative of the enduring valency of analogue tactility and the notion of trace despite the apparent immateriality of the digital.

Spanning a time frame from the mid 1990s through to the 2000s and including works made within the last five years, the core of this study is a reflection on the reconfiguration of artists’ moving image in the age of digitalization. The intermedial syntheses of film, analogue video and digital media in the selected artworks emerge from within the circulating and commodified image world of neoliberal capitalism, yet this does not preclude these works from interrupting, intervening in and rerouting the normative temporalities and rhythms of this system. As installations that are experienced in collective and immersive conditions, they individually and on their own terms involve us, the viewers in the practice and texture of memory through the moving image.

Notes

1. See Connolly (2009) and Balsom (2013a).
2. See Osborne (2013).
3. On the question of time in contemporary art, see Birnbaum (2005), Lütticken (2013), and Ross (2014).
4. See Lütticken (2009).
5. LUX replaced the London Film-makers Co-operative, London Video Arts and the Lux Centre in 2002.
6. See Balsom (2013b, 2017).
7. Curated viewing platforms like Vdrome, founded in 2013 give access to artists’ moving image and indirectly, in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, artists’ moving image has become more available through galleries’ and other arts organizations’ websites.
8. ‘The Memory-Image’, IFI, Dublin, 29 January 2019 screened work by Mark Leckey, Lucy Raven, Rosalind Nashashibi and Alain Resnais. Founded by Alice Butler and Daniel Fitzpatrick in 2016, aemi is an agency and platform for the support and exhibition of artists’ and experimental moving image work in Ireland.
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