

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### NOTES TOWARDS A SENSIBLE STAGE

Bridget Crone

This essay explores the way in which twinning the words, 'sensible' and 'stage' mobilises both a recognition of the entanglement of bodies in and with the world through their common capacity for sensation, and the structure that acts to delimit movements, relations and becomings that is evoked through the image of the stage. This movement of simultaneous expansion and contraction suggests a doubling that is at the heart of theatre in which there is tension between the experience of commonality and estrangement, immersion and separation, affection and distance, action and passivity. Put very simply, this is the distinction between being immersed in sensing the world, and the representation of that experience set apart upon the stage. This sense of immersion can be connected to the affective and expansive capacities of the body that we find within Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's notion of 'becoming animal', (Deleuze and Guattari 2001) and also to the dense networks of vibrant matter that Jane Bennett introduces us to in her work. (Bennett 2010) States of entanglement, inter-connectivity and the affective nature of the body prevail in these philosophical scenarios. The figure of the stage suggests the opposite movement where – as well as providing an opening up to imaginary, fictional worlds – space and time are confined to a specific point (and I have elsewhere connected this to the philosopher, Alain Badiou's work). And finally, in a very different way, the notion of the sensible as it is used here finds some connection with Jacques Ranciere's commonality of the sensible in which we are conjoined through a common capacity for sensation but also divided in spheres of action. The 'sensible stage' therefore becomes a way of exploring some of these philosophical tendencies through contemporary art practice.

Rather than referring overtly to theatre, the stage is utilised here as a conceptual figure, tool or diagram, and, in this essay, I will explore the way in which this figure of the stage operates in a number of contemporary art practices that sit at the intersection between moving image and a particular kind of performance practice. In the work discussed – work by artists Gail Pickering, Heather Phillipson as well as Ryan Trecartin and Lizzie Fitch – the so-called stage appears as a form of infrastructure that is alternatively a screen, a sculptural form, a body. The stage is therefore is an organising device that interrupts – albeit momentarily – the dense flow of images around us. Thus I will begin by examining the claim that the boundary between body and image has become blurred or mutable through an exploration of Gloria Katz and Willard Hyck's 1973 horror film, *The Messiah of Evil*. Reading through and with the film, I will consider the way in which the body becomes strung out within the infrastructures of the image – that is to say, it is arrested upon the screen and at the same time disseminated through the screen. This announces a tension between the materiality of a single image-body and the dematerialisation of images in movement. Rather than addressing recent scholarship in the digital humanities that more explicitly explores interfaces with the digital (through virtual technologies, gaming and so on), I will consider our encounter with images through writing on artists' film and video alongside Deleuze's writing on the cinema producing a text that is creative and speculative in form; moving between a reading *with* certain ideas and artworks (an immersion into their possible worlds), and a speculation about these ideas and artworks. From establishing what I term the 'tangled interfaces' between body and image, I will then turn to an examination of several contemporary artists' work in order to explore the way in which a sense of encounter between body and image is produced in this work. It is this 'special' encounter with images (as distinct from the continuous contact with have with images in general) that, I will suggest, forms the stage as a point of exceptional meeting and potential.

#### **Virtual spaces / tangled interfaces**

A single image-frame sticks in my mind arrested from the movement of images through the filmstrip of Katz and Hyck's film *Messiah of Evil* (also known as *Dead People*). It shows a woman's hand covered in blood and stretching upwards against a cinema screen. It is an image that is at once exceptionally bodily – a state of agony in the flesh, as flesh is ripped apart – *and* becoming immaterial as the hand projects an image upon the screen behind it.

There is immediately here a tension between the body as image, that is as a singular, a fleshy, materialized image, and the image that projects and propels itself into movement. As Sean Cubitt has pointed out in a different context, this is the difference between a single image and the 'ephemerality of the mass image'. (Cubitt 2016: 3) Announcing this tension between the singular body and image and the mass image, Hyck and Willard's scene proposes a doubling and looping that speaks to the dematerialisation of bodies into images and into circuits of dissemination. This is further emphasized in this scene, by the ever-tightening relationship that Katz and Hyck establish between the images and action that are taking place *on* the screen *in* the present (Toni's present, which has become ours) and those that are projected upon the screen (in the form of the film that has been screening in the cinema, and then the image that Toni projects in her death throes). As Toni attempts to escape from the zombies who inhabit the cinema auditorium she flattens her body into the screen attempting to become image, and at the same time, she projects an image upon the screen in an evocation of a Platonic theatre. Thus image folds into image folds into image, and the distinction between a real taking place in the present and an imaginary, a fiction, or a virtual threat are violently elided.

There is a fascinating sense of entrapment in this scene that is not only the zombies' violent entrapment of Toni but also the enclosure of *an* image that is distinct from the flowing proliferation of images *plural*. In the narrative of the film, Toni wants to matter singularly (rather than simply be another victim of the zombies' rampage) and the film uses several devices to enclose space and time around Toni so that we come close to her and her plight. In this scene, it is as if glimpses of other temporalities outside of the present act to corral and thus tighten our focus upon the primacy of the present moment. As she enters the cinema, the camera loops between the unfolding present of Toni's actions – buying a ticket, stealing a box of popcorn – and stepping just outside of this present temporality, and this has the effect of closing down space outside of this emerging world as images compose a tight (and tightening loop). As such: Toni buys a ticket and enters the cinema; the camera returns outside the cinema as the ticket seller puts out the 'closed' sign. Toni steals the box of popcorn, looking nervously around her as she does so; and the camera loops back to show us the lights on the cinema building turning off. Indicating closed. There is a looping here between images of different temporal orders and of different (filmic) genres. The cinematographers play with this 'looping' by interweaving parts of the movie that Toni watches into what we see, and this opens up an indeterminacy of time beyond the present that we see and are immersed within. (The film Toni watches *Gone with the West* (James Caan and Stephanie Power, dir. Bernard Girard) was in fact released a year after *Messiah of Evil*.) As Toni enters the cinema, time and space contract so that increasingly there is no space outside of the cinema's auditorium (as she discovers upon trying to escape) and there is no time outside of the auditorium either as Toni's lifetime becomes directly measured by the length of the film that she watches.

What is particularly interesting about this scene is that Toni both tries to escape into the image (that is, through the screen), and is devoured by images (images of her own fear made manifest, we could say). Yet, at the same time, her death is excessively fleshy. She appears as both 'body' (or flesh) and image at the same time. Thus image folds into body folds into image, and the distinction between what is taking place in the present and an imaginary, a fiction, or a virtual threat are violently elided. In attempting to escape *through* the screen – *through* the screen as a Bergsonian 'virtual' in which the image of fear and fear itself coexists – Toni becomes doubled as body and image. She flattens her body into the screen trying to escape, and at the same time, she projects an image (her shadow) upon the screen. Thus she is projected upon the screen (her blood spatter, her shadow), and she is framed / caught within the proscenium arch of the theatre, in other words, she is immersed into an extreme state of bodily-ness while at the same time projected or represented as an image upon the screen. The fleshiness of the body is emphasised through the means of Toni's death – the ripping into flesh, the blood, the cries of pain, are all of the order of the body: sensation. While we could say that all theatre is composed of this trapping of the 'flesh' body within the proscenium arch and therefore projecting or reproducing it as an image, what is key for us here is the constant doubling between the image (or screen) and the body as an affective, sensual, or feeling material. This doubling,

particularly when thought in relation to our relationship to the many screens in our lives today, results in an increasing porosity on both sides – in terms of the image (or screen's) relationship with the body, and the body's relationship with the image. How do we measure the limits of the body in this scenario? When is the body – body – and when is it an image projected, distributed, disembodied?

This re-evokes the question that Ian White asks in the essay, 'Performer, Audience, Mirror: Cinema, Theatre and the Idea of the Live'; how can we rethink the value of presence and authenticity of bodily presence outside of the constant reproducibility of the screen? Put in another way, and a way which has particularly implications for us as curators, this is to ask how might we have an intense, valuable encounter with images (and/ or screens) that does not simply replicate our own reproducibility as an image 'strung out across the network' (to paraphrase the original accelerationist thinker, Nick Land). In his essay, White attempts to answer this question concerning the value and presence of the body in relation to the screen through what he terms, 'differential cinema' – a form of cinema that emphasises the experience of the audience in the present moment, and indeed the projection of film as a singular, unrepeatable live act. Most obviously we might think of this practice in relation to what we know as expanded cinema – the experimental cinema practices initiated in the 1960s in which artists attempted to materialise the projection of film as a 'unique' act. If we think about this in relation to the British filmmaker, Malcolm Le Grice's work *Horror Film* (1971), for example. We see that the projection of the film becomes a performance much like the one that I described previously in relation to Toni's death in *The Messiah of Evil*, for example (but in Le Grice's case there is, usually, one presumes, no zombies present). In *Horror Film*, the projected frames of 16mm film are completed by the actions of the artist-filmmaker which cast shadows / images against the screen. While the actions are scripted and therefore repeated each time the performance is staged, subtle variations ensue through the repetition of the performance producing variability in the capacity of the body (subtleties of health, mood, weather and so on) at different moments in time. What White's 'differential cinema' offers us, then, is not simply the intervention of the 'live' body into the image but an action or engagement that is bound very specifically in time – it is a temporally bound encounter where variation occurs through the recognition of the differentiation of time as a series of discrete instants rather than a continuous projection (or duration). This suggests the marking of space and time within delineated boundaries. It suggests paying attention to the particular *time* of encounter as an unrepeatable instant or moment. And here I find Deleuze's work on the crystal image of time (Deleuze 2005) useful for considering how we might understand and indeed mark out the stage as a discrete space-time – a 'restricted circuit' in which the image and body meet with an intensity that sparks new (or different) possibilities. This then is my conception of the stage as primarily related to that of time – the stage as the time of encounter.

Returning to the fateful cinema-scene in Hyck and Willard's *Messiah of Evil*, Toni is at once strung out across the network as she is dissolved into the screen, melding into the images on the screen (becoming image), and at the same time she is arrested in a powerful encounter with the images of her fears. As Toni enters the cinema, she enters what this so-called 'restricted circuit', which Deleuze defines in *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* as a point (like the point of a crystal) where the actual (what is taking place) and the virtual (what might take place, what has taken place and so on) coningle. Here space and time contract so that the distinction between the image in her head (the imagined image) and that of her experience in the world collapses. In this final image, in which the zombie-cinema goes devour Toni, we find the intertwining of actual and virtual images that Deleuze describes drawing upon the work of Henri Bergson (and using much more high brow examples). Deleuze tells us that this 'restricted circuit' is situated at a sharp, articulated point like the point of a crystal, and that it is here in this tiny space that the actual and the virtual, the present and the past, the real and the imaginary become indiscernible. The spatial contraction that takes place in relation to the time-image – this collapsing of the past-present-future, actual and virtual into one point – has the effect of prioritizing time over space, and can therefore be contrasted to what he refers to as the 'movement-image' in which images are motivated into movement by the dynamics of

space, in particularly the space between them. I will return to this question of time and its relation to what I term 'the stage' later in the essay.

### Crystal stages

Gail Pickering's recent work, *Near Real Time* (2014) is both a single screen and a three-channel video installation; here I focus upon the three-screen version of the work, which was exhibited as part of her solo exhibition *Mirror Speech* at the Baltic in Gateshead (2015). At the Baltic, one entered Pickering's *Near Real Time* through a hidden door in another work – a large cyclorama simply coloured red. The title of this work *She was a Visitor* immediately positions us as entering into another unknown space in which we are a visitor – drawing upon suggestions of visitation, alienation and other worlds. Entering through a door situated in the curved wall of the cyclorama, one arrives in the large darkened space of *Near Real Time*, which is situated across three enormous screens, each with localized, synchronised sound. The extra-life size of the screens presents a monumental incursion into the space – the screens cut across the space forming a diagonal that runs along the gallery's length. Yet at the same time, the irregularity of their arrangement, presenting open and closed spaces in this diagonal form, means that they also present invitingly protective corners – nooks within which we might situate ourselves in close proximity to the images that they present. These are spaces within which we dwell with the image.

'The light of the image is here', the voiceover states. The images on the three screens beckon us; glowing outwards from screen into the dimly lit space, it is as if they invite us into their realm and into the space of the screen. This sense of invitation into the 'here' of the image results not only from the size and scale of the screens and their situation in the semi-darkness but is also an effect of the formal composition of the images themselves: *Near Real Time* is interspersed or punctuated with moments of footage in which the protagonists sit, their gaze directly addressing us (the viewer), and with other moments in which a theatre light shines directly onto us; almost violently, accusingly, it insists on the 'here' and the now. The work is composed around a repeated stanza (that we hear), and that also contributes to the construction of this territorialisation of space (the 'here' within which we are situated or dwell) along with the repeated motif of a bright theatre-light that is trained upon us (the viewer) from inside the film-image: 'The brightest image is here. We've dimmed out the background so it doesn't bother you. We've dimmed out the other people.' (Pickering 2014) The light faces us down from inside the image, creating a centre of light that spills onto the actors-protagonists sitting either side of it (in the image) and out of the screen onto us – the viewers. This large convex-shaped light spirals into a dark centre that faintly reflects the bodies sitting on either side – this is an image contained within image and within the means of its production. Thus this dark centre (of the theatre-light) contains and projects the territory of action from the screen into the gallery space – drawing both into it. By shining so insistently at us, this light (which appears at times upon each of the three screens) *extends* the space of the screen to include us within its bounds, the stark light of screen spilling over into a small delineating area within the darkened gallery space acts like a spotlight to create an stage-like area on the floor in front of the screen. In this case, I suggest, that the 'stage' is this insistent 'here' and 'now' of the light of the image spilling off the screen, delineating its own space and time and demanding that we cross over from the dark auditorium-like black box space of the gallery into a proximity with the screen.

The manner in which we are implicated within the field of the image (or as I have suggested above, drawn into the space of the screen) can be linked to Pickering's intention to re-materialise the image. Pickering has spoken of her desire to re-materialise or re-embody images in relation to her ongoing work (including *Near Real Time*) that draws upon footage from the archive of a nameless community TV station that was located in one of the post war new towns in the south of France. When Pickering was first invited to engage with this archive she was struck by residents claiming: 'it doesn't represent us'. Instead they suggested that the archive represented the vision of the large number of the Parisian Left who resettled there in the late 1970s. This question, 'it doesn't represent us', allows Pickering to address the image not as a kind of truth attached to or speaking for a

referent or subject but as a material, a form that has a material life that she explores, re-embodies and asks us to encounter within the work. This act of re-materialising the image is then a form of embodiment in Pickering's work such as *Near Real Time* – this embodiment extends, as I have already suggested, to include the viewer in the space of the image but also importantly it is activated through the production of the work itself and specifically through the way Pickering approaches archival material. Here, for example, rather than re-enacting or simply re-presenting the footage found in the Community TV archive, Pickering has over a number of years carefully translated many of the scripts and traced the gestures of the movements found in pieces of the footage. The archive images are therefore re-made through re-tracing these movements – re-making a stance, a gesture, an attitude – in an entirely bodily manner. Just as the original footage appears not as an image but as a material (all texture, weave and close ups) so too is it re-embodiment through the re-tracing of its affective form – its movement, texture, sensation.

This sense of re-materialisation comes from the re-making or re-tracing of the archival images through and via what we might call their 'material order' – that is, shape, form, gesture, affective dimension. Rather than simply re-enacting or re-iterating what the imagery (film footage) shows or tells, Pickering attempts to re-inhabit the image. This inhabitation occurs through Pickering asking instructing a dancer or actor to re-make the movement from one of the pieces of footage, but also importantly in the way that we (the viewer) are addressed from the image (and brought into proximity or encounter with it), and the way in which equivalences of scale are set up between our own bodies and those on the screen. We see this in another work in Pickering's exhibition *Mirror Speech*, and this is the single screen video *Karaoke* (2014-), which was presented on a video monitor. In *Karaoke* – ka-ka-roe, which means 'heart' in Japanese but also alludes to karaoke in its alliteration – questions of the materiality of the image, participation and voice are made even more apparent. Beginning with the title of the work – there are several connecting threads suggesting this sense of materiality and participation: the heart, something fleshy, something of the body but also of emotion as in heartfelt and pertaining to *affect*, and therefore of the body, but also the suggestion is of a collective body – of polyphony and singing along as karaoke suggests.

In *Karaoke*, we see a number of hands participating in the opening up of a mummified body so immediately the idea of flesh and a dense materiality is present. And it is as if we are invited into this scene – a voice seems to address us, 'let's cut here' the voice says. So there is a sense of a kind of participation in or with the image – a re-materialising of the image. Also, the image presents to us at a comparable human size so that there is an immediate affective correlation between our own bodies and the hands on the screen. This feeling is extended to my experience of *Near Real Time*, the three screen video work also presented at the Baltic. In the case of *Near Real Time*, I felt as if I could quite easily step into the screen and join the image there just as my hand wouldn't feel out of place should it join the other hands in the screen of *Karaoke*. This issue of scale opens up a very particular form of encounter that we have with the image and screen in these works. This encounter – I am thinking especially of *Near Real Time* – produces a time of being-there or being-with the image. This space of encounter between body and image is akin to what I consider the stage – that is, a space in which the actual and virtual, real and imaginary, lived and projected image meets.

### **Sculptural theatres**

The sense of entering into the exhibition of Ryan Trecartin and Lizzie Fitch's work *Priority Infield* (2013) is that of entering into a very dark swamp of rapidly moving images, bodies and image-bodies. I am here at the exhibition opening, it is very crowded and it feels swarm-like and libidinal, as I move almost automatically towards the light of one of the several projection screens that move me through the space. It feels as if there is no outside of this experience simply a vast mutable space that is traversed by image flows. It's a post-Internet or post-digital version of affective-immersion – a closed feedback loop between bodies and body-images that flattens any distinction between the action that takes place on screen and off-screen where that off-screen is the influence of found images or types or texts feeding through from digital space, or the movement of bodies in

the spaces around the screens (i.e. in the gallery). (I think that this flattening of space is also evident in the process of the work's production where collaborators engage in an intense experience shut off from the world and hanging out in the one space, performing, being, fed one line at a time... as filming, not filming, devising, improvising takes place.) So these distinctions between on-line and off, on-screen and off-screen spaces have been flattened into an immersive melting pot of flows – flows that are conditioned by what Trecartin has termed 'affinities' as distinct from identities. This is a world of signs and signals announced by 'nameable affinities / FB likes, dating profile stats or competencies (the school assessment report, the HR review)', as Brian Droitcour has observed. (Droitcour, Brian (2013): 52) This conditioning of image-movement through the pull of 'affinities' is evident in the video *Centre Jenny* (2013), which is organised around characters name 'Jenny'. The space-time of *Center Jenny* (which is included in the *Priority Infield* project) feels like a wet amorphous body in so many ways – expanding in a seemingly ad hoc way. Yet the space of *Priority Infield* is punctuated by what Fitch and Trecartin have termed 'sculptural theatres' – ladders, huts and bleachers – and which negotiate a holding-pattern between a seemingly limitless expansion of the post-human body (a body sorted by 'type') and the limits imposed by these structures. Structure that act, I would suggest, as striated spaces like the point of the crystal – stages that delimit, curtail the seemingly limitless flow of bodies and images and the extended duration that this endless movement brings.

Through the interposing of the 'sculptural theatres' within the space of *Priority Infield*, Fitch and Trecartin introduce these points of gathering – places to see and be seen. These structures (or theatres) act to insert questions of command and control into what seems an amorphous and free-flowing movement of image-bodies, while at the same time suggesting the possibility of a space apart – a theatrical space in which the protagonists might break free from the flows and forces that condition their movements. (<sup>1</sup>) *Priority Infield's* 'sculptural theatres' activate a space that punctures the incorporeal movements of body-images producing the stage as a momentary place of encounter –fleeting holding point amidst the constant flow of images. The use of architectural structures both in the installation of the work – ladders, huts, bleachers, platforms – and in the image itself puts to rest any residual belief that the Internet / digital space is limitless or without structure instead there is a nod here to what Keller Easterling has termed 'infrastructure' – the hidden, generative structures that form and inform the world. As Trecartin himself has said: 'Structures and tools are important terrain for contemporary art.' (Interview with Cindy Sherman, 144.) Here, however, the infrastructural space is one of commonalities – as in *Center Jenny* – textual, visual and other forms of seemingly random patterning.

There is a commonality between the way in which Fitch and Trecartin's work produces a wet or slippery interface with the screen, and the approach found in Heather Phillipson's video installations. Both artists treat the screen as an almost organic and certainly bodily, affective structure. At the same, there is a sense in the artists' work of a free-ranging gathering of imagery – almost a sucking up or filtering of imagery, largely circulating from the Internet (in Phillipson's case) – that is in fact very carefully scripted or scored. There is a careful interweaving of text, image and voice in Phillipson's trio of works – *Zero-Point Garbage Matte* (2012), *Torso Portions* (2012) and *Catastrophaleconomy* (2012) commissioned for an shown at an exhibition at Flat Time House, home of the John Latham Foundation in 2012. Yet at the same time, there is always a sense of something – image or sonic material – escaping control. This sense of containment, immersion and mutability is evinced by the manner in which Phillipson's works are situated within Flat Time House. Like a sprawling body-form, the works are connected throughout the House by a series of veins and arteries conducting the electrical energy by which they are sustained and given life. And at the same time, the giant body-form of the work is also contained (and the images' movements momentarily stilled) by the structure proposed by the house itself; Latham conceived of his house as a body, so that we first enter the mind, then the brain, torso and hand thus moving from the cerebral to bodily activity and closer towards what Latham termed, the body-event. Phillipson's work interacts with this pre-existing structure as a kind of given in the same manner that she approaches the use of pre-existing image or sound material, familiar words or phrases so that we move from head (*Zero-Point*

*Garbage Matt*), to torso (*Torso Portions*) and to the hand (*Catastrophephaleconomy*). As Phillipson herself states: 'The works map out the brain-gut interchange. The building becomes a nervous system, composed of wiring, audiovisual noise and hard-to-reach islands.' We are 'inner-space' visitors, she adds. We are visitors seduced along 'in-roads into the body-mind's canals' where 'The videos are organs that fidget and limbs that scratch their own surfaces, trying to figure out their limits.' (Phillipson 2012)

Like the sculptural theatres in Fitch and Trecartin's work, Phillipson draws attention to the structural forms or architectures that bear the screens in her work such that there is a sense of an infrastructure that orders the dense liquidity of image-flow both inside the screen and external to the screen, acting as a physical support to the screen. In the works in the exhibition at Flat Time House these included a stepladder and wading pool, a stand adorned with rotting fruit and a cardboard cavern. What is proposed in these works is a body-image interface in which an equivalence or proximity is found between the screen and the body. Like the 'material equations' that Lucy Reynolds notes in the work of Carolee Schneeman in which Scheemann seeks to find a way in which film can enter into her performance as an equal party – 'handled as a tactile, palpable material', she writes. (Schneemann 2000 quoted in Reynolds 2016: this book) Yet there is a sense today in which the image is always a 'palpable' by which I would understand as – affective – material; acting as a signal, a transmitting of sensation, an affective agent or even... body, the image might be characterised by its ubiquity as well as its affective presence. In highlighting the infrastructural interfaces with which we encounter images – that is the screens, bleachers, platforms and podiums – these works highlight the entanglement of our relationship. In this respect the stage is a contingent device that acts to provide a momentarily holding point in and amidst the constant movement of images that surrounds us.

How do we to understand the relationship between the body and the image in contemporary performance and moving image practices? How do we navigate the relationship between what is 'live' – unfolding in the present moment – and what is not, particularly considering the manner in which these relationships have become more mutable with the widespread use of virtual imaging and other technologies in our everyday lives? Into these questions and this scenario of a limitless movement of images, the concept of the 'stage' draws our attention to the infrastructures of present and participation with and through the image. Furthermore through exploring the ways in which this stage might be produced through a particular spatial and temporal arrangement of technological as well as bodily (if we can still make that division) *affects*, it enables to think beyond the confines of the so-called 'real' in understand the encounter between bodies and images today. Staging is a device of enclosure that acts to attune our attention to a specific moment in space and time – moments of encounter, dwelling, convergence, coalescence. In this way, the use of the term 'staging' provides us with a means to articulate the way in which images and bodies meet in a particular space and time. And most importantly, 'staging' is a way of both complicating and re-imagining the relationship between body and image; between what is experienced and what is imagined, what is immediate and what is mediated, and what is live and what is not-live. The stage, therefore, might be understood as a sorting device and as a methodology that allows for a testing of the relationships between body and image, projection and presence, materiality and reproducibility in the contemporary performance and moving image practices that are explored in this book. The simultaneous immersion and separation that is inherent in the theatrical nature of the stage enables the kind of dual process that engages with the need for re-thinking these relationships in regards to the increasingly influence of new technologies and their affective, sensory impacts upon the body.

## REFERENCES

Bennett, Jane (2010), *Vibrant Matter*, Durham: Duke.

Cubitt, Sean (2016), "Untimely Ripped (Against the Mass Image)", paper given at the Transimage conference, 3-6 July 2016, Plymouth.

Deleuze, Gilles (1990), 'Mediators' in *Negotiations 1972-1990*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (2001), *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, London and New York: Continuum.

Deleuze, G. (2005), *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* (trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta), London and New York: Continuum.

Droitcour, Brian (2013), 'Societies of Out of Control: Language and Technology Ryan Trecartin's Movies', in Omar Kholeif (ed.) *You Are Here: Art After The Internet*, Manchester: Cornerhouse Books.

Phillipson, Heather (2012), Artist's Statement, August 2012.

Pickering, Gail (2014), *Mirror Speech*, Baltic Arts Centre for Contemporary Art, Gateshead, UK, 31 October 2014 to 11 January 2015.

---

<sup>i</sup> ... 'I think it would be interesting to explore the organizational, programming and structural components of a merged media experience as an active performance. Structures and tools are important terrain for contemporary art.' (Interview with Cindy Sherman, 144.)