

‘Enter the Memory’: Interactivity, Authorship, and the Empowered Spectator in the Digital Audio-Visual Essays of Chris Marker

Abstract:

This article theorizes the cinematic essay as a fluid, self-reflexive form which addresses the spectator directly in order to engage them in an intellectual process of dialogical exchange. Because it encourages the active involvement of the viewer in the determination of essayistic meaning, the cinematic essay challenges traditional models of authorship. As opposed to relaying information to a passive viewer from a position of authority and omniscience, the cinematic essayist offers tentative thoughts and ruminations which the spectator is called upon to critically interrogate and treat as the foundation for their own essayistic reflections. This article focuses on two of Chris Marker’s late-period works to examine the relationship between dialogical exchange, interactive spectatorship, and the capabilities of the digital database: *Immemory* (1997) and *Ouvroir* (2012). In these works, Marker carries over his career-long impulse towards dialogism to the realm of the digitized database, composing intricate, intermedial constellations of archival materials which the viewer may peruse in whatever order they please. This article offers two substantial contributions to existing scholarship: firstly, it demonstrates the impact of digital technology on the nature of spectatorial engagement in essayistic audio-visual texts; secondly, it explores the role that technological innovation played in facilitating communicative exchange between filmmaker and spectator across Marker’s body of work. Applying close textual analysis to two of Marker’s late projects illustrates that Marker embraced new media in a particularly enthusiastic and exploratory fashion in the latter part of his career because the technology offered his new ways to break down the barrier between artist and viewer, create intellectually active viewing situations, and treat the spectator as an empowered co-creator of artistic meaning.

Introduction: the essay film and communication

In *The Personal Camera: Subjective Cinema and the Essay Film*, Laura Rascaroli argues that one of the defining characteristics of the essay film is that it is based on a structure of ‘communicative negotiation’. The essayistic text, she argues, foregrounds the ‘enunciational subjectivity’ of its creator so that it may establish a substantial ‘dialogue between film-maker and spectator’ (2010: 3-7). As opposed to effacing the role that the filmmaker has played in shaping the cinematic text, the cinematic essay foregrounds the layers of mediation which separate the referent from its filmic record. As Rascaroli continues, the essay film ‘reflects on its own coming into being, and incorporates in the text the act of reasoning itself’, and in the process, calls upon the spectator to ‘engage in a dialogical relationship with the enunciator, hence to become active, intellectually and emotionally, and interact with the text’ (2010: 36). The cinematic essayist, therefore, draws the viewer’s attention to their own presence as the guiding authorial figure who consciously manipulates sounds and images to construct essayistic discourse.

It is the contention of this article that there is a notable and curiously under-explored connection between the impulse towards dialogism in the essay film and the capacity for digital technologies to create interactive viewing situations which collapse the gulf which separates media producer from media consumer in traditional paradigms of screen spectatorship. As D.N. Rodowick argues, in an era where the vast majority of images are produced, stored, distributed and accessed through computer technologies, ‘the spectator is no longer a passive viewer yielding to the ineluctable flow of time, but rather alternates between looking and reading as well as immersive viewing and active controlling’ (2007: 177). It is understandable, then, why so many essayistic filmmakers have utilized the two-way functionality of the computer system as means to empower the ambulatory gaze of the viewer by enabling them to directly alter the temporality, structure, and design of the text. With the aim of exploring how strategies of articulating the authorial voice and immersing the viewer in a process of communicative exchange have transformed through engagement with the dialogical potential of new media, I will focus on the late work of Chris Marker, and, in particular, his digitally composed audio-visual essays *Immemory* (1997) and *Ouvroir* (2012).

Before moving on to a close textual analysis of Marker's work, it is worth clarifying precisely what I mean when I use the term 'essay film'. The issue of how an 'essay film' may be defined is a contentious one, and a great deal of recent scholarship has been dedicated to determining its generic position within the history of non-fiction cinema. For the purpose of clarity and concision, I will briefly outline four characteristics of the essay film which must be taken into account when considering its relationship to the subjective voice and dialogical address: it articulates a line of theoretical inquiry through film form; in pursuing this line of reasoning, it reflects back on the conditions of its own production, and hence reflects more broadly on the relationship between cinema and truth; it may incorporate elements from the documentary, the avant-garde and narrative cinema, and, therefore tends to utilize a wider range of expressive means than is associated with the documentary in its classical mode; and, finally, it communicates directly to the spectator through a process of dialogical exchange. This emphasis on deconstructive reflexivity de-mystifies the filmmaking process by calling into question the reliability of its own textual mechanisms. As Arthur argues, the cinematic essayist ruminates on a certain issue (or set of issues), while simultaneously reflecting inwards on the capacity for the medium to represent these issues. As such, the essayistic text 'must proceed from one person's set of assumptions, a particular framework of consciousness, rather than from a transparent, collective 'We'' (2003: 60) The cinematic essayist makes their presence known as they articulate a line of thought and assess different perspectives, while simultaneously communicating to the viewer that the topic is always open to further contemplation.

The essay film, then, is a fluid, self-reflexive form which problematizes the viewer's perception of the image as an authoritative document, instead calling attention to the mechanisms which produced the image, as well as the social, historical and political context in which the image is embedded. Rather than presenting the spectator with a fixed set of facts for them to passively absorb, the essay filmmaker offers a series of thoughts and reflections which the spectator must critically think through, and, in the process, become a participant in the construction of textual meaning. The author of the essay film pointedly refrains from providing fixed, pre-determined conclusions, because to do so would be to close the text off from further contemplation – and the essay film, by its very nature, resists such closure. It is for this reason that Paul Arthur writes that '[a] quality shared by all

film essays is the inscription of a blatant, self-searching authorial presence' (2003: 58). This forms the foundation of what Corrigan describes as a 'question-answer format initiated as a kind of Socratic dialogue' (2011: 35). The essayistic enunciator appears tentative in their pursuit of knowledge as they communicate to the viewer through direct address, and the attentive viewer must, in turn, interrogate the ideas being proposed.

Although specatorial address in the essay film is based on the expression of a strong authorial voice, it should be noted that this voice may be articulated through discursive strategies other than the literal presence of the filmmaker as an empirical subject or the use of voice-over narration. Their authorial perspective may be articulated through the use of intertitles, idiosyncratic framing choices, and unexpected juxtapositions between images. As Timothy Corrigan observes:

'[W]hen lacking a clearly visible subjective voice or personal organizing presence, this act of enunciation can also be signalled in various formal and technical ways, including editing and other representational manipulations of the image' (2011: 30).

The essayist may even articulate a distinctive authorial perspective when working solely with pre-existing archival sounds and images. For example, Gina Telaroli's essayistic short film *SP(EYE) GAM3Z* (2012), which communicates the filmmaker's intellectual concerns regarding American imperialism, surveillance culture, and military interference on Hollywood film production, purely through the creative re-contextualization of images taken from a variety of narrative features, documentaries and music videos.

Marker's filmography offers a fascinating case study through which the aforementioned topics may be addressed, not only because he has produced a high number of essayistic works in a variety of different media (ranging from 16mm film, electronic video, digital and animation), but also because communicative negotiation has served as a fundamental structuring principle in Marker's work since the very beginning of his career: the verbal narration in *Letter From Siberia* (1958) directly asks rhetorical questions to the spectator, and calls upon them to consider how other filmmakers may interpret its images of the city in a different light to Marker; the multi-channel design of the installation piece *Zapping Zone* (1990) allows visitors to flit between the images on the monitors using the remote control, and therefore construct surprising contrasts and comparisons

between the available pieces of footage; *Immemory* is a work of hypermedia which organizes a dense array of archival footage in a non-hierarchical structure that the user can browse in whatever order they desire; rendered with a video game engine, *Ouvroir* is a virtual reality simulation which allows the spectator to perceptually explore a computer-generated 'museum' by operating an avatar. As the following sections will illustrate, Marker's late work with new media utilizes devices such as hyperlinks, navigable 3-dimensional virtual spaces and multi-option menus to advance his longstanding imperative towards spectatorial involvement. As his career developed, Marker continuously implemented new technologies into his craft, using them to simultaneously reflect upon the constantly-transforming landscape of cinema and explore their potential for expanding the boundaries of his formal practice. Through a close examination of Marker's diverse output, we may observe that the essayistic impulse need not be restricted to the format of the feature film, but may be carried over to a wide array of other audio-visual modes.

Amongst scholars of the essay film, Marker has consistently been hailed as an exemplary pioneer of the form. Indeed, one of the earliest articles which sought to discuss the essayistic potential of cinema was André Bazin's review of Marker's short travelogue *Letter from Siberia*. Marker argued that, although it contained elements of non-fiction filmmaking, *Letter From Siberia* resembled:

'[N]othing that we have ever seen before in films with a documentary basis', and that it should, therefore, be approached 'as an essay documented by film [...] in the same sense as in literature; an historical and political essay, though one written by a poet' (2003 [1958]: 44).

Marker developed his essayistic style over the 50s and 60s, consciously positioning himself in opposition to the *cinéma vérité* movement, to which his work was sometimes compared. As Catherine Lupton notes, Marker always demonstrated skepticism towards that movement's 'troublesome connotation of some general truth discovered through cinema', and instead spoke of his desire to make the viewer aware of both the presence of a singular, fallible authorial voice *and* the means of filmic production which enabled that voice to express itself (2006: 84). Asked about the relationship between his work and the classical documentary during an early interview, Marker quipped that instead of it being categorized as '*cinéma vérité*', the term should be applied to his films instead was

‘cine, ma verite’ (‘cinema, my truth’) (Lupton, 2006: 84). As this statement would indicate, Marker’s practice is concerned not with treating images as objective snapshots of the pro-filmic world, but in foregrounding his own presence as an enunciator who consciously interprets, manipulates, and projects his personal preoccupations onto images.

Throughout *Letter From Siberia*, Marker’s self-questioning narration makes no attempt to hide the fact that he is observing the city through a lens of cultural difference, and therefore, his meditations may be vastly different from the views of those who have a closer relationship to the location. During one striking sequence, for example, images of workers and construction sites in the capital city of Yakutsk are inflicted with three separate strands of voice-over: the first, a simple description of the names and geography of the buildings; the second, a revolutionary perspective detailing the need for the oppressed workers to rise up against the unjust working conditions on display; and the third, a right-wing voice expressing their desire to pass further legislation to crack down on union-lead industrial action to keep the city running efficiently. Far from offering a single, unified interpretation, Marker’s voice-over calls into question the possibility of an ‘objective’ account of his chosen location, and raises questions regarding the many other potential approaches others may take to producing a cinematic account of the city. Marker’s short exemplifies David Montero’s observation that the essay film tasks the spectator with negotiating ‘the multiplicity of meanings that images acquire in different temporal and discursive contexts (as well as their meaning in relation to those images that never were or failed to make it into a film)’ (2012: 44). Instead of searching out a single, objective ‘truth’ about Siberia, then, Marker critiques the very notion that a cinematic text can offer an authoritative take on a topic, as the images which constitute it are always open to further perceptual reframing and individual contemplation.

Sunday in Peking (1956) also utilises a number of essayistic techniques to challenge the very notion of epistemological authority. Although Marker often employs voice-over in this experimental, self-critical take on the travelogue, the narration is not simply used to provide information but to expand the potential interpretations of the image and point to different ways in which the viewer may perceive it. The short opens with a series of close-ups of an array of Chinese artefacts, including

bracelets, articles of clothing, bracelets, and traditional dolls. After a few beats, the camera abruptly pans up to reveal the Parisian timeline, revealing that the artefacts are lying on the windowsill of a France apartment. Marker's voice-over reveals: 'For 30 years in Paris, I had been dreaming of Peking without knowing it. In my imagination, I could still see an illustration from a book I had looked at in my childhood, without knowing exactly what it referred to'. In the film's opening moments, then, Marker spatially confuses the viewer, first leading them to believe that the images are taking place in the title city, and then destabilizing their perspective, to reveal that what they are actually looking at a Westerner's approximation of Peking within his own living space. Immediately afterwards, Marker cuts to an image of the book from his childhood, depicting a faded black-and-white still photograph of the avenue leading to the tombs of the Ming Emperors. The film then cuts to a motion image of the same avenue, in colour. Through narration, Marker intones: 'It's not very often that one can step into a picture belonging to one's childhood'. Marker's voice-over offers commentary on the images, but the relationship between aural and visual footage is not direct and unproblematic. Marker reflexively establishes his own cultural myopia, and makes it clear that he will be presenting his study of Peking through the lens of his own upbringing as a European. As he announces his shortcomings as a documentarian of Peking, he encourages the viewer to question the cultural gulf between the filmmaker and the land he depicts, and therefore to judge the accuracy of his observations.

Marker's desire to reflexively undermine the notion of the Author as a wholly reliable, omniscient figure who solely determines the meaning of a cinematic text is further evidenced by the essayistic works he produced as part of the political filmmaking collective The Medvedkin Group towards the latter half of the 1960s. The Medvedkin Group aimed to create a new, radical political cinema by providing the human subjects of their films with the means to produce their own images, depicting their own struggles on their own terms, which would then be synthesized into essayistic texts by the Medvedkin filmmakers. The most significant film produced by the collective was *Classe de Lutte* (1969), a short cinematic essay which tracks the activities of a group of trade unionists at the Yema watch factory in Besançon as they campaign for better pay, shorter hours, and generally improved working conditions. In addition to shooting some of the footage themselves, the Medvedkin

group equipped multiple members of the union—all of whom had little-to-no prior filmmaking experience—with a 16mm camera, a miniature editing bay, and a home projector. Marker and his crew then gave the strikers lectures to teach them the essential elements of production. As Marker elucidated in an interview conducted later in his career, the ambition of the group was to investigate the ‘possibility of organizing film production along cooperative and non-hierarchical lines, and of using film as a tool within political struggles rather than as simply a medium of entertainment’ (2015 [2003]: 24). Such a project would have been impossible to achieve without the use of cost-effective, portable and easy-to-use technology: ‘The means of the time was 16mm silent, which meant three-minute camera rolls, a laboratory, an editing table, some way of adding sound –everything that you have now right inside a little case that fits in your hand’ (2015 [2003]: 24). By placing the tools of cinematic production into the hands of the striking workers, the Medvedkin group sought to circumvent the unidirectional power relationship between the filmmaker and the filmed subject.

Moreover, *Classe De Lutte* reflexively makes this unorthodox production process the very subject of the film. In addition to showing the images produced by the workers, the film illustrates how the workers produced these images. They are shown being trained to use the equipment, focusing the cameras, cutting and splicing film reels, reviewing their footage with home projectors, and deciding which pieces of film to keep and which to discard. *Classe De Lutte*, then, is not only a film about strike action, but also an investigation into the potential for 16mm film to function as a political tool. By placing so much emphasis on the processes of militant political action were constructed on the ground-level with readily accessible equipment, the Medvedkin group calls upon the viewer to recognize the importance of producing politically charged counter-images which work against the skewed representation of trade union activity in the mainstream media, and illustrates to the viewer how they themselves implement consumer-grade audio-visual tools in the fight for social justice. Foregoing a more traditional theatrical release, the collective distributed *Classe De Lutte* directly to universities, town halls, and trade union centres. Each showing would typically be followed by a live discussion, allowing the viewers to voice their opinions on the text and challenge certain aspects that they felt did not correspond to their own experience. This unorthodox method of distribution further

highlights Marker's persistent drive to create works which inspire ongoing debate and dialogue regarding the veracity and impartiality of the cinematic image.

Immemory: the essay film meets the computer database

During the later stages of his career, Marker developed a fascination with the potential of interactive digital technology to advance his imperative towards interpolating the viewer into a shared dialogical space. In *Immemory* and *Ouvroir*, Marker sets up a labyrinthine digital database of archival materials (photographs, videos, texts, digitally synthesised graphic designs) which the spectator may search through in an individualized, non-linear manner. Thus, Marker ensures that each spectator will have a quantitatively different experience of these works, and that their experience will vary each time they engage with the project. Released on the cusp of the new millennium, *Immemory* is a monumental reflection on the Marker's own life and artistic practice intertwined with a broader investigation into the socio-political history of the 20th century. Comparable in scope and ambition to Godard's contemporaneous *Histoire(s) du cinéma* (1998), *Immemory* revisits symbols events, texts, images and themes that have haunted Marker since his origins as a filmmaker while expanding his montage practice by filtering them through the lens of an interactive CD-ROM. Aspects of Marker's earlier works which are revisited in *Immemory* include: a fascination with Asian culture, with a particular focus on Peking (the photograph of the camels lining a path in the desert which is framed as the catalyst for Marker's reflections on the city in *Sunday in Peking* is revisited here); a preoccupation with various leftist political movements which arose over the latter half of the twentieth century, such as the May '68 riots in France and the anti-Vietnam protests in America; the radicalism of Soviet montage cinema, and the ways in which its influence continues to shape contemporary political cinema (Aleksandr Medvedkin, the focus of Marker's earlier cinematic essay *The Last Bolshevik* (1992), takes on particular prominence); and the connection between cinematic form and the articulation of personal memory. Marker's subjective viewpoint therefore pervades every aspect

of *Immemory*, not as an aural or a physical presence but as an orchestrator of the audio-visual material which the viewer may navigate.

The viewer of *Immemory* is, then, is sited in a dialogical relationship with Marker, whose presence as a mediating enunciative voice is inscribed into every element of the project. In his written introduction to *Immemory*, Marker stresses that, though the project presents the viewer with ‘the guided tour of a memory’, he also aimed to provide the viewer within freedom for ‘haphazard navigation’ (2020 [1997]). In his new media works, then, Marker provides the starting point for each individual’s essayistic journey, but does not determine its trajectory; each spectator must decide for themselves how they will traverse the dense collection of materials, what connections they will draw between them, and what conclusions they will derive from the encounter.

The composition of *Immemory* resembles a digitized photo album, with archival materials arranged across a series of interactive menu screens featuring hyperlinks which splinter off into various different directions. *Immemory* is divided into seven different topographical ‘zones’, each of which is composed of a collection of audio-visual materials revolving broadly around a particular theme: ‘Cinema’, ‘Travel’, ‘Museum’, ‘Memory’, ‘Poetry’, ‘War’, and ‘Photography’, each of which may be accessed through the CD-ROM’s main menu (Figure 1). Each ‘zone’ is comprised of audio-visual material organized roughly according to a shared theme. Within a zone, the user can press an arrow on the right of the screen to move towards the next screen, or click on the left of the screen to return to the previous page. Although this may seem to provide some semblance of a linear pathway through the database, Marker complicates this by embedding within almost every screen various interactive hotspots that the viewer may click on to access a different menu screen, or to open various other materials. Marker refers to these elements as ‘bifurcations’, as they split the screen into a multitude of pathways which the viewer may embark upon. Marker actively encourages the viewer to explore these bifurcations, which lead to numerous forking pathways. Sometimes the bifurcation will lead the viewer to another pathway within the same zone, sometimes it will lead the viewer to a different zone, sometimes it will direct the viewer back to the page they were previously on, sometimes it will direct the viewer back to the main menu. The viewer is able to skip forward to the

next screen by clicking the arrow on the right of each page, skip back by clicking the arrow on the left, return to the main menu by clicking the arrow at the top of the screen, and return to the beginning of each 'zone' by clicking an arrow at the bottom of the page.

Figure 1: The 'zones' of *Immemory* (1997)

The inscription of the author's subjective voice, setting up of a direct communication with the audience, and the selective incorporation of 'found' materials produced by other artists signify that *Immemory* is a truly essayistic work in the Montaignian tradition. In his *Essays*, the text which is widely theorized as originating the form of the essay as we now understand it, Montaigne describes his endeavour as being an act of self-portraiture, as he attempts to capture, through the medium of the written word, the complexity of his own thought process. For Montaigne, it was vital that act of essaying was left open, and never 'closed off' through arriving at stable, concrete conclusions: 'If my soul [âme] could only find a firm footing, I would not be assaying myself but resolving myself. But my soul is ever in apprenticeship and being tested' (2003 [1580]: 908). The essay, according to Montaigne's conception, is not a factual report of a truth that the essayist has already arrived at; instead, the essay is the direct expression of thought in the process of being formed, the act of an inquisitive and reflective enunciator putting forward ideas for further discussion and dissection by his audience. As Montaigne continues, '[t]here is no pleasure to me without communication: there is not so much as a sprightly thought comes into my mind that it does not grieve me to have produced alone, and that I have no one to tell it to' (2003 [1580]: 457). For Montaigne, as for Marker, the act of essaying is incomplete unless there is a receptive second party who absorbs and reacts to the enunciator's proposals.

Furthermore, throughout the *Essays*, Montaigne highlights his own position as a critical reader as well as a writer. He describes his writing environment as an enormous library consisting of literary texts which influenced his development as an author, and he regularly 'lifts' passages (often at great length) from them to integrate into his own essayistic arguments. At times, Montaigne accompanies the citation with his own critical commentary, and sometimes he allows the citation to

speak for itself, letting the viewer to determine its relation to the surrounding text. Montaigne, therefore, emphasises that his essayistic reflections were not produced in isolation and they shouldn't be received in isolation, they were formed in response to artists who came before him, and they should, in turn, inspire the dialogical engagement of the spectator. Like Montaigne's *Essays*, *Immemory* extracts a wide range of archival fragments from their original contexts for the contemplation of the spectator. Thus, the spectator is tasked with reacting to a text which never provides straightforward answers but perpetually opens up new issues of consideration through the dialectical tensions which arise from the re-contextualization of audio-visual elements.

The rhizomatic, digressive structure of *Immemory* does not provide any suggested route through the archive, and it is near-impossible for the user to tell if they have viewed every piece of material available to access on the disk. This ensures that the path through the project will be qualitatively different for every user, and that every time the user revisits the project they will experience it anew. 'Don't zap! Take your time', is the advice given from Marker to the user in the introductory instructions screen, thus encouraging them to not be concerned with attempting to establish a straightforward path through the project, but to wander, to reflect, get enter diversions. In following Marker's instructions, the viewer will actively establish their own unique path through the non-chronological assemblage of artefacts, and, therefore, become an engaged participant in the construction of essayistic meaning. My use of the term 'rhizomatic' is rooted in Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the 'rhizome', which they describe as a system in which 'any point . . . can be connected to any other [point], and must be' (Deleuze and Guattari 1987). In Deleuze and Guattari's model the rhizome is:

'[A]n amorphous set which has eliminated that which happened and acted in it . . . a collection of locations or positions which coexist independently of the temporal order which moves from one part to the other, independently of the connections and orientations which the vanished characters and situations gave to them'. (Deleuze 1986, 120)

The rhizome, therefore, describes a condition in which a space is constituted in such a way that an individual may move from one node to another without ever reaching a final destination. The open-ended, interactive infrastructure of Marker's virtual museum may be understood through the lens of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of a rhizomatic space with 'multiple points of entry' divided into branches which stretch into infinity in various directions and create multiple points of convergence and divergence (Ibid). As the authorial figure, Marker sets up a series of responsive audio-visual elements which the spectator may actively navigate in order to conjure unexpected linkages and points of disjunction between the archival materials. It is through this relationship that the process of dialogical exchange takes place. *Immemory*, therefore, fosters an empathetic act of communication, one which not only allows the spectator to enter a closer relationship with Marker by dealing directly, materially, with the artefacts of the artist's personal experiences, but also to achieve a more sophisticated conception of their relationship with their own past, and the way this relationship is shaped by material artefacts. As Marker explained in an interview conducted around the time of *Immemory*'s release, he was drawn to the digital database because its dispersed, non-linear structure seemed to capture the 'aleatory and capricious character of memory' (Alter, 2006: 148). Just as human memory constantly skips back and forth across moments in time, revisiting and repeating certain events according to a non-linear logic which makes sense only to the individual, *Immemory* does not package its collection of memory totems into a pre-established sequential order. As in the rhizome, or what Deleuze calls elsewhere the 'any-space-whatever', the individual is constructed of 'parts whose linking up and orientation are not determined in advance, and can be done in an infinite number of ways' (Deleuze 1986, 109, 111-122). *Immemory* has no beginning and end points pre-determined by the author; it is up to the spectator to work their way through the interactive options and forge their own path. It is a space of 'pure potential', to borrow Deleuze's terminology, a constantly shifting, open textual field which is never 'complete' and which offers a qualitatively different experience for every spectator.

The project, therefore, combines the dialogical structure of the essay form with interactive properties of return-channel digital media. As Rockley Miller argues, the relationship between a user

and a computer program may be described as being strongly interactive, even when the creator of the program is not literally present to provide a one-to-one response to their input. This is because the navigation of such a program relies upon:

‘[T]he active participation of the user in directing the flow of the computer or video program; a system which exchanges information with the viewer, processing the viewer’s input in order to generate the appropriate response within the context of the program’ (Miller quoted in Jensen, 1999: 191).

The computer program remains inactive unless there is a user present who actively provides input values which activate a virtual response—the user’s actions play a vital role in determining the output of the computer program. This creates an interactive relationship wherein the functions performed by the digital program are dependent upon the commands given by the user, which, in turn, generates a tailored experience for the user, which has an influence on the further commands they give to the machine.

Dominic M. McIver Lopes contrasts the interactive potential of computer media with the ‘unidirectional’ relationship between user and content fostered by broadcast television, the radio, and photochemical film. While those forms of media only allow for the viewer to be a receiver of pre-determined content produced by an artist, computer media is powered by a ‘return channel’ infrastructure’ which enables the spectator to exert direct control over their viewing experience by exerting commands over the screen content. Lopes, however, perceives of interactivity in digital media in terms of a continuum, ranging from ‘weakly interactive’ to ‘strongly interactive’ medial objects. Lopes uses the term ‘weakly interactive media’ to describe text which only allows the viewer a basic level of influence over screen content. For example, a Blu-Ray disc which contains an interactive menu feature is ‘interactive’ in the sense that it allows the user to select the point at which point in the narrative they start watching the cinematic text, it does not allow them to substantially alter the structure or shape of that text. In Lopes’ words, the Blu-Ray or DVD menu only allows the viewer to ‘control the sequence in which they access content’. Lopes contrasts this with ‘strongly

interactive media', in which 'the structure itself is shaped in part by the interactor's choices. Thus strongly interactive artworks are those whose structural properties are partly determined by the interactor's actions.' The spectator may, therefore, reshape the 'intrinsic or representational properties [the text] has, the apprehension of which are necessary for aesthetic engagement with it' (2001: 68). In *Immemory*, Marker fragments and deconstructs recognizable elements of cinematic language – the shot, the audio clip, the intertitle – so that the spectator may recombine them into unique constellations. As such, *Immemory* may be described as 'strongly interactive', to borrow Lopes' terminology, as the viewer has the power to construct their own individualized experience through the manipulation of malleable elements.

At one point in the project, Marker presents the spectator with a collection of clickable artefacts which the accompanying caption identifies as 'Madeleines' (Figure 2). The caption continues: 'Thus one comes to call Madeleines all those objects, all those instants that can serve as triggers for the strange mechanism of Memory'. Marker has frequently claimed Proust as a major influence on his understanding of human memory, and here refers to the quotidian objects which activate subjective mnemonic associations throughout the author's masterwork *In Search of Lost Time*. The most iconic example of such a mnemonic passage in Proust's novel, of course, is the instance in which a madeleine pastry dipped in tea conjures memories of the narrator's experiences in Combray with his Aunt Léonie. In *Immemory*, Marker re-imagines Proust's literary 'Madeleines' as interactive audio-visual objects which, when clicked on, provide access to further digital hot spots. These totems are familiar objects: a postcard, a theatre program, a photograph of composer Vittorio Rieti, a book cover and a 'do not disturb' sign from a hotel. Clicking on one of these objects opens up a different forking pathway, which relates to some aspect of Marker's personal history, either directly or obliquely. For example, clicking on the photograph of Vittorio Rieti brings the viewer to a new menu screen, from which they can access written biographical information about the composer, images of written correspondence, an audio snippet of one of his compositions, and an image of an oscilloscope reading. By clicking one of the hotspots, the viewer encounters Marker's personal, tenuous relationship to Rieti: Rieti's son Fabio would one day paint a collage of owls used

by Marker in the series *The Owl's Legacy* (1990). Therefore, the simple icon of the photograph expands outwards to a multitude of tangentially related archival materials, which the spectator may peruse at their own leisure.

Figure 2: Marker's virtual madeleines

As Erika Balsom observes, *Immemory* 'introduces an element of action into Proust's more passive conception of involuntary memory, as it is precisely the trajectory decided upon by the viewer, possible only through interactive technology, that memory becomes actualized' (2008). Rather than watching a pre-established stream of images which may trigger a personal memory, as the viewer would do in the classical paradigm of film spectatorship, the user of *Immemory* must actualize memory by making a series of active choices regarding which on-screen object to focus on, and which direction through the material to move in. In doing so, Marker encourages an 'intensive mapping that forces the user into the creative role of determining his or her own trajectory through the work' (Balsom, 2008). The user's encounter with *Immemory* is not simple, and they may find different correspondences between the archival materials each time. As Nora Alter observes:

'There is no pre-established sequential logic. The route chosen by the viewer dramatically transforms him or her from the role of being a mere witness of Marker's memory and lived history to that of a co-producer of histories and memories in the twentieth century' (2006: 121).

Immemory does not present the user with a problem that can clearly be 'solved' or a conflict that can be overcome. The project allows the user to reconfigure the materials of Marker's personal archive into a theoretically infinite number of potential combinations according to their personal preferences, and each time the user does so they will forge new connections between the materials which, in turn, spur their own mnemonic associations. Marker, therefore, does not put across a single, fixed interpretation of history, but instead facilitates a pluralistic range of interpretations based on individual encounters with his digital mementos. As Marker writes in his introduction to *Immemory*, his ultimate ambition with the project was to create a work that would enable the viewer to reflect on the processes through which their own memories are formulated:

‘My fondest wish is that there might be enough familiar codes here (the travel picture, the family album, the totem animal) that the reader-visitor could imperceptibly come to replace my images with his, my memories with his, and that my *Immemory* should serve as a springboard for his own pilgrimage’ (1997).

The externalization of Marker’s memory in the form of a freely navigable database, then, was intended to more accurately resemble the way that actual human memory functions than would be possible to achieve through the form of a feature film. As Marker makes clear, the participative, non-linear nature of the project is designed to make the mechanisms of memory more perceptible to the user, so that their own, personal act of remembrance may be triggered. In the process of essayistic communication, what is most important is not that the separate parties synthesise their individual perspectives into a single, unified conclusion (an outcome which, as I have illustrated, the essay film inherently resists), but that the conditions for an exchange of communication between one party and another is established. Marker’s interactive interface invites the viewer to enter into a personalized, subjective relationship with historical artefacts, rather than to perceive of these archival documents as transparent windows into the past. Because there is no pre-established line of response, and there is no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ way to interact with the collected materials, the project enables the viewer to develop an individual conception of the past and their place within it; the negotiation of meaning in *Immemory* occurs through the spectator’s unique engagement with the text, and this process will vary from spectator to spectator.

Ouvroir: empowering the gaze of the spectator within virtual space

With *Ouvroir*, a virtual museum constructed within the web-based role-playing game *Second Life*, Marker carried over his fascination with the archival possibilities of digital technology into the realm of three-dimensional simulation. *Second Life* is a never-ending, three-dimensional platform game without hierarchal levels, manufactured conflicts, or clear objectives, instead setting up a virtual

environment in which users may converse with other players, build architectural spaces, upload multimedial objects from their computer hard drive, and pursue their own self-defined goals. When a user constructs a new architectural space within the game, it becomes available for other users to engage with. *Second Life*, then, offers the user a great number of possible spectatorial experiences, as the viewer may explore and interact with a series of constantly expanding and evolving computer-generated environments with no pre-set guiding path. The never-ending, participative nature of *Second Life* proved attractive to Marker, who recognized its potential to aid him in reimagining the museal possibilities of the virtual database and granting the viewer increased agency over their spectatorial experience. *Ouvroir* arranges a range of archival audio-visual materials around the space of a computer-generated archipelago, which the user may navigate through the avatar of the anthropomorphic ginger cat Monsieur Guillaume – a CGI creation based on an illustrated character who appears in several of Marker’s other multimedial projects. The archipelago is divided into several different sections, each of which is housed in a different enclosure; these spaces are arranged across several levels, connected through bridges, alleys and corridors. Although the structure vaguely resembles that of a real-world, material museum, there are several elements of its design that defy the laws of physics: bridges float above the water with no support, a large red orb is suspended in the air, and small objects drift across the environment in all directions in an unpredictable pattern (Figure 3).

Figure 3: The impossible architecture of *Ouvroir* (2008)

Within each of these simulated spaces is contained a collection of digitized archival materials, each one relating to some aspect of Marker’s life and/or work. As in *Immemory*, these items are all connected to Marker’s life and works in some way, ranging from digitally remediating images and clips from the filmmaker’s previous features, Marker’s still photography, totems from countries and historical eras which have featured prominently in Marker’s earlier artworks, images from the features of Marker’s claimed artistic inspirations (including Kurosawa, Tarkovsky, and Medvedkin – three filmmakers who have served as subjects for short essays by Marker in the past). In one of the central galleries of *Ouvroir*, multiple images from Marker’s book of portrait photography *Staring Back* (2007) are dispersed across the perimeter of the room, as if hanging in an art exhibit. In the middle of

the space sits a table, across which eight objects are displayed. The objects are miniature digital reproductions of eight books, which resemble miniature, digitized versions of travel books written by Marker during his early years as a photo-journalist (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Navigating the computer-generated museum

Ouvroir grants the user more possibilities for perceptually exploring the digital database than in *Immemory* by extending the ambulatory gaze into multi-directional, simulated space. While *Immemory* allows the user to perceptually engage with screen content by using the cursor to select options presented to them in a series of two-dimensional menu screens, *Ouvroir* allows the viewer to feel as though they are physically traversing an environment along the x-, y- and z-axes. In addition to being able to track forward, back and side to side through the computerized museum, the spectator may use the mouse or the arrow keys to direct the focalizing perspective of their avatar across a 360° plane. Immersed in screen space of *Ouvroir*, the spectator is free to zoom into different parts of the museal objects, to view them from different angles, or even to position their perspective so that only a fraction of the object is visible on their monitor. As the viewer is able to intuitively control the direction, speed and perspective of the avatar, they have a greater level of freedom in determining their perceptual experience of the archival materials.

Like *Immemory*, *Ouvroir* is not only constructed in such a way that permits meandering on the user's part, the construction of the project is intended to destabilize the viewer. Marker does not provide the spectator with a stable, linear path through the dense collection of archival materials. To do so would imply that there is a fixed, correct way of consuming the archival totems, and therefore set up a uniform spectatorial position that would be identical for every user. Such a design would be antithetical to the very ideological nature of the project. Any attempt that viewer may make at traversing the entire space of the archipelago in a straightforward line of motion is bound to end in frustration. The museal spaces are arranged in no clear order, and the maze-like passages which connect them branch out into multiple forking paths, some of which lead the spectator to a dead end, while others lead the spectator to a path they have already crossed. At times, the impression of solid,

traversable architecture breaks down entirely, such as in one ‘underground’ compartment which exists as a shadowy, abstracted area in which an assemblage of still and moving images (some with visible borders, some without) drift in a across the contours of the screen in a randomized sequence. This environment does not align with any traditional model of realistic architectural space, and the unpredictable movement of the images across the x-, y- and z-axes means that the user cannot establish a stable vantage point which would allow them to clearly see all of the artworks (Figure 5). This interplay between recognizable elements of architectural space and spatiotemporal distortion results in what Jihoon Kim describes as a ‘spatial instability’ which is suspended between ‘the uncanny coexistence of boundedness and boundlessness’ (2020: 99). The difficulty of establishing a stable trajectory through this virtual environment forces the user to engage in substantial intellectual labour; they must make a concerted effort to map their way through the often-destabilizing blocks of space, to view the vast reservoir of audio-visual materials in a non-linear and individualized way, and, in doing so, to traverse the contours of their own memory.

Figure 5: The breakdown of virtual space

Immemory and *Ouvroir* are both projects which have no definitive beginning or ending points. The spectator may select their own starting position, embark on their essayistic encounter, and then finish the experience whenever they choose. Even though the essayistic feature film may employ strategies of direct address, alter the chronology of events, and incorporate techniques of distanciation to provoke active and critical spectatorship, the open-endedness and the interactivity of digital media enables the viewer to determine the conditions of their perceptual journey with a greater degree of freedom. The empowerment of the spectator’s gaze in Marker’s late digital projects does not, however, mean that the authorial presence of the filmmaker is concealed; like Marker’s earlier essayistic works, *Immemory* and *Ouvroir* foreground the presence of Marker as a figure who provides the tools and establishes the topics of philosophical enquiry which form the building blocks of the spectator’s intellectual navigation. It is through the tension between the agency afforded to the viewer and the boundaries which delimit the user’s choices that the dialogical communication between filmmaker and spectator takes place. Asked in an interview about his overarching filmmaking

ambitions, Marker remarked that he 'tr[ies] to give the power of speech to people who don't have it, and, when it's possible, to help them find their own means of expression' (Douhaire, Rivoire and de Baecque, 2003: 39). By embracing new media, Marker developed a range of effective devices for breaking down the hierarchy between author and viewer. In *Immemory* and *Ouvroir*, essayistic meaning is produced through the exchange between Marker's arrangement of digitized archival footage, and the linkages forced by the viewer as they actively work through these objects. In the process, the spectator is trained to realize their potential for essayistic thought, to become a montagist in their own right who locates unexpected intertextual connections between 'found' audio-visual fragments.

Bibliography

- Alter, N 2006 *Chris Marker (Contemporary Film Directors)*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Arthur, P 2003 Essay Questions: From Alain Resnais to Michael Moore. *Film Comment*, 39(1): 58-62.
- Bazin, A 2003 [1958] *Bazin on Marker*. Kehr, D (trans.) *Film Comment*, 39 (4): 44–45.
- Corrigan, T 2011 *The Essay Film: From Montaigne, After Marker*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Douhaire, D and Rivoire, A 2003 ‘Marker Direct: An Interview with Chris Marker’. *Film Comment*, 39(3): 38-41.
- Jensen, J.F 1999 Interactivity: Tracking A New Concept In Media And Communication Studies. *Nordicom Review*, 12:1: 185-204.
- Kim, J 2020 The archive with a virtual museum: The (im)possibility of the digital archive in Chris Marker’s *Ouvroir*. *Memory Studies*, 13(1): 90–106. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698018766386>
- Landay, L 2009 Virtual Kino-Eye: kinetic camera, machinima, and virtual subjectivity in *Second Life*. *Journal of e-Media Studies*, 2(1). DOI: 10.1349/PS1.1938-6060.A.340
- Lopes, D M M 2001 The Ontology of Interactive Art. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 35(4): 65-81. DOI: 10.2307/3333787
- Lupton, C 2006 *Chris Marker: Memories of the Future*. Islington: Reaktion Books.
- Marker, C 2020 [1997] *Immemory by Chris Marker*, 13 August 2020. Available at: <https://chrismarker.org/chris-marker/immemory-by-chris-marker/>. [Last accessed 20 December 2021].
- Marker, C 2015 [2003] Medevkin and the Invention of Television. *Comparative Cinema*, 3(7): 24-26.

Marker, C 2007 *Staring Back*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Montaigne, M 2003 [1580] *The Complete Essays*. Screech, M A (trans.) New York: Penguin.

Montero, D 2012 *Thinking Images: The Essay Film as a Dialogic Form in European Cinema*. Berlin: Peter Lang AG, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften.

Rascaroli, L 2009 *The Personal Camera: Subjective Cinema and the Essay Film*. London: Wallflower Press.

Rodowick, D N 2007 *The Virtual Life of Film* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vertov, D 1985 [1926] *Kino-Eye: The Writings of Dziga Vertov*. O'Brien, K (trans.) California: University of California Press.

Filmography

Classe de lutte. 1969. [Film] Chris Marker. France: Societe pour le Lancement des Oeuvres Nouvelles.

Dimanche à Peking [*Sunday in Peking*]. 1956. [Film] Chris Marker. France: Pavox Films and Argos Films.

Histoire(s) du cinéma. 1998. [Film] Jean-Luc Godard. France: Canal+, Centre National de la Cinématographie, France 3, Gaumont, La Sept, Télévision Suisse Romande, Vega Films.

Immemory. 1998. [CD-ROM] Chris Marker. France: Direction des Editions du Centre Pompidou.

Le Tombeau d'Alexandre [*The Last Bolshevik*]. 1992. [Film] Chris Marker. France: Les Films de l'Astrophore and CNC.

Lettre de Sibérie [*Letter From Siberia*]. 1958. [Film] Chris Marker. France: Pavox Films and Argos Films.

L'Héritage de la chouette [*The Owl's Legacy*]. 1990. [TV] Chris Marker. France: Icarus Films.

Ouvroir. 2012. [Online Resource] Chris Marker. United States: *Second Life*. Available at: <https://secondlife.com/destination/ouvroir-chris-marker>. [Accessed December 5th 2021].

SP(EYE) GAM3Z. 2012. [Film]. Gina Telaroli. United States: MUBI.

Zapping Zone. 1990. [Installation] Chris Marker. France: Centre Pompidou.