

Movement That Matters Historically: Janet Cardiff and George Bures Miller's 2012 *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk*

Christine Ross

Since the late 1990s, with the growth of new media technology and relational aesthetics as well as the renewed interest in the history of places, spatial art practices have expanded to include in situ installation art, relational interventions, immersive environments, intelligent architecture, augmented reality, and Internet localizations. This expansion has set about a significant rearticulation of the aesthetics of space, one in which artistic practices invested in the critique of space have moved away from the *demythologization* of space of the 1970s and 1980s (the disclosure of the doxa of specific environments) to engage with what might be called the *activation* of sites—an activation that calls for the mobilization of the spectator and his or her participation in the making of the artwork.

The shift has been a progressive yet persistent one. Site-specific activities emblematic of the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s concurred to problematize the notion of space as a passive receptacle of objects and subjects. This problematization took different forms. It included the Minimalist integration of the gallery space in the spectator's perceptual experience of the art object as well as institutional critique, the turning of space into place, the production of countermonuments, and the unfolding of site as

what art historian Miwon Kwon, in her influential *One Place after Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity* (2004), identified as a “discursive vector” (a vector rooted in language and context).¹ Many of these practices shared the democratic impulse to disclose what art historian Rosalyn Deutsche in her equally influential *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics* (1998), which includes an exemplary analysis of Krzysztof Wodiczko's installations, designated as the hidden conflicts and exclusions constitutive of social space.² In the last two decades or so, this impulse has not so much disappeared but instead has been rearticulated, with varied success, in media practices that explore mobility, movement, communality, corporeality, and affectivity as modalities by which space can be mapped, known, or simply felt through the actual experience of that space. In most cases, the activation of space requires the mobilization of the spectator inside or outside the gallery space and often relies on new media technology to do so. In terms of exploring the mobilization of the viewer as a form of emancipation of the spectator, recent media art's activation of space has its roots in expanded cinema practices of the 1960s and 1970s—practices that seek to break away from the corporeal immobilization and black boxing of film spectatorship.³ Activation also requires a greater participation from the spectator in the production of environments—one recent example being Thomas Hirschhorn's 2013 *Gramsci Monument* in which a team of residents of Forest Houses in the South Bronx was invited to transform their district into a live monument.

Although several art historical studies have started to examine this spatial shift,⁴ the redefinitions that it appears to entail—redefinitions of spectatorship, perceptibility, criticality, spatial politics, mediality, and temporality—remain insufficiently addressed. Key to the rearticulation is the blooming of the aesthetic exploration of spatial interfaces provided by mobile technologies (books, maps, Walkmans, CD players) as well as the exploration of contemporary mobile media endowed with location-awareness applications (Wi-Fi, the triangulation of location by radio waves, smartphones whose localization capacities are enabled by the Global Positioning System [GPS]). There is no real understanding of contemporary spatial art without an assessment of these media art developments. Let us briefly refer to the following two works: (1) Jeremy Hight, Jeff Knowlton, and Naomi Spellman's image and sound location-aware narrative *34 North, 118 West* (2002), which unfolds on the basis of participants' location and movement in space while equipped with headphones and a Tablet PC with a GPS card, so as to uncover the history of the industrial

era of Los Angeles, and (2) Rafael Lozano-Hemmer's *Open Air* (2012), an interactive artwork held in Philadelphia's museum district whereby participants, using an iPhone application, could register messages played back loud over the site and then contemplate the modulation of light rays projected across the sky by robotic searchlights that react, in brightness and position, to voice frequency and volume as well as to GPS localization. These media works substantially modify the demythologizing practices of the 1970s–90s, which aimed to disclose the ideologies, textualities, or systems of belief of specific sites. The main ethos of these projects is to animate sites by soliciting movement from participants in these very sites. The projects localize participants to connect them and create transitory communities. More importantly, the projects immerse participants in mixed (virtual and physical) realities that historicize the space in which they are invited to circulate.⁵

In an attempt to begin to assess the role of media art in the development of the aesthetics of space, this essay examines a mobile artwork, taken from a production that has significantly contributed to the contemporary shift of spatial art: Janet Cardiff and George Bures Miller's 2012 dOCUMENTA (13) video walk, the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk*. This work explores movement and mobility as an undertaking by which a specific space (a train station in this case) is historicized. The innovativeness of the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* resides in its elaboration of movement as an affective historicization of place. In the video walk, movement is both an action and a medium through which what has been forgotten about a place is emotionally felt by the participant rather than disclosed, represented, or deconstructed by the work. The historical materialization of space comes about in the manifold and interdependent occurrences of movement—not only the movement of the walker in space but also the mobility of media devices, the movement of the image, the movement of sound, the circulation of contemporary and historical information in relation to a singular place, and the participant's capacity to be affectively moved through movement. In addition, movement is pivotal to the historicizing of space as an alternative not only to learned history but also to oblivion: it is a key player in historicizing processes by which forgetting—what philosopher Paul Ricoeur has designated as “the emblem of the vulnerability of [the historical] condition”⁶—is potentially countered. To historicize a place through affectivity is to explore movement as an action and medium by which a subject becomes receptive and responsive to that place. Triggered by movement, affectivity is a “dispositional orientation” (an intensity, a force) that motivates an emotional receptivity to one's environment.⁷ In the

Bahnhof walk, emotional receptivity is to the otherwise invisible history of the train station.

The Alter Bahnhof Video Walk

Berlin-based Canadian artists Cardiff and Bures Miller's video walk was designed for the Hauptbahnhof, Kassel's old but still active train station. Visitors, equipped with an iPod and a headset, are invited to circulate in the space while being guided by a twenty-six-minute video of the station broadcast on the iPod, accompanied by prerecorded sounds of the site as well as Cardiff's voice transmitted through the headphones (figure 1). Involved in a narrative that appears autobiographical but whose autobiographical tone is inseparable from the fictionality of film noir's aesthetics, Cardiff describes the train station in Kassel. She identifies objects, people (musicians, a ballerina) and areas in the train station and asks us to look and walk. The screen can be said to both augment the walker's view of the space by adding information onto it *and* partially fictionalize that view (the screen offers a video of the space recorded at a different time, with actors and props—a prerecorded space to which the walker nevertheless clings to in order to grasp her or his own environment). As the walker's gaze passes from the prerecorded space communicated by the screen to the physical space, objects and sections persist, but people change and disappear. The screen is an optical/aural framing device, something that mixes together but is never quite reducible to a window (the screen makes the space visible), a camera (the walker often has the impression of filming the site in real time), an archive (the images show what Cardiff has seen but what we will never see, insofar as they document past though similar views), a means of alignment with the artist's initial view (so as to better circulate in the actual space), and a portable cinema (the walker's gaze clings to the screen, at the risk of unbalancing her movement in space). Hence, Cardiff's use of interchangeable words at the beginning of the walk: “Turn on the camera; press the video button. I am sitting here with you in the train station in Kassel watching people pass by.”

After a few minutes into the Hauptbahnhof, however, the space ceases to be an ordinary train station. It gains in singularity. As we walk on, Cardiff starts to refer explicitly—a reference that will remain active from now on—to the history of Kassel during World War II. We hear a man speaking about the bombing of Kassel. Cardiff speaks of the deportation of the Jewish people. She guides us to a monument dedicated to the Holocaust and then to different



Figure 1. Janet Cardiff and George Bures Miller, *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk*, 2012. Courtesy of the artists.

platforms. She shares her fears of trains, recalls a troubled dream (“I remember lying in the hotel room that night, alone, watching a German black and white movie . . . [and] the images of trains and soldiers”), speaks about the difficulty of letting go of memories and brings us to Platform 13, the very platform from where Jews “boarded the trains.” The historicization of the train station slowly unfolds but intensifies around Platform 13 when the soundtrack gains in ecological and environmental sound texture.”

Although Cardiff’s narrative and our listening to that narrative can be considered as a process that historicizes the train station—recalling what might be already forgotten about it or what is about to be forgotten, what is in fact not visible in that space—historicization occurs not so much narratively but instead more so occurs affectively. The mix of narrative and fiction is certainly a condition of possibility for the historicization of the station, and historicization unfolds as we keep listening. However, the video walk is more innovatively involved in the progressive production of an alternative form of historicization that results from the walker’s feeling of the train station as one of the important sites of the genocidal state that developed around World War II, when Jews were transported by freight trains to extermination camps. Indeed, following the moments of historical referencing, the soundtrack progressively immerses walkers in the increasingly intensive sounds of trains and people rushing through the station, as the participants in the exhibit themselves walk in that same space some seventy-years later. This mixed reality evolving around Platform 13 propels the walker

into a felt space that densely overlaps the audible and the visible as well as the fictional and the real. This overlapping blends the past and the present (the victims of the Holocaust and the 2012 listener) to create a historical awareness that occurs through this intermingling. During these few seconds, history (the history of the Hauptbahnhof train station) is lived as a vital force—an intensity that drives the contemporary walker closer to the historical victim to coexist with that victim in the station (not to be like the victim but to feel what the victim might have felt and be transformed by that feeling, even at the level of one’s identity). Moving in space has been transformed into being moved *by* space.

How and why does movement matter in a spatial media art practice invested in the historicization of space? The *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* sets into play movement as an activity that not only constitutes the perception of a specific place (the Hauptbahnhof) but also progressively thickens visual and aural perception as a mode of enactiveness, extendedness, and sensorial immersion. It is this very thickening of perception through movement that slowly prepares and constitutes the affective activation of site and, more precisely, the affective historicization of Kassel’s train station around Platform 13. These operations overlap in the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* experience to produce affective historicity.

Enactiveness: Perceiving Space through Movement

The walking dimension of the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* is crucial to the participant’s experience. The walker perceives, apprehends, and feels the public space in and through movement—a public space itself mobilized by the moving images and sounds of the video. The whole trajectory inserts the walker in a movement that enables her or him to experience space in its mixed fictional/physical reality. In so doing, the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* can be said to provide conditions of mobility that not only support but also constitute perception.

To better understand this perception of space as being partly supervened on bodily activity, it is useful to see this work as establishing an important dialogue with contemporary cognitive science research insofar as it shares cognitive science’s preoccupation with and growing expertise in the phenomenology of movement and its impact on perception. I am thinking here more specifically of the phenomenologically oriented enactive model of perception developed by philosopher Alva Noë, which establishes that perception is inseparable from movement. This model fundamentally contests

what Patricia S. Churchland, V. S. Ramachandran, and Terrence J. Sejnowski have called “the pure theory of vision,” according to which vision consists of producing internal representation of the visual world on the basis of information exclusively available at the retina.⁸ Following the enactive perspective, perceptual experience is a tactile exploration of the perceiver’s environment, whose content is not only conditioned by the body in movement (by what we *do*) but also by one’s possession of bodily skills (by what we *know* how to do).⁹ Especially useful for the study of spectatorship in recent spatial arts, where the question of representation recedes to make room for the activity of the participant, is the postulate that the subject’s ability to perceive not merely depends on but is constituted by her or his possession of sensorimotor knowledge—the knowledge “of the way sensory stimulation varies as you move” and of how appearances change as one moves and as perceived things move.¹⁰ This tactile enactment can be said to mobilize the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk*’s walker insofar as those who undertake the video walk are asked to move their eyes, head, and body to take in what is around them and not simply rely on internal representations of the world. Cardiff’s voice repeatedly asks us to look and align our view with hers. As Noë’s research discloses, perception does not solely consist of a construction of internal representations (content-bearing internal states) of the environment but also consists of brain-environment and vision-action interactions. The uniqueness of this model lies in its postulate that perception is a skillful activity on the part of the perceiver, which means that all perception “is intrinsically active.”¹¹ Perception is more specifically a *thoughtful* activity (to see, one must have visual impressions that one understands). One never perceives every part of a visual field simultaneously. One looks by attending to different areas of that field bit by bit or by moving, with the expectation that one’s perception of objects in that field will change as one moves or that the perceived moves in relation to the perceiver: the visual field is only virtually present as a whole through an accumulation of perspectival views operated through bodily movements and a mastering of the relevant sensorimotor knowledge contingencies.¹²

The *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* is a crucial contributor to the enactive perspective, and Noë’s enactive approach makes us aware of the productivity of its movement: by promoting movement—the movement of the image, of binaural sound, and of the walker—as the very medium of the work, the video walk invites the participant to perceive the train station bit by bit and not simply see it as a whole and from afar or deduct what it might be. The video walk embodies participants’ relation to that space. It overlaps fiction

and reality to incite them to perceive it in a more complex way. Participants are invited to move to know space. Of special use here are cognitive science’s findings on movement as “the generative source of spatial concepts”¹³ (such as insiderness, farness, and nearness), according to which the ability to move is rooted in kinesthesia—the subject’s deep sensitivity to its own position and movements of its bodily parts. The work of dance philosopher Maxine Sheets-Johnstone is pivotal to this field of study. Sheets-Johnstone suggests that “[s]tudies from the experiential perspective show that we put the world together in a spatial sense through movement and do so from the very beginning of our lives. Spatial concepts are born in kinesthesia and in our correlative capacity to think in movement.”¹⁴ Following this perspective, there are no spatial conceptualizations without movement. In the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk*, movement can then more precisely be said to make the participant receptive to the otherwise impalpable complexity of space. Enactive perception is a condition of possibility for the affective historicization of that space. If affectivity (as a multisensorial experience of intensity) is to come about around Platform 13 and if one is to be moved to historicize the place where one circulates, it is because one is already moving in that space. In contrast to the cinematic experience, where the spectator is moved by a film that is projected indifferently to the history of the movie theater environment, the walker is moved by a mixed (fictional and real) place as she or he actively engages with that environment.

Extendedness

Let us push this assessment of movement a bit further so that it may better account for the role of the media device in the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk*. After all, key to the video walk is the walker’s circulation in the train station equipped with an iPod and a headset. The moving images and moving sounds are part of the overall experience of the piece. Again, the work’s dialogue with contemporary cognitive science (its sharing of concerns and findings) is extremely useful in assessing how the manipulation of the iPod by the walker can be said to *extend* her or his cognitive processes into the environment. This observation, which will become clearer in a moment, is critical to our overall argument, which is to claim that in the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk*, movement thickens perception to constitute the affective activation—the affective historicization—of the train station.

The *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk*’s iPod works as a special kind of handheld screen—one that requires movement from the walkers

as they listen to Cardiff's directives and adjust their trajectory to Cardiff's taken at the moment of recording. As stipulated above, the screen can be said to partially fictionalize the walker's view of the space (it offers a video of the space recorded at a different time, to which the walker nonetheless clings in order to follow the narrative). The screen also provides an augmented view of that space by adding information onto it. The screen is simultaneously a window, a camera, a portable cinema, an archive, and a means of alignment with the artist's initial recording. Quite early on, Cardiff directs the walker to "try to align your movements with mine." The functionality and manipulation of the iPod never cease to be about the walker's alignment with the prerecorded images and sounds. As literary critic N. Katherine Hayles has recently reminded us, "We think . . . through, with, and alongside media."¹⁵ This is typical of our manipulation of iPods as we circulate in public spaces, as is the case in the Hauptbahnhof experience. Technogenesis—the coevolution of humans and technology—occurs both at the evolutionary and the developmental levels (throughout the evolution of the human species and throughout the life span of each human being). On the human side, the neuroplasticity of the brain enables humans to adapt to changes in the technological environment. On the technology side, technical objects are dynamic, incomplete, and transformable processes that continuously let go of preindividual components to make future individuations and new technical ensembles possible. Following a technogenetic modulation, the mind coevolves with changes in the technological environment, including today's dense environments in which technology is increasingly involved in information processing.

Mobile media is not only something the walker learns to manipulate by hyperattention as she or he switches between diverse (fictional and real-world) information streams.¹⁶ The media apparatus, rather than separating fiction and the real world, provides instead images and sounds that the walkers can use—while holding the iPod and wearing the headphones—to deepen their knowledge of and sensitivity to the space in which they move. That extended perception is the main premise of Andy Clark and David J. Chalmers's *extended mind* model of cognitive processes, a model that supports the view that cognitive processes by humans coevolve and are thus influenced by changes in the technological environment.¹⁷ It helps to highlight that the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* is a walk in which coevolution, interdependence, and coinfluence take place between the walker's cognitive processes, the media device, and the environment. The iPod system becomes inherent to the cognitive processes. As such, it inserts the user in a postcogito

or post-Cartesian type of cognition—a cognition that is not simply internal but instead depends on or is extended by the media device. This mutuality is decisive. It is unthinkable to speak of an affective experience if the walker is conceived as a closed unit or an internal processor of information.

The extended model—a philosophical theory that investigates the active externalism of cognitive processes—is a constitutive thesis which posits that the environment plays an active role in cognitive processes. According to this model, it is not simply that the attributes of the environment influence cognitive processing occurring in the brain but that some cognitive processing (such as recognition and search) is enabled and constituted by these active attributes. Cognitive processing is defined as the interactive link between external elements of the environment and the organism. As Clark and Chalmers maintain, "In these cases, the human organism is linked with an external entity in a two-way interaction, creating a *coupled system* that can be seen as a cognitive system in its own right."¹⁸ The mind can be understood as reaching beyond the boundaries of the brain out into the body and into the environment to think, perceive, and navigate in ways that make this environment a genuine part of the very substrate required for cognitive activities. Hence, not only (as the enacted model already claims) are mental processes not identical with or exclusively realized by brain processes, but, as specified by philosopher Mark Rowlands in his reformulation of James J. Gibson's ecological theory of affordances, we make use of things around us in order to solve problems and get these things done: the mental tasks (notably perception, remembering, reasoning, and expression) function in part to "off-load . . . onto the environment around us," that is, "to get the environment to do some the work for us."¹⁹ In other words, as the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* perceivers walk in the train station equipped with a portable screen and a set of headphones, they manipulate the iPod as an information-bearing structure. They hold and move the screen to adjust it to the actual train station to make information about that place available—information that was initially unavailable prior to this information processing. That action—to transform information present in the environment to information that is available—is part of the cognitive process. It is therefore not only movement but also a media-facilitated movement in space that adds information to walkers' perception of the Hauptbahnhof train station. More importantly, walkers' cognitive processes are extended (that is, cognitive processes are not exclusively constituted by brain processes and are in fact shared by the media player). Likewise, the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* perceiver

is not the sole agent of affectivity: affects are also constituted by movement and shared by the media system.

Sensorial Immersion

Before we proceed to define what affectivity is (a definition that can only be approximate), it is helpful to go back to the actual experience occurring around Platform 13. This is not a universal experience, and so I can only describe my own. But the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* relies on a specific sound technology that conditions—to a certain degree—the walker's experience of a mixed-reality immersion. As in all of Cardiff and Bures Miller's video walks, video is recorded in binaural audio, a method of recording sound that uses two small microphones, each one installed in the ears of a person or that of a mannequin head, to register the sound as it goes to one ear and then to the next. Played back on headphones, it creates a three-dimensional stereo sound sensation, giving to the listener the sensation of being in the actual space as if its prerecorded events were live. The binaural sound is considerably powerful, as it tends to actualize a continuum, an overlap, a blurring, and sometimes an amalgamation (but not a complete fusion) between the inside and outside as well as between the fictional and the real. It is a key component of the enmeshment occurring on Platform 13, where the past and the present of the train station—the victims of the Holocaust and the 2012 dOCUMENTA (13) listener—just about coexist to create a fluctuating and evanescent yet half-imaginary/half-real single space. To move in the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* is to be engaged in that fluctuating yet continuous coexistence.

What constitutes this continuous coexistence? How is this enmeshment productive? Does the affective historicization of space occur through distancing or immersion—a distancing from or embrace of enmeshment?

In a conversation with Cardiff and Bures Miller held at the Haus der Kunst in Munich in 2012, Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev, artistic director of dOCUMENTA (13), referred to *The Paradise Institute* (2001) to explain what she believes to be the Brechtian aesthetics of their art production. Initially presented at the Venice Biennale, *The Paradise Institute* consists in a plywood pavilion containing two rows of seats, which offers to the audience a hyperperspective view of a cinema theater. Installed with their headphones and immersed in binaural surround sound, spectators are exposed to two stories unfolding simultaneously: the film itself (a hybrid of film noir, science fiction, and thriller) together with its own soundtrack and the

aural action of a fictive audience that mixes with the aural action of the audience in the pavilion. Christov-Bakargiev identifies this *mise en abyme* setting (a theater within a theater) as offering a Brechtian experience of cinema that distanciates spectators from the fictionality of the plot and makes them aware of their spectatorial identity.²⁰ Experiencing the binaural soundtrack, Christov-Bakargiev argues, spectators are invited to watch a film while hearing themselves as a public outside the film; they see themselves as spectators looking at the film. Surprisingly, however, later in the conversation Bures Miller speaks of his own grasp of binaural recording as articulating a confusion between reality and fiction: in the audio and video walks as one hears the sound of a place through the headphones and also the prerecorded sounds in the headphones, “you are never completely sure about what's fiction and what's reality.”²¹

In other words, the desired effect is not Brechtian—the audience's reflective detachment or distanciation from the narrative—but instead is an enmeshment of the real and the fictional. Even in moments of confusion, the use of binaural sound does not entail that the fictional absorbs the real world or that the real world incorporates the fiction: they might be confused, but they do not necessarily dissolve in one another. This amalgamation accounts for the immersive experience of the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* around Platform 13. This immersion is that of a perceiver whose perception is enacted and extended by movement in its manifold occurrences—not only the perceiver's movement in space but also the mobility of media devices, the movement of the image, the movement of sound, the circulation of information in relation to a singular place, and the participant's capacity to be affectively moved through movement. In other words, binaural movement of sound is key to the affective historicization of the train station: its immersive and blurring effects intensify the enactment and extendedness of the participant's perception of space that progressively unfold through the video walk. Immersion creates an audible space whereby to move in space transforms itself into being moved by space. Around Platform 13, I feel what the other might have felt like. That feeling is the core of the affective historicization process.

The Affective Historicization of a Singular Place

The *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk* can be said to thicken the perception of the train station by the different levels of movement that it sets into play. Perception in movement is a progressive form of

embodied action (rooted in sensorimotor knowledge and kinaesthesia), an extension, and a sensorial immersion. Therein lies the process through which the affective historicization of the Hauptbahnhof takes place, a historicization that is more of a process and a progression than an immediate unprepared experience. As suggested above, the movement of the perceiver in space—a perceiver whose perception is extended by the mobile media—brings forward the possibility of being moved: it enables, conditions, and opens up one's availability to affectivity around Platform 13.

Although the definition of the term "affect" remains unstable and ongoing in current literature—it is frequently equated with feeling or emotion and is variably defined as a reaction to stimuli that is precognitive or postcognitive—its Deleuzian formulation has considerably evolved in recent social sciences and in the humanities. Brian Massumi, for example, defines affectivity as "an ability to affect and be affected. It is a prepersonal intensity corresponding to the passage from one experiential state of the body to another and implying an augmentation or diminution in that body's capacity to act."²² In contrast to the personal dimension of feeling and the social dimension of emotions, affect is understood here in the post-Cartesian sense of being a force that cannot simply be contained by the body, the self, the mind, or the brain. If affect is to have any tangibility, then designating it as a force and an intensity is productive.²³ As best described by communication scholar Eric Shouse, an affect according to a Deleuzian perspective "is a non-conscious experience of intensity; it is a moment of unformed and unstructured potential. . . . Affect is the body's way of preparing itself for action in a given circumstance by adding a quantitative dimension of intensity to the quality of an experience."²⁴ Defined in this way, as "what makes feelings feel" and "what determines the intensity (quantity) of a feeling (quality), as well as the background intensity of our everyday lives,"²⁵ the affect is prior to and outside of consciousness. Affect conditions emotion, feelings, action, cognition, and will and has the power to influence consciousness by amplifying the subject's awareness of an individual's biological state as well as her or his environment. Affectivity is itself a movement—a "movement toward or away from"²⁶ the inside and the outside, a receptivity or responsiveness to one's environment by which the subject acts, thinks, and feels in specific ways.

This conceptualization of affectivity is valuable if we are to account for the walker's experience of the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk*. What our examination of the walk has shown is that affects do not simply drive us toward movement but also feed off of movement.

This is a progression whose outcome is never guaranteed yet leads to the formation of intensities that condition actions and emotions. As the walker evolves while moving around Platform 13, binaural amplified sounds of arriving trains and rushed passersby immerse the walker in a mixed reality that enmeshes the past and the present, the Jew of Kassel facing deportation and the walker. Throughout the walk, the walker's cognitive processes are increasingly enacted and extended, making her or his postcogito state available to affectivity. The mix of narrative, fiction, and sound creates an intensity that moves the post-Cartesian walker toward and away from the environment, making her or him responsive and receptive to that environment. There is a strong emotional tone to that receptivity by which beings of the past and of the present are experienced as coexisting. What is this affective, emotional experience? It doesn't quite match identification as defined by film theorist Kaja Silverman: neither idiopathic identification (the absorption of the other within the self) nor heteropathic identification (the identification with another as other). If the ethics of heteropathic identification comes from its opposition to the incorporative model of idiopathic identification, identification here cannot be simply equated with heteropathy whereby "one lives, suffers and experiences pleasure through the other."²⁷ Instead, identification unfolds following a post-Cartesian logic. Around Platform 13, I was carried by the binaural sound to dissolve into a crowd of imagined and real passersby where Jews facing deportation and twenty-first-century participants met and coexisted in a relation of interdependency and proximity. These moments established a common ground. This shared ground was intensely modulated by the intermixing of emotions of fear, speed, anxiety, and perplexity. Therein lies—in that very relation, in that very receptivity (which is itself a movement toward and away)—the *Alter Bahnhof Video Walk's* unique contribution to the historicization of space in spatial media practices: it historicizes site through the interplay of movement that is medially, enactively, affectively, and emotionally explored. Movement historicizes the site when it allows the participant to experience the presence of the past without collapsing the two temporal categories in an undifferentiated whole. History is felt (not represented) as a commonality with the disappeared. In this aesthetics of movement, forgetting as "the emblem of the vulnerability of [the historical] condition"²⁸ is not only temporally and potentially offset; it keeps haunting the remembering.

Notes

¹ Miwon Kwon, *One Place after Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004), 29.

² Rosalyn Deutsche, *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998).

³ On the historical development of expanded cinema, see Gene Youngblood, *Expanded Cinema* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1970); Chrissie Iles, *Into the Light: The Projected Image in American Art, 1964–1977* (New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 2000); and Gabrielle Pedullà, *In Broad Daylight: Movies and Spectators After the Cinema*, translated by Patricia Gaborik (London: Verso, 2012).

⁴ See Grant H. Kester, *The One and The Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011); Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participation Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* (London: Verso, 2012); Anna Dezeuze, ed., *The 'Do-It-Yourself' Artwork: Participation from Fluxus to New Media* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2012); Lev Manovich, "The Poetics of Augmented Space," *Visual Communication* 5, no. 2 (2006): 219–40; Mark B. N. Hansen, *New Philosophy for New Media* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006); Steve Benford and Gabriella Giannachi, *Performing Mixed Reality* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011); Jason Farman, *Mobile Interface Theory: Embodied Space and Locative Media* (New York: Routledge, 2011); and Adriana Souza e Silva and Jordan Frith, *Mobile Interfaces in Public Spaces: Locational Privacy, Control, and Urban Sociability* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

⁵ See Ronald Azuma, Yohan Baillot, Reinhold Behringer, Steven Feiner, Simon Julier, and Blair MacIntyre, "Recent Advances in Augmented Reality," *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications* 21, no. 6 (November–December, 2001): 34–47, www.cs.unc.edu/~azuma/cga2001.

⁶ Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, translated by Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 412.

⁷ My definition of affectivity borrows from clarifications proposed by Francisco J. Varela, "The Specious Present: The Neurophenomenology of Time Consciousness," in *Naturalizing Phenomenology*, edited by Jean Petitot, Francisco J. Varela, Bernard Pachoud, and Jean-Michel Roy (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), 299, and Maxine Sheets-Johnstone, *The Primacy of Movement* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011), 454.

⁸ Patricia S. Churchland, V. S. Ramachandran, and Terrence J. Sejnowski, "A Critique of Pure Vision," in *Large-Scale Neuronal Theories of the Brain*, edited by Christof Koch and Joel L. Davis (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994), 23–60.

⁹ Alva Noë, *Action in Perception* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004), 3.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 78.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹² *Ibid.*, 57.

¹³ Maxine Sheets-Johnstone, "Thinking in Movement: Further Analyses and Validations," in *Enaction: Toward a New Paradigm for Cognitive Science*, edited by John Stewart, Olivier Gapenne, and Ezequiel A. Di Paolo (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010), 167.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ N. Katherine Hayles, *How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 1.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 69.

¹⁷ Andy Clark and David J. Chalmers, "The Extended Mind," in *The Extended Mind*, edited by Richard Menary (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹⁹ Mark Rowlands, *The New Science of the Mind: From Extended Mind to Embodied Phenomenology* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010), 16.

²⁰ Roland Barthes, "La Révolution brechtienne" [1955], in *Essais critiques* (Paris: Seuil, 1964), 51.

²¹ George Bures Miller, "Haus der Kunst: Artist's Talk—Janet Cardiff & George Bures Miller with Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev," April 12, 2012 (published on April 16, 2012), www.youtube.com/watch?v=xMWd50TmuHs.

²² Brian Massumi, "Notes on the Translation and Acknowledgments," in *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), xvi.

²³ "Affect . . . is the name we give to those forces—visceral forces beneath, alongside, or generally *other than* conscious knowing, vital forces insisting beyond emotion—that can serve to drive us toward movement, toward thought and extension." See Gregory J. Seigworth and Melissa Gregg, eds., *The Affect Theory Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 1.

²⁴ Eric Shouse, "Feeling, Emotion, Affect," *M/C Journal*, 8, no. 6 (December 2005), <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0512/03-shouse.php>.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Sheets-Johnstone, *The Primacy of Movement*, 454.

²⁷ Kaja Silverman, *Male Subjectivity at the Margins* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 205.

²⁸ Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, 412.