All space is potentially cinematic. Cinematic space, in its conception and production, historically drew from a renaissance model of linear perspective. It differs from perspectival space through its discrete technological manifestations of the ideology inherent in the cinematic apparatus of production, as identified by Jean-Louis Baudry (though ideology is also present in the apparatus of quattrocento perspective). Architectural space, having a longer history, draws upon a wider range of conceptual models of spatial formation of cultural meaning, though architectural space in 20th century modernism draws from the same conceptual soil, and similar methods of production as cinematic space. The tendency of modernism, identified by Clement Greenberg and others, to reductively turn towards the processes of making that are unique to specific artistic practices generally holds true in architecture and cinema, but modernism has historically involved some promiscuous spatial formations hovering between the proper boundaries between cinema and architecture.

The project of industrialized modern architecture during the interwar period often suppressed the representational, ornamental, and signifying traditions of architectural space, in a slow process loosely paralleling the ascendancy of film over opera. The technological vision of modernism, in diminishing the function of representational space as the metaphysical locus of absolute truths, transformed the conception of space into a question, a neutral, undifferentiated void. Into this conceptual void there came a slow seeping of new "latent" and "surplus" meanings from then-contemporary materials and methods of industrial production. Let us term these seeping meanings impulses, or more cinematically, movements. Generated from a fetish of industrial technique, the voiding of metaphysics in modern space was often a mortgaging the presence of the past for the promise of the future today. The reductivist "architecture-degree-zero" of German architect Mies van der Rohe is the most transparent example of this tendency. In the spaces of modernity, the predominance of instrumental logic, Fordist-Taylorist techniques, and the reliance on mechanical craft (or material culture) appear as a repetition-compulsion that seeks not the return of an abandoned and unrecoverable metaphysical origin, but the search for a differential
origin in the immediate - or more accurately in the progressive utopian potential of the immediate near future. The proper material of architecture is not its skins, but its voids, and the voids of modern architecture are often undifferentiated and neutral, inviting projections of meaning from the techniques of their construction (or more accurately from their framing). In the Miesian model, modern space is partially defined by separated and technologically-mediated pure planar surfaces.

Consider an analogous case of constructed modern space, not in architecture but film, postulated in 1923 by Russian avant-garde filmmaker (kinok) Dziga Vertov:

I am Kino-eye. I am a builder. I have placed you, whom I've created today, in an extraordinary room which did not exist until just now when I also created it. In this room there are 12 walls shot by me in various parts of the world. In bringing together shots of walls and details, I've managed to arrange them in an order that is pleasing and to construct with intervals, correctly, a film-phrase which is the room.¹

Here seeing is building | constructing | projecting (the critical tropes of modernism).² Vertov's architectonic model of cinematic space is posited on a radical modernism where meaning is located specifically within the technological process of making. Vertov's fused montage-space is described by the discrete de-contextualized surfaces of the film-phrase, though he sustains the pre-modern tendency of aesthetic valuation in the process of making (i.e. arranging them in an order that is pleasing). Their near-instantaneous existence is also critical for understanding modernist space, for the suddenness of revolutionary impulses and movements frequently displaced the slow revelation of truths through epochal metaphysical constructs. Following from Vertov's insight, the existence (never essence) of perceptible space is imaginary, assembled from autonomous "shots" that can only be understood in the mechanically-mediated medium of filmic projection. Though this method apparently opens the gates for later surrealist or postmodern strategy of forming complex semiotic constructs, the explicit intention is not to create a polyvalent but a unified space, unified not by imagery but by rigorous attention to this discipline-specific and self-referential process of making.³

It has been claimed that the origin of modern architecture lies in the earlier model of Ferdinand Laugier's "primitive hut," operating as the informative germ cell of emergent modern architecture in 18th century France.⁴ This curious model sought to turn away from the excesses of the past, to reduce architecture to its minimal absolutes (verifiable facts), rethinking architecture as a technological mediation of the primitive, disciplining the impulses and movements of desire outside of a historical determinism, by emphasizing its irreducible components (column - space - hearth - shelter). Vertov's prophetic cinematic film-phrase is the primitive hut of modern cinematic space.

Vertov's contemporary (and tragically-fated architectural double) Ivan Leonidov (1902-1959) designed vast unbuilt revolutionary projects with a near-identical revolutionary approach to the construction of modern urban space. Leonidov projected discrete object-buildings, pristine technological apparatuses levitating above the solid soil, prophetically hovering in a fluid and undifferentiated space. From his thesis project for the Lenin Institute in the hills of Moscow through his Don Markomtiazhprom Project, he situated materialized or objectified movements and impulses, architectural-phrases, rendered as ahistorical volumes in ruthlessly rational and functional arrangement. These separated elements were drawn from diverse sources such as cooling towers, dirigibles, and pyramids, cinematically montaged into expansive urban landscapes.⁵

These specific modernist practices render space as the space of montage, where the Russian Formalist strategy of estrangement / defamiliarization (ostranenie), foregrounds the literariness of poetic language by exposing the methods of making. Modernism's attempts to overcome pretenses towards absolute historical and cultural truths utilizes defamiliarization on many levels, and consequently induces the imaginary spaces of modernity to become producers
of specific effects. The spatial practices of Leonidov and Vertov were simultaneously cinematic and architectonic - they were structuralist / formalist foregrounding of framed events, enabled by the physical structure of a space or media that reveals its tectonic method of materialized production. At the center of their works lay the imaginary spaces of modernity.

**IMAGINARY SPACES**

We are told nature abhors a vacuum; the analogously physical and conceptual voids of technological modern space cannot resist the "seepage" of subjective and perceptual meanings into their pristine voids. For this reason, modern space's instrumental reason continuously frames the emergence of that which it proposes to negate: the irrational, the "others" of reason. El Lissitzky's analysis of the movement-space of modernity reads (cinematic) space as the space of impulses and movements:

Form is only a dematerialized projection of the plane and makes use of only one property of the visual faculty. But we know that a material point can form a line; for example: a glowing coal while moving leaves the impression of a luminous line. The movement of a material line produces the impression of an area and of a body. There you have but an intimation of how one can build a material object by means of elementary bodies, in such a way that while it is motionless it forms a unity in our three-dimensional space, and when set in motion it generates an entirely new object, that is to say, a new expression of space, which is there for as long as the movement lasts and is therefore imaginary.

How then do we understand the presence of this constructed imaginary, and its implication of the irrational, in the projective voids of modernity? This filmic imaginary is the perception of movement-spaces from still images; cinema is "a writing with movements." The urban imaginary is the perception of event-spaces framed (not confined) by the neutral planes of modern space. All that is imaginary seeps into the most rational formations of cinematic space, urban space, even pictorial space. The imaginary is elusive because it cannot be fixed into a single constant representation: the fluid spaces of the modern form and reform around fluid desires, impulses, and movements.

For interior space is complete, finished (and this even includes the space that narrative theory calls the "diesgesis", the fictional universe). Movement in this space is always held within bounds, retracing known paths. Indeed, in this space motion is finally of no real significance, for it can take one nowhere. But if we are projected to a space outside ourselves, then movement is supremely important, for movement reveals that space which was not known before and by so doing suggests sense, becomes action.

Primitive imaginary spaces have always preceded writing and myth. The pre-modern aesthetic imaginary is posited upon a unified work whose intentions are transparent, and are grounded in stable metaphysical truths. The imaginary spaces of Mies, Vertov, or Leonidov (or any of the cinematic spaces of modernity) pretend towards a wholeness (the totalizing symbolic order that becomes the modern metropolis) when such a wholeness can never exist temporally or physically. The deliberate incorporation of disparate elements into a fused modern space involves a selective principle, editing, and depersonalized repetition that subvert the myth of a unified subject as anything but a provisional construct in provisionally constructed spaces.

To theoretically situate the imaginary outside the narrow concerns of aesthetics, we should turn to the Lacanian imaginary, with conditions. The imaginary self, constructed in the mirror phase, is a realm of prelinguistic images of the self in a space. Lacan's construct of the imaginary posits the subjectivity of the individual as divided, incomplete, and a partial register of conflicting impulses and movements. The imaginary, in contrast with the Lacanian symbolic, allows for the
subject to project hypothetical meanings into the gaps of a fragmented and tenuous link to what Lacan names "the Real" - the locus of material culture. "As imaginary, the city is the images and representations invoked to fend off the lack introduced into the real by the symbolic. It is the bid to make whole, to suture the wound of urban subjectivity." The real is an omnipresent void we cannot see, but can know through its effects and limits; it is a site for the projection of the imaginary, and can only be perceived through the imaginary. And this void is where modern architecture and cinema spring from.

**BERLIN: THE EXPRESSIONIST METROPOLIS**

Simultaneous with the influential experiments of the Russian avant-garde cited above, post-WW1 German modernism initially drew upon the pre-war model of the Jugendstil or Expressionism (even the radical industrial pedagogy of the Bauhaus sprang from Expressionist origins). Pioneering works in mutually informed cinematic spaces and modern urbanism accumulated in the experiments of the Weimar-era, when the freefall from the past opened the gates to cultural modernity. German Expressionist cinema, contemporaneous with the development of the Expressionist spaces of modernity in art and architecture, frames the imaginary spaces of the emergent modern metropolis as dissonant spaces, rationally conceived but producing a riot of irrational impulses.

Sociologist Georg Simmel observed the antagonistic effects of the emergent German metropolis upon the individual:

> The deepest problems of modern life flow from the attempt of the individual to maintain the independence and individuality of his existence against the sovereign powers of society, against the weight of the historical heritage and the external culture and technique of life. This antagonism represents the most modern form of the conflict which primitive man must carry on with nature for his own bodily existence.¹⁷

The unrestricted voids of modern urbanism, surrounding discrete object-buildings, proliferated at a vast scale as Berlin’s population expanded dramatically. Sigfried Kracauer noted in his review of the Expressionist film *Die Straße*:

> The individuals of the big city streets have no sense of transcendence, they are only outer appearance, like the street itself, where so much is going on without anything really happening. The swirl of the characters resembles the swirl of atoms: they do not meet, but rather bump up against each other, they drift apart without separating. Instead of living connected with things, they sink down to the level of inanimate objects: of automobiles, walls, neon lights, irrespective of time, flashing on and off...¹⁸

These spaces, increasingly modernist, undifferentiated, and totalizing, surrounded the fraying subject with relentless voids. These spaces of modernity were no longer proper perspectival representations of the real, but of the residual effects of the voids of the real.

Walter Benjamin offered many precise accounts of the emergence of modern urbanism's tenuous relation to the real, rendered as a dreamscape with uncertain boundaries: "The crowd is the veil through which the familiar city lures the flâneur like a phantasmagoria. In it the city is now a landscape, now a room."¹⁹ The city of voids appears to the individual as a constructed but fleeting imaginary space, a gaping space.

This negative vision of the spaces of modernity frames the emptiness of space as the spaces of the imaginary, as in the works of pre-war expressionism. In the diverse artistic production of expressionist spaces in film, art, and architecture, palpable shadows hover in these gaping spaces, inviting projections of the imaginary. "Space is assumed to hide, in its darkest recesses and forgotten margins, all the objects of fear and phobia that have returned with such insistency
to haunt the imaginations of those who have tried to stake out spaces to protect their health and happiness." These haunting shadows also mark the failure of the project of rationalism. Architecturally, these framed absences operate in a manner that André Bazin would later call "spectral spaces" normally found exterior to the cinematic (here urban) frame.

Sigfried Kracauer and others have shown the dominance of the cultural and ontological split personality dominating German Expressionist cinema of the 1920's (that fermented into fascist ideology of the 1930's). Berlin has always been posited upon this chronic split personality, a double vision of self and mirror, of figure and ghost, configured historically as real - imaginary, socialist - nationalistic, German - "other", east - west, and past - future. These dialectic extremes bound a persistent discursive topography that is always a construction site (of the irrational), a vision of mutable depths of space that operates cinematically as Vertov described. The origin of these constructions can be traced to the narrative spaces of Expressionist Berlin, in all its manifold forms, which conjured up the Doppelgänger or double of rational space, through the intersections of the erotic landscape with a relentless metropolis of difficult angles.

The increasing use of glass for building envelopes in the metropolis of Berlin in the modern period only enhanced this quality of an elusive space that refuses to stay within its bounds, or whose boundaries are porous. Glass architecture was the material language of the Expressionist utopias of Scheerbart and Poelzig. Glass architecture announces hygienic modernity and the dream of a purely transparent society. But in practice glass walls hide what they propose to expose, projecting distorted and phantom reflections from within their intended transparency. It must be noted that the cinematic lens and projector also use glass to mediate cinematic space. Without the discipline of rational glass constructions, the doubles of desire would have no place to haunt, and we would not recognize the doubles in our own subjective spaces.

The difficult constructions of expressionist space were achieved from film-phrases and architectural-phrases whose spaces were fragmentary, tending towards torsion and disintegration. These spaces were often diegetic phenomena of negative imaginary that anticipated the horror of blank spaces and vague terrains to come in late modern urbanism. Into these voids come the uncanny guest, modernism in the figure of the stranger, the double, or the ghost. The spaces of Berlin have always thus been haunted by these uncanny guests accompanying the project of modernity. Berlin's urban spaces, like Vertov's film-phrases or the Lacanian subject, pretend towards wholeness when they are in fact constructed from fragments and their shadows, historically given.

**THE (IMAGINARY) SPACES OF HISTORY**

The spaces of the imagination, the spaces of childhood, the spaces of dreams, and the spaces of the city are real to the degree they produce effects. Architectural spaces and cinematic spaces are never neutral - even abandoned and derelict spaces can become meaningful as entangled in subjective perception and memory. These spaces, cinematic or architectural, are stained by our own perceptions, our own doubles of reason. Our subjectivity
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can be seen cinematically as the selective history of the spaces we have known, both real and imaginary.

All history is fictive - its narratives are a constant tension between the real and the imaginary, like a city. What if history (or the utopian myth of progress) ceased to be a master narrative subsuming all, but shifted towards a complex of imaginary spaces - the space of little narratives, of minor histories? Would not this spatialized history of the self be a double of our memories, and also would it not resemble the contemporary city of Berlin?

As architecture projects specific visions of history into life, so too do the cinematic representations of the city. Cinematic space has the ability to project future/past (utopian) into the present, and to recall and remember the past and future as present - as memory, nostalgia, propaganda, or fiction - all are imaginary spaces projected into the gaps of the real. These expansive discourses belong in the spaces of history, and are written in the stones, buildings, and spaces of Berlin. Every space is plural - inscribed with “surplus” meanings, haunted by its doubles. History is always plural, and it can be conceptualized as a sum of movements in the sense intended by El Lissitzky - history is not a teleological line, but an animated and polyvocal space that is differentially inscribed in the perceived spaces of subjectivity, framed cinematically and urbanistically.

**MAPPING BERLIN**

Few cities physically register the sum total of the effects of their histories as explicitly as Berlin. It can be argued that all 20th century history begins and ends in the streets of Berlin, repeatedly. Berlin has held a crucial place in the development of early 20th century urban modernism, and early 20th century cinema - and not by accident, as the "place" (topos) of Berlin is always in question. The countless traumas of history (international and personal) leave visible gaps and scar tissue in the fabric of the city, as they do in the imaginary self of subjectivity. The spaces of the present are always haunted by selective pasts and projected desires of the future. The myth of the integrated totality of a historical city tethers together many movements, many temporalities, simultaneously and uneasily.

From its dubious inception, the discontinuous international metropolis called Berlin has persisted as the material playground for discrete ideological solid/void relations that fade and return into the urban fabric as uncanny ghosts, as superimposed timescapes of competing pasts, presents, and futures in the turbulent movement-spaces of the city. In dissonant cycles movements the cinematic urbanism of Berlin, imagined pasts and projected futures have been sutured into the urban fabric differentially. Berlin has a long history of abandoned, destroyed, reconstructed, and “phantom limb” urban artifacts that haunt the inherited utopian dream of a smooth space, juxtaposing the past and future with the real and the imaginary.
The mapping of Berlin, of establishing fixed positions and boundaries to implicate fixed meanings and relationships, is a sieve through which the doubles of desire pass through unhindered. Its historical maps suppress the residues and traces of traumatic (imaginary) histories, but they are there, beneath the paving stones, behind the glass reflections. The ideology of Prussian imperialism is still tattooed on the sandy soil of Mitte. The subsequent industrialization of the metropolis and the dream of a reactionary garden city have also been partially grafted into the projected spaces of Berlin. The avant-gardes and the fascist state have projected competing idealized urbanisms, but left only partial semiotic fragments incapable of dominating the whole. The explicit division of the corpus of Berlin in the cold war lingers amongst recent efforts to optimize economic and political globalization, resulting in further deterrioralizations that create more exquisite fragments floating in the urban fabric. This is not the failure of the project of modernism, but its optimal realization.

In the Hegelian model, each historical trauma undermines the foundations of dominant political structures so as to replace them. But the physical spaces of the city (mapped meanings), and the cinematic representations of the city, are traumatized outside of any single master narrative - trauma is never systematic, simple, or normative, though modernism may pretend otherwise. The tendency towards politicization of art and the aestheticization of politics identified by observers like Walter Benjamin in the 1920’s continues in the persistent construction, erasure, and rebuilding of the urban landscape, as if changing the present can an any way erase the past, or achieve an unequivocal meaning. The spaces may be transparent, but their ghosts are not. Obsolete utopian visions, built or projected, become the soil for the perpetual reconstruction of a cinematic urbanism. As histories are always incomplete, Berlin is always under (re)construction. This indeterminate structure of the social space in the city shifts reactively in Berlin, and there is no space, no matter how small, that is not a contested space of a historical subconscious, a fragment opposed to the void of meaninglessness.²¹

UNMAPPING THE DOUBLES OF BERLIN

Maps are posited upon the unified, hierarchical, and static model of the city frozen in moment of time drawn from a godlike perspectival stationary point, yet the individuated histories of the self formed as the spaces of meaning occur as indeterminate flows. The subjective self haunts the spaces of modernity. All transitory events and shifting cultural formations, all impulses and movements that matter, are opposed to the epistemological foundation of traditional mapping. Everything imaginary resists mapping. What is to be done?

In conceiving of totalities as fictions, let us propose that the metastatic spaces of cinematic urbanism of Berlin can only be “unmapped.”²² A process of unmapping should be a Vertov-like construction of all that a physical map fails to capture. Unmapping can be a cinematic methodology that teases out the concealed meanings of urban formations, urban desires, and urban events-spaces which are invisible to mapping.²³

Unmapping necessarily involves analysis of the city through its architectural images (real and imaginary), photography, film, and base visual culture, as these more accurate representations of impermanent little truths generated in the modernist voiding of metaphysical truths. Violated S-bahn maps, enigmatic advertisements, and cryptic graffiti are closer to the semiotic riot of impulses framing modern space than any official map can approach. The city, like subjectivity, is a constructed space in transit, and should always be considered to be cinematic.

CINEMATIC URBANISM

Historically, the urbanism of Berlin can be seen to operate like a film. Neither documentary nor drama, Berlin appears as a film constructed from different reels of exposed film stock diverging from any epochal structure (or strict Hegelian montage determinism). The history of the city is the history of specific mechanically-mediated projections into the voids of modern space or the resultant reflection into the void at the core of subjectivity. In projecting and reflecting transient
impulses, it resists any unified language, any master narrative or metahistory, any deep structure -
though modernity cages and forms these resistances into constructed spaces.
Films about Berlin perform an unmapping of Berlin. Films about Berlin are prevented from
projecting a mute and timeless terrain by the cinematic apparatus; they project individually
and subjectively haunted scenes of conflict and co-existence spontaneously erupting in the framed
spaces of modern apparatuses of subjectivity. Berlin is plural the instant it is framed; there can be
no neutral space, urban or cinematic, that is not always already occupied by its doubles - Berlin is
always plural, a cinematic heterotopia:

... there is a worse kind of disorder than that of the incongruous, the linking toghether of things
that are inappropriate; I mean the disorder in which a large number of possible orders glitter
separately, in the lawless and uncharted dimension of heteroclite; and that word should
be taken in its most literal etymological sense; in such a state, things are 'laid,' 'placed,'
'arranged' in sites so very different form one another that it is impossible to find a common
place beneath them all. Utopias afford consolation; they open up cities with vast avenues,
superbly planted gardens, countries where life is easy, even though the road to them
is chimerical. Heterotopias are disturbing, probably because they secretly undermine
language, because they make it impossible to name this and that, because they shatter or
tangle common names, because they destroy syntax which causes words and things (next
to but also opposite to one another) to 'hang together.' This is why utopias permit fables
and discourse: They run with the very grain of language and are part of the fundamental
dimension of the fabula; heterotopias...deissicate speech, stop words in their tracks, contest
the very possibility of language as its source; they dissolve our myths and sterilize the
lyricism of our sentences.

Within the diverse examples of realized and projected modern architectural space, the
negations of the machine age allow the movements or impulses of ideology to fill the silence of
space. In modernism, ideology is always audible within the materialized constructs of fluid
space. Ideology becomes the privileged apparatus of projection (and negation) in modernity,
but it too is also plural. Both cinema and urbanism are apparatuses of projection that encode
ideology, producing "surplus" meanings affecting subjective immersion and understanding of the
city, and disturbing any pretense towards historical absolutes in favor of the imaginary. Because
the twin discourses of cinema and urbanism are posited on the condensation and displacement
of immaterial / subjective forces in material form, they become saturated with impulses and
movements including ideology, whose tendency (like the Lacanian symbolic order) is to pressure
the imaginary into the voids of the real:

In ideology men do indeed express, not the relations between them and their conditions
of existence, but the way they live the relation between them and the conditions of their
existence; this presupposes both a real and an imaginary, lived relation... in ideology the
real relation is inevitably invested in the imaginary relation, a relation that expresses a
will (conservative, conformist, reformist, or revolutionary), a hope or nostalgia, rather than
describing a reality.

Althusser here situates ideology within the imaginary; the overt ideologies once driving the
formation of modern urbanism and cinematic space did so through the imaginary other of the real.
Because art and politics are so knotted in Berlin's urban fabric, modernist ideologies have had
significant influence on the imaginary spaces of the city, often rendered as utopias conceived of as
a single, integrated history producing a hypothetical integrated spatial topography. Colin Rowe's
influential critique, Collage City, analyzed the history of utopian thought in modern architecture,
suspiciously avoiding Berlin. But as though describing the doomed project of a comprehensive
projective (utopian) mapping of Berlin, he notes specifically their intertwined relationship:

If Utopia introduces itself as a blueprint for the future, then it is doubly coercive since the future cannot be known to us... Utopia is particularly dangerous since the inventions of Utopias is likely to occur in periods of rapid social change; and urban Utopian blueprints are liable to be rendered obsolete before they can be put into practice... 

Modernist utopias, or any architecture-degree-zero, erupt as a subjective montage of heterotopian fragments: the city is framed by and dialectically frames a constructed landscape, a plural landscape of competing and fragmented semiotic impulses and drives. Utopias require totalization or pure negation. Utopias frequently propose to construct an ideologically narrow reading of the idealized future throughout the sites and contexts of the contemporary. But every materialized condensation of ideology, no matter how disciplined, precise, or rational, generates the “others” of reason because of the origin of utopian thought in the subjective historical unconscious. We cannot conceive of a utopia separate from our own historical consumption of space, cinematic or architectural. In this sense, we can never create a space-degree-zero, despite modernism's claims.

What if there was no integrated or enduring city of Berlin? What if history could end and start again - would history then be the subjective personal history of the eternal recurrence of the same? Would the utopian past return to haunt the present, an uncanny guest previously expelled?

GERMANIA, ANNO ZERO

In 1947 Roberto Rossellini’s haunting film Germania, Anno Zero was released, a sharp contrast to the Fascist polemics of Leni Reifenstahl’s Triumph of the Will (1935) or Olympia (1938). Moving beyond the “rubble films” of the post-war period, it presents the city in ruins - a city whose map would be in tatters, vast blank spaces disguising the true horrific conditions. These are the cinematic spaces of the ends of history. The ends of history may be overstated, but the effects are not. As catastrophic events that mark the end of teleological history and the capitulation of all utopian designs as a result of utopian technological imperatives, the voids of Berlin smolder as the sites of eruption of suppressed origins. These voided spaces, inviting projections and marking the erasure of the past, became the site of a city overtly divided along ideological lines, a double-vision of the future drawn from the techniques of modern spatial arrangement (cinematic and architectural). The homogenous gloss of history, like a glass facade, becomes plural; the spaces of the city return as plural, projections of the simultaneous others of utopia. The traumas of the ends of history erupt in modernism’s undifferentiated smooth space, traumas that are the uncanny completion of the project of modernity.

To the disinterested observer, the cold war produces a doubling of Berlin, but this was anticipated in the expressionist origins of modernity. The overt ideological division of the city into communist (un-photographable space) and capitalist (specular space), is really a politics of vision inherent in all modernist spatial practices. In year zero, simple dialectical oppositions between material-immaterial, human-divine, socialist-capitalist, young-old, and transient-eternal were ripped loose from the constraints of modernism’s glass bell jar. In post-war Berlin’s cinematic urbanism these dualisms were reconfigured within the ideologically overdetermined spaces of the imaginary in the Cold War. The divided self becomes the template for a divided city; both are plural spaces rationed conceived in the origin of modernity.

DER HIMMEL UBER BERLIN

German “new wave” film director Wim Wenders made Wings of Desire (Der Himmel Über Berlin, 1987) as an elegy to the split city, but not simply along conventional political/spatial lines (though this is certainly evident in the apparatuses forming cinematic and architectural space).
The Lacanian divided self projected into the difficult spaces of the divided city is constructed as a cinematic master trope. Spaces divided by their own historical ends and remembered futures in this film are reconfigured into a divided vision of the city, specifically along a much older dialectic: the angelic and the mortal (black-white and color). Wenders described the haunted spaces of modernity persisting in the memory of Berlin, not as impulses and movements, but as objectified subjects:

There are other ghosts from the past too, shadowy presences visible to the angels: previously fallen angels and grim demons that had rampaged through the city and the country and put on their worst and bloodiest spectacle. These past figures are also hanging around Berlin; they too are unhoused and even more accursed.

This film foregrounds the construction of post-war cinematic space by including mock-evidence of a filmic reconstruction of World War II - with a surprising suturing of documentary clips into the narrative, recalling the documentary work of Vertov's *The Man with the Movie Camera* (1929). It is of significance that the revelation of Wenders' process of making falls within the spectacle of the unhousing of phantasms into the empty spaces of city, which appear empty and dream-like, but are not entirely without qualities.

These angels, abandoned by God, roam ghost-like throughout the buildings and spaces of the city like a directionless "fleeting-in-being." As dematerialized beings, they can move instantaneously through any material form, and hear all thoughts simultaneously, though they have no access to the real except through human agents. As a consequence of modernity's irreversible abandonment of any transcendental truths or absolutes, they are cast adrift in the cinematic spaces of Berlin, only capable of seeing and hearing, like spectators. They are simply the ghosts of modernity, the perfect readers of the text of Berlin, and their experiences are the recording (attempted mapping) of the unappable within Berlin.

*Der Himmel Über Berlin* clearly projected a Rilkean examination of the fragile temporality of cinematic urbanism in Berlin. The old fusion of cinema and urbanism in Berlin was always the recurrent dream of modernism, smooth and pure but haunted by transparent phantasms. In this film Berlin is no longer a mere topography: open to the penetrating gaze of angels, the city cannot operate as a Renaissance perspectival backdrop. This film, drawing upon earlier representations of Berlin, frames the city as a semiotic economy of de-historicized desires - for these non-transcending angels, the city is purely imaginary, a Lacanian imaginary whose real is tantalizingly close, as if under glass. Here architecture is an imaginary signifier tending towards an implausible permanence, informing and informed by historical impulses forecast in the allegorical image of Benjamin's "Angelus Novus" (angel of history):

His face is turned towards the past. When we perceive a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe, which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet. The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise; it has got caught in his wings with such violence that the angel can no longer close them. This storm irresistibly propels him into the future to which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows skyward. This storm is what we call progress.

When the wandering storyteller asks an angel "where is Potsdamer Platz?" his lament projected into the void of the "no-man's-land" adjacent to the Berlin Wall becomes pure irony, as the erasure of the historic building fabric of lively *Potsdamerplatz* was destroyed partially in the war and completely after the construction of *der Mauer*. In the film the storyteller and angel can still see this Weimar-era urbanism while the human eye and camera eye register only a barren field. This testimony to the physical construction and erasure of political space within modernity is now
ever more telling: Potsdamer Platz has since been rebuilt with crass commercial shopping centers, offices, and housing designed primarily by international architects. The filmic ruined landscape, and the wall that generated them, is almost gone. And, by design, almost forgotten. In Potsdamer Platz, in the rehabilitation of the DDR Plattenbau, and in countless examples of the increasingly transparent and cinematic spaces of the city, reunified Berlin can be seen to be another phase of experimentation in the construction of spaces implementing the subjective processes of forgetting and remembering, as historical and spatial truths.

**THE SPACES OF THE ANALEPS AND THE FUGUE**

If modern history is a (cinematic) space, then is it by necessity an indeterminate gaping space. In Berlin, punctuated corporal time slips to open up discrepancies, deviations, and gaps that themselves can be read spatially to function as both landscape and the absent voids of time. These are the spaces of the analeps, a disynchronous sequence of fleeting perceptions (film-phrases) as described by Benjamin and Simmel at the origin of the German metropolis. Genette defines analeps as “any evocation after the fact of an event that took place earlier than the point in the story where we are at any given moment,” a “discordance between the two temporal orders of story and narrative.” We are created from and wounded by memory, by an analeptic occurrence of remembered time causing the forgetting of the immediate interval of time. Linear continuity, an ideal of historical narrative and the utopian myth of progress, is obsolete in the urban and cinematic spaces of modernity. Absences and voids propose an unstructured alterity; its boundaries are remembering and forgetting - they are constructed spaces of the psychological fugue.

Though its not set in Berlin, but in contemporary suburban Los Angeles (itself an increasingly influential model of urbanism), David Lynch’s film *The Lost Highway* (1993) explores the psychological condition of “dissociative fugue.” Psychologically this radical loss of identity is provoked and manifest by blackouts, extensive pointless travels, a chronic discontinuity in subjectivity and memory - which force the subject to over-invest significance in arbitrary moments as the root of their identity. This analeptic loss of identity, where the history and memory of the self contains significant gaping spaces inviting projection, originates in severe trauma, and can be seen as a coherent metaphor for the incoherent heterotopian urbanism of Berlin.

**PLANWERK INNENSTADT AND AFTER**

Government-supervised urban design projects since the 1989 fall of the Berlin Wall have sought to reconnect dissynchronous urban fabrics (like so much grafted organic tissue), without fully addressing the diversity of political formations of space that have lead to the gritty urban mix of contemporary Berlin. This utopian attempt to congeal the ghost spaces of the past is not a new condition, but a compulsive repetition of past procedures for redefining the metropolis into a single coherent entity it can never be (and never has been). The voided spaces of Berlin are the registration of its unique analeptic history, initiated in the origin of modernity. These vague terrains and abandoned sites still contain the influence of their prior unrealized utopian desires - they are always contested spaces, always under reconstruction, visually and politically.

Globalization in Berlin has been the selective return to the past as legitimization for present ideological formations manifest in the material structure of the city. This is legible in the German government’s *Planwerk Innenstadt*, which modeled the reunification of Berlin as a coded map. This guide to the reconstruction of Berlin attempted to suture selective urban elements from the past into a unified present and future. This will always fail, as an urban or cinematic strategy, because reason excludes what is crucial to subjective life. The spaces of the city are not only significant as traces of historical formations, but their political role as social spaces has been increasingly influenced by separate diasporic immigrant cultures (including Wessies relocated to East Berlin). The current dialectic between Germans and *Ausländer* (foreigners) legible in the use of the city is merely the afterimage of the original Prussian split vision that divided the city into worker quarters and imperial constructions. None of the subsequent divides has or can be healed or erased. Gluing
these fragments together, superimposing new utopian models into the perceived gaps of the city, only blurs the spaces between the fragments.

More recent cinematic productions including Cetin's *Berlin in Berlin* (1993), Kutlucan's *Ich Chef, Du Turnschuh (Me Boss, You Sneakers, 1998)*, and Tykwer's *Lola rennt (Run Lola Run, 1999)* reveal the contested historical spaces as the constructed imaginary spaces of a cinematic urbanism, and urbanism that resists permanent, monocular, and durable visions. As the dark spaces of Berlin, created in the dream of a totalizing transparent modernity erupt cinematically, the city is continuously recast as a dialectical construct between the imaginary and the real, where plural spaces tug at the integration of the subject. Cinematic urbanism frames the void of the subject as the gaping space of a historical analpse.

How are the spaces of Berlin's cinematic urbanism present today? The tented consumerism of Helmut Jahn's Sony Center in Potsdamer Platz, intended to be urban and cinematic, conjures up all of Benjamin's analysis and critique of the late 19th century capitalist city. This Americanized glass urbanism contains an impressive amount of functional space dedicated to cinema, but fails to incorporate the sophisticated spatial constructs of cinematic urbanism, as defined above. There is little attempt to make welcome the uncanny ghosts of modernity. In negating the histories of the site, which are significant, it operates as a deliberate forgetting, ostensibly sanitizing the site in the hopes of eliminating the dark spaces of modernity, through the glass architecture of modernity. But we know that glass architecture does not necessarily lead to an open and transparent society, but to reflections - the SONY Center is merely a repetition of modernity’s early mirror phase of development.

Cinematic urbanism is more clearly accomplished in the former Potsdamer Platz Info-Box (1995-2000) by Schneider/Schuhmacher, previously adjacent to the Sony-Center, and now destroyed. This temporary installation was built in a language reminiscent of the Russian avant-garde, a dynamic transgressor of the prior urban symbolic order. It housed images of the future city grafted into the inherited ruins of its past, and required
a deliberate ascent from the ground into the skies of Berlin for this omniscient overview. The Info-Box answered Wenders’ storyteller’s rhetorical question: “Where is Potsdamer Platz?” by marking the site’s histories as a dialectical absence and return, a dialectical analeps and dream. This transitory architecture’s distinct modernist idiom sought the real of a pending Berlin through its contained imaginary (often cinematic) representations. This intention was most clear in the doubling of desire created in the interior spaces, where maps and models of the future city exist near multiple framed openings and fixed windows opening up glimpses of the future city. This project is closer to a cinematic urbanism than the Sony-Center, in that its construction acknowledges its temporary status, it does not seek to normalize or capture the existing historical space with a single point of view, and the project cannot be fully experienced only from a stationary point of view, but must be immersed into a constructed space by a series of three-dimensional movements.

AFTER CINEMATIC URBANISM: BLURRED SPACE

The cinematic spaces of the city are always double: hinged spaces between what is revealed and what is concealed; formed by reflective planes or screens conveying distorted pasts and imagined futures; the sites of traumas and dreams, constructed through instrumental reason but producing irrational effects. Cinematic urbanism renders social space a volumetric *mise-en-scene* posited upon individual subjectivity that simultaneously frames the individual within larger (shifting) political structures, whose boundaries are as constructed and discontinuous as Vertov’s “film-phrase” of the room. The voids of modernity framed by apparatuses of projection and reflection, are never neutral; the project of rationalism culminates in a technological negation where the impulses and movements of the irrational seep in; rational spaces become plural and haunted, differentiated scenes of radical subjectivity and experiences under the pretense of utopian completion. And even the end of history that utopianism promises is not a terminus, but the point where the rope of fate frays into small narratives, small meanings inhabiting the smooth spaces of modernity. The spaces of the modern city, and their intertwining with cinematic space, is unavoidable - they both originate with the same impulses, the same methods, and desire the same effects.

Perhaps it is most accurate to propose that the cinematic spaces of the city in modernism proper were inherently dialectical and contaminated by that which was intended to be excluded. When impossible utopias become fragmented heterotopias, the desire to restore the project of rationalism once again has now made the spaces of the cinematic city of Berlin into something other: “blurred spaces.” In the blurred spaces of the city, nothing remains static, nothing can ever be read or experienced identically, there is no single privileged point of view, no clear and distinct entities that are not subsumed by their erasures and reconstructions. The formation and framing of urban spaces creates plural spaces; plural spaces are necessarily blurred in perception. This is the challenge facing the city of Berlin, and every city caught in the promise of globalization: to create an
urbanism within the inherited forms of the past that deliberately allow the prospect of the analepsis and fugue to play out before our eyes and surrounding our bodies. The unmappable blurred spaces of the city, as the site of a discontinuous subjectivity, are the vital assemblages (in)forming the work of contemporary urban architecture. The eager consumption of moving images within the city now blur the determinist meanings of Berlin, and every city.
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Endnotes
3 Metz, The Imaginary Signifier, 75.
6 In architectural terminology, a design for a building or space is called a project until it is realized. Projection is not normally found in architectural lingo, though it is clear that the designing of a project is a type of projection. The troping of the cinematic term “projecting” is deliberate and crucial to understanding modernist space, as it also implicates the projection of desires, ideologies, and effects into neutral spaces. The flat images of space within cinematic representation are perceived as depth of volume through their cinematic movement; in architecture 3-dimensional space is usually designed through 2-dimensional representation termed plans, sections, elevations, depending on their conceptual “framing.”
7 We can see in the quote that the ghost of the rational Cartesian subject anticipated in linear perspective is here made explicit as a producer of spatial meaning, in that each of the shots that compose the hypothetical “film-phrase” called a room is also selected, filmed, and edited by the omniscient author. Vertov’s sophisticated attempts to foreground the ideology of constructed (social) space film work, as in The Man with the Movie Camera, pursues the modernist strategy of revelation of the process of making and reception under the direction of this monocural Cartesian ghost.
9 Leonidov’s favorite modernist mechanism was the airship, his fetish, whose image of haunts many of his renderings of extreme modernist projects. The formal structure of the airship is a strong influence of his designs of modern architectural and urban space in the unbuilt projects of the Russian avant-garde, where a delicate and repetitive structure and minimal fabric-like enclosures are configured around a desire to introduce freedom from the ground of history and gravity. For a thorough analysis of the architecture of Leonidov, see Andrei Gozak, Ivan Leonidov: the Complete Works (New York: Rizzoli, 1988).
10 This influential theory is proposed in Viktor Shlovsky, “Art as Technique,” (in) L.T. Lemon & M.J. Reis (Eds. and Trans.) Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1965, 1917).
11 Foregrounding is complicit in the processes of defamiliarization dear to Russian Formalist literary and artistic theory. Foregrounding call attention to the artifice of artistic production. It is an ability to focus in on one element in a deliberate way to suppress the non-hierarchical structure of a work as a means of teasing out its deep structure. In this essay, my affinity for post-structuralist thought that negates the presence of such deep structures still relies on foregrounding to tease out the conflicted structures that prop up conventional systematic thought in the production of cinematic space.
15 The Lacanian imaginary is a well-known and sophisticated element in his tripartite model of modern subjectivity (imaginary - symbolic - real). It is not the intention of this essay to pretend that orthodox Lacanian schemas can explain all spaces in cinema and architecture.


21 The prospect of a political unconscious and optical unconscious are obviously necessary to consider in the question of cinematic space, but the historical subconscious, which is the register of traumas forming individual identities is fundamentally opposed to the historical self-consciousness of Hegelians. The historical subconscious cannot be conceived of without reference to a model of these identities founded upon the fluid space of modernity.

22 Unmapping is an ugly term for what should be a vivid range of visual solutions - in the underrepresented visual ephemera of modern life, which the Berlin Dadaist movement cleverly used to assault the “aura” of high art.

23 Deleuze’s rereading of film theory posits the movement-space as the proper object of analysis. In architecture, Bernard Tschumi has published texts positing the primacy of event-spaces, over static structured meanings, as the most appropriate role of architectural space. See Gilles Deleuze, Cinema I: The Movement-Image (London: The Athlone Press, 1986); Bernard Tschumi, Architecture and Disjunction (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1984); and Tschumi, Event-Cities 1.

24 Films about cities that are not Berlin would also offer crucial evidence for this rereading of cinematic urbanism in Berlin, and should also form a part of the history of Berlin, cinematically reconceived.


28 For a clear analysis of living in the contemporary period considered as the occupation of a historical space after the ends of history, see Gianni Vattimo, The End of Modernity (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); and Maurice Blanchot, The Writing of the Disaster, trans. Ann Smock (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1995).

29 Even the concept of a cold war, with a dialectical division between two ideologies, is a chess-like spatial metaphor manifested in the built environment as divided spaces.

30 A Heideggerian analysis of Der Himmel Über Berlin would do well to note the significance of what Heidegger describes as the fourfold: earth, sky, divinities, mortals. Wenders’ approach clearly illustrates this fourfold within the contested structure of the city, not through any comprehensive mapping of the city, but through a wise turn towards individual event-spaces avoiding encyclopedic totalization.


35 The analeps, as in Genette, is the ellipsis or break that turns towards the past. Prolepsis is the related forward-looking movement, and their propriety for art historical analysis implicates a fixed and linear temporality. Both terms are described within the general category of anchrony, interruptions in the continuity of time, and it is argued here that both the content and the histories of cinematic representations of urban space motivate these interruptions. The analeps merely offers a discrete and discontinuous replacement and conceptually follows the method of fragmentary effect.