'Screen Theorizing Today: a Celebration of Screen's Fiftieth Anniversary',
Screen 50.1(2009), £12.00

In the last half century screen studies has had to contend with the fact that its object (or indeed objects) are under a process of continual change. The rapidly changing technologies of image making, delivery and consumption have presented a challenge to ways in which the discipline can be conceived and how it can be theorized.

The fiftieth anniversary issue of *Screen* engages with this challenge, as part of a range of activities organized to mark 50 years of this most important film journal. This special issue '*Screen* Theorizing Today' is a celebration of the journal's fifty year birthday and of the scholarship that has made *Screen* fundamental in the arena of screen studies. It includes fifteen essays, organized under the headings 'Spectatorship and Looking', 'After Cinema' and 'Screen Cultures' and gathers the work of both established and new scholars. It takes new approaches to *Screen* and screen studies' dominant discourses, agendas and theorists.

The issue opens with an introduction by the editor Annette Kuhn which rehearses *Screen*'s past from its beginnings as an occasional newsletter called *The Film Teacher* through its evolution into the BFI published periodical *Screen* in 1969 to its present home at Glasgow University. Kuhn reflects on *Screen*'s teacherly mission of the 1960s and its activist phase of the 1970s. In reference to its activism, Kuhn mentions the key issues and key essays and/or theorists which have become hugely influential in Anglophone film studies and what distinguish '1970s *Screen* Theory'. She also talks about 1970s *Screen*'s 'love affair' with and subsequent retreat from psychoanalytic theory and its important, if somewhat 'sporadic', commitment to feminist film theory, calling Laura Mulvey's 'Visual pleasure and narrative cinema' a 'legendary manifesto'.

Kuhn assesses the state of screen and *Screen* theorizing today suggesting that the discipline and the journal have passed through the uncertain times of their formation, into an era in which we can no longer even speak of a 'unitary' discipline nor indeed of a single, 'all-embracing' *Screen* theory. Instead, Kuhn suggests, screen studies is increasingly made up of many subdisciplines and a rejection of the totalizing theorizations and excesses of the journal's militant past. She presents the essays in this special issue as examples of this new 'open' and 'interactive' theorizing. Finally, Kuhn reminds us of *Screen*'s role as cultural gatekeeper; playing a part not just in the academy but also in the public sphere.

The essays in part one think about different ways in which the spectator engages with the text. Rob Lapsley's essay is metacritical in that it explores the various criticisms of the ways in which *Screen* engaged with psychoanalysis in the 1970s, suggesting that psychoanalysis needs to assume new forms. Using *Walkabout* he offers two examples of what new forms a psychoanalytic approach might take. In the first, he looks at *Walkabout*

as a response to the real as impossible, analyzing the narratives of the different characters and their attempts as subjects to find a form of independence. In the second he analyzes the pathology of the textual structure looking for possible modes of *jouissance* afforded by the text. Laspley concludes that, above all it is the role of the critic (like that of the analyst) not to produce a definite reading but to prevent the spectator from becoming blocked. Stephanie Marriott is more formalist in her conception of the spectator, using textual analysis of *Babestation* to explore how adult chat television channels subordinate content production to revenue generation and thus challenge conventional notions of the relationship between television and viewers. Vicky Lebeau looks at how practices of visual culture converge with psychoanalysis; particularly in terms of the key psychoanalytical function of the mirror. She goes a step beyond Christian Metz's formulation of the screen as the mirror to apply D.W. Winnicott's notion of the mother's face as its precursor. She then asks what happens to the dialogue between psychoanalysis and visual culture if the emphasis is placed not on reflection but on the 'image not seen' 'the look that does not happen'? Lebeau illustrates her exploration of the non-look, with an analysis of Michael Haneke's *The Seventh Continent* (1989). She suggests that the perplexing quality of Haneke's camera, resides in the ways in which it tries to convey the absence of the look. Psychoanalysis remains essential to our understanding of the visual, Lebeau concludes, particularly in relation to affect, selfhood and life. Richard Rushton explores how Deleuzian notions of spectatorship in the cinema challenge those of classic *Screen* and its model of a spectator in control of what he or she sees and experiences. For Rushton the Deleuzian spectator is one who loses control of the self in front of the cinema screen and by doing so opens up to 'other ways of experiencing and knowing'.

The essays in part two follow on from those in part one exploring 'The Screen Experience'. Franco Casetti expands the notion of screen spectatorship arguing that it 'may be understood as a state of openness'. Filmic experience, argues Casetti, can teach us things about the history of cinema, and the altered screenscapes of the present and future. At the same time, Casetti claims, the filmic experience guarantees 'an aesthetic experience that [enlivens our senses] can pit itself against an otherwise generalized anesthesia'. John Ellis asks how digital technologies have affected the believability of and audience trust of media images. Ellis discusses how digital technologies have increased rather than decreased the need for human and moral agency in documentary making. Martine Beugnet and Elizabeth Ezra take a Deleuzian approach to Douglas Gordon and Philippe Parreno's *Zidane: un portrait du 21e siecle* (2006). The film is perception expanding, they argue, and about cinema's ability to forge a sense of 'interconnectedness' with the world. Laura Marks looks at the Deleuzian 'fold' suggesting that 'enfolding-unfolding aesthetics' represent a move away from a cultural model of vision towards one of information.

The essays in Part Three highlight different questions concerning post cinematic screen theorizing in relation to 'marginal' and 'experimental' moving image genres. Thomas Elsaesser centres on the parts of Freud's work that deal with problems of inscription/recording and of storage/retrieval. He argues that psychoanalytic film theory's stress upon vision and identity may no longer suitable post the digital revolution, but that Freudian theory can still be of relevance to theorizing in the information age. Ji-Hoon

Kim takes on Rosalind Krauss's term 'post-medium condition' to explore how in the context of digital media, cinema studies can reclaim arguments on behalf of medium specificity. Elizabeth Cowie also addresses questions about medium specificity in the context of the digital, but in relation to the spectator watching documentary (Kutlug Ataman's *Kuba* (2005)) in the gallery. Dale Hudson and Patricia Zimmerman take on the question of oppositional cinema in a 'post-cinema' age arguing for 'collaborative remix zones' that offer a space outside transnational media corporations (TMCs) 'where plural pasts, multiple temporalities, multiple artifacts and polyvocalities can join together to reclaim public spaces'.

The essays in Part Four, are gathered together under the heading of 'Screen Cultures'. Charles Acland offers the descriptor 'mobility' to characterize contemporary screen culture. He suggests that, rather than being cheapened by the 'rising informality' of viewing formats (mobile phones, buses, etc) the proliferation of moving image material has created a heightened 'platform consciousness'. Through a history of how moving images have been mobilized, Acland points out how arguments about multiple and moving viewing formats have always been at the centre of screen cultures. John T. Caldwell writes about the ways in which film and television professionals in Hollywood have theorized the screen, suggesting that it shows a marked affinity with academic screen studies. Lee Grieveson argues for the usefulness of Foucault's work on government as 'the shaping of the conduct of the self' for screen studies projects, particularly in relation to the function of 'media cultures as aspects of liberal (and neoliberal) governance'. This last (and most enjoyable) essay ends with the hope that future work on this aspect of screen cultures will inform 'politically engaged future screen/*Screen* theories and histories'.

It is noteworthy that *Screen* at 50 should end on this concept, and worth mentioning that *Screen* shares its fiftieth birthday with another endeavor, the Cuban revolution, which has also situated screen culture at the heart of ongoing political engagement and consciousness raising. Furthermore, *Screen* also shares its fiftieth birthday with another organization dedicated to the furthering of screen (and media) cultures, the Society for Cinema and Media Studies (formerly Society for Media Studies) The essays in this special issue make a strong case for *Screen*'s continued and historical importance in the present, complex moment of cultural and medium transformation.

- Dolores Tierney