University of Texas Press
Society for Cinema & Media Studies

"Baraka": World Cinema and the Global Culture Industry
Author(s): Martin Roberts
Source: *Cinema Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Spring, 1998), pp. 62-82
Published by: University of Texas Press on behalf of the Society for Cinema & Media Studies
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1225827
Accessed: 16/07/2009 14:41

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=texas.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

University of Texas Press and *Society for Cinema & Media Studies* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Cinema Journal.*

http://www.jstor.org

Baraka: World Cinema and the Global Culture Industry

by Martin Roberts

Through a discussion of Ron Fricke's global documentary Baraka, *this article calls for a recontextualization of "World Cinema" within the larger field of the contemporary global culture industry.*

> After three thousand years of specialist explosion and of increasing specialism and alienation in the technological extensions of our bodies, our world has become compressed by dramatic reversal. As electrically contracted, the globe is no more than a village.
>
> —Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media* (1964)[1]

Honey, They Shrunk the Planet. Ever since Marshall McLuhan's celebrated proclamation that communications technology had "electrically contracted" the world to the dimensions of a global village, it would seem, the earth has been shrinking: satellite TV, frequent flyer miles, and, of course, The Web are making the world a smaller place. Thirty years after *Understanding Media*, the global village has become a commonplace, with McLuhan himself hailed as a visionary prophet of a world in which distance no longer matters. AT&T commercials show families talking on cellular phones to relatives on the other side of the planet; IBM commercials show African tribesmen happily using laptop computers.

This article considers the impact of these developments in the domain of film. On the one hand, the history of the cinema has been entangled from the outset with global processes, from colonialism to its postcolonial aftermath. Cinema today, most would agree, has become a global cultural form, however different its local manifestations. At the same time, McLuhan's trope of the global village both reflects and has lent further momentum to the emergence of an imaginary idea of "the world," and this global imaginary, we will see, has assumed increasing prominence in contemporary cinema. In turn, film today plays a significant role in articulating and perpetuating what might be called global mythologies: ideological discourses about the world and humanity's relationship to it.

The growing attention to what is variously called "World Cinema" or "global cinema" in recent years might seem curious, given that film production, distribution, and consumption have long been a global affair. Studies of non-Western film industries abound, and "World Cinema" has long been approached much as "world

Martin Roberts teaches in the graduate program in Media Studies at the New School for Social Research. He is currently working on a book on the global culture industry.
© *1998 by the University of Texas Press, P.O. Box 7819, Austin, TX 78713-7819*

literature" was studied in English departments before postcolonial studies came along.[2] Yet if film industries in many parts of the world today remain strongly national in character, the business of film making and film watching have equally long been *trans*national in nature, as any African who grew up on westerns, Indian musicals, and kung fu movies knows only too well. The received wisdom on such matters, as reports of Sylvester Stallone and Arnold Schwarzenegger's colonization of the world's movie screens make clear, is that the transnational traffic from North to South, West to East is largely a one-way affair, but such a view (if it was ever true) is today becoming outdated as it becomes increasingly evident that the cultural traffic has if not reversed then at least become more of a two-way street. In many cases today, indeed, deciding where exactly a film is "from" and to whom it is addressed has become increasingly problematic: a film by a Senegalese director may be coproduced with German and Swiss money, edited in Zurich, and play to larger audiences at film festivals in New York than in Dakar.[3] Transnational cinema, the films of diasporic subjects living in cosmopolitan First World cities, has become a proliferating film genre rivaling older national cinemas.[4]

While much attention has been devoted in recent years to emerging transnational or diasporic cinemas, less attention has been paid to the impact of globalization on European and American film. What I have in mind here is the increasing number of films since 1960 which are in different ways *about* something called "the world" itself. They include films such as Gualtiero Jacopetti and Franco Prosperi's *Mondo Cane* (1963), Chris Marker's *Sans Soleil* (1982), Godfrey Reggio's *Powaqqatsi* (1988), Wim Wenders's *Until the End of the World* (1991), Jim Jarmusch's *Night on Earth* (1991), or even the IMAX film *Blue Planet* (1991). While the films in question belong to different national cinemas and film genres and address different audiences, they share an awareness of globalization and of the new cultural formations of the postcolonial world order as well as an attempt to encompass these within a globalizing vision of "the world." It is films of this kind that I will be discussing here.

The specific film on which I have chosen to focus is *Baraka* (United States, 1992), a feature-length, wordless documentary film directed and photographed by Ron Fricke and produced by Mark Magidson.[5] Inspired by the works of the mythographer Joseph Campbell and shot in twenty-four countries, the film purports to provide a global portrait of the world and its peoples. *Baraka* is the latest in a series of related projects with which Fricke has been involved since the early 1980s, including Godfrey Reggio's films *Koyaanisqatsi* (1983) and *Powaqqatsi* (1988), for which he was the cinematographer, and *Chronos* (1985), shot in a mere eight countries, which he directed and which was in some ways a prototype for *Baraka*.

Although it was distributed in over twenty countries and was widely reviewed in the popular press, *Baraka* has been virtually ignored by academic film scholars.[6] While it would be easy to attribute this to the recentness of the film's release, the sheer number of films competing for the film scholar's attention today, or even its "lack of importance" next to more profitable films (a dubious criterion), one of the reasons why the film seems to have slipped through the net of film studies may be that it is not easily located within existing generic categories of film analysis. The

problems start simply in trying to define what kind of a film *Baraka* is. While it ostensibly falls into the general category of documentary or non-narrative film, unlike most documentaries it was distributed in theatrical release, and its running time (ninety-six minutes) roughly corresponds to the standard length of dramatic feature (fiction) film. Once we do accept that it is a documentary, the question is: what kind of documentary? Bill Nichols distinguishes between two kinds of documentary: the historiographic and the ethnographic.[7] The first is exemplified by political documentary (including propaganda films), from the work of Dziga Vertov to Third Cinema, and conceives of film as a catalyst for social/political change. Ethnographic documentary has historically concerned itself with documenting so-called vanishing societies threatened by global modernity. While *Baraka* has parallels with these categories, as we will see, it belongs to neither and is in different ways opposed to each. *Baraka*'s attention to the natural world (waterfalls, lakes, volcanoes, etc.) in fact lends it more in common with a documentary genre which Nichols does not mention, the nature film (what he might call ecological documentary), which has been a staple of American television from the Wonderful World of Disney films of the 1950s to the Discovery Channel. Outside broadcast television, nature documentaries have been largely distributed through the IMAX and Omnimax theaters of science museums. Yet although *Baraka*'s ecological subject matter has much in common with such films and it was distributed in a 70 mm print, it was not distributed in IMAX theaters. One could even go so far as to claim that *Baraka* exceeds the boundaries of film itself, in some ways having more in common with media other than film, such as music or photography.

My purpose in what follows will be to show that to grasp the cultural significance of a film such as *Baraka*, we need to move beyond film genres and even beyond film itself. This involves treating it not so much as a documentary film but as one modality—cinematographic, in this case—of a cultural continuum extending across the spectrum of contemporary media and which is itself reflexive of broader historical and global cultural processes. While *Baraka* may be something of a special case, it is symptomatic of processes at work in cultural production today and for this reason can serve as a useful model for rethinking old paradigms and elaborating future directions for media studies.

Field Notes from the Global Village. If *Baraka* presents us with, in the words of its promotional blurb, "A World Without Words," it is certainly a world *with* music: the entire film, indeed, is accompanied by a musical soundtrack and includes no natural sound.[8] The soundtrack itself, available on compact disc, combines field recordings (I use the ethnographic term deliberately) made during the shooting of the film; existing World Music and World Music–inflected recordings, notably by the Anglo-Australian duo Dead Can Dance (Brendan Perry and Lisa Gerrard); and synthesizer music by the New Age composer Michael Stearns.[9] Soon after *Baraka*'s release, its producer, Mark Magidson, released a concert film called *Toward the Within: Dead Can Dance* (1993) about the group featured on *Baraka*'s soundtrack. Its opening song is basically a music video which uses footage from *Baraka*. One begins to wonder, then, whether *Baraka* is a film with a World Music

soundtrack or a World Music record with a global image track. If certain sequences of *Baraka* could comfortably pass as music videos on MTV, the reverse is also true: one of the music videos for *Deep Forest*, a recent French recording which juxtaposes field recordings of African pygmy chants with Parisian dance beats, looks remarkably like a five-minute version of *Baraka*.

This intersection between World Music and cinema is not unique to *Baraka*. In recent years, an increasing number of films with World Music soundtracks have begun to appear and are today relatively common.[10] The metamorphosis of World Music into World Movies in some ways comes as little surprise. One aspect of the horizontal integration of the culture industries in the 1990s, indeed, has been the increasingly symbiotic relationship between commercial cinema and popular music, and to this extent the *Baraka* effect is symptomatic of a broader tendency within commodity culture. The interrelationship between World Music and cinema in the case of *Baraka*, however, raises some interesting questions. If the emergence of World Music as an increasingly major genre of contemporary popular music is attributable to larger global processes in the second half of this century (decolonization, immigration, the globalization of capitalism), how have these same processes affected cinema? Is it possible today to speak of a "World Cinema" analogous to World Music?

In the colonial world order, the West's encounters with its colonized others were mediated by and largely confined to (largely male) colonial administrators, missionaries, traders, natural scientists, anthropologists, and assorted explorers. What Mary Louise Pratt calls the "contact zone," the intercultural space of symbolic exchange and transculturation created by the encounter between the Western colonial powers and the indigenous peoples of their colonies, remained a relatively circumscribed, localized space confined to the outposts of colonialism itself.[11] All this, it need hardly be emphasized, has now changed. In the postindependence (if not yet postcolonial) world of multinational corporations, global labor markets, the jumbo jet, and global television, societies previously separated by vast distances encounter and live among one another as economic migrants, refugees, exiles, diplomats, business travelers, tourists. The contact zone, previously the privilege of the relatively few, has undergone a process of democratization and is today a mass cultural phenomenon.

One consequence of these global changes within the ex-colonial but still capitalist First World has been what might be called the ethnographization of mass consumption. In recent decades, anthropology has been engaged in a sustained process of critical reexamination of its goals, methodologies, and raison d'être.[12] Parallel to this, however, the ethnographic itself has been undergoing a process of popularization and commoditization across the spectrum of the culture industries. Ethnographic writing becomes travel writing; ethnomusicology becomes World Music; ethnographic artifacts become ethnic objets d'art, earrings, furniture; ethnographic museums become ethnic gift shops; ethnographic documentary film becomes *Baraka*. Even the ethnographic field trip has been coopted by the global culture industry in the form of ethnotourism, in which First World tourists armed with notebooks and camcorders enact fantasies of First Contact with what Dean

MacCannell calls ex-primitives in carefully manicured "tribal" villages from the Amazon to Indonesia.[13]

In the eighteenth century, according to Mary Louise Pratt, the historical conjunction of European colonial expansion and Linnaean systems of classification, with the possibilities the latter afforded of imposing a standard, unifying model of meaning upon the world, led to the emergence of what she calls a European "planetary consciousness."[14] In the late-twentieth-century world of the global contact zone, this Eurocentric mythology of the world, faithfully handed down by the National Geographic Society, the *Family of Man*, and David Attenborough documentaries, has become the global consciousness so ubiquitous in contemporary mass culture, from "We Are the World" slogans to the United Colors of Benetton. As the world has become the global village, so it seems, Euro-American mass culture has sought not just to capture but also to commoditize it. Advertisers have been quick to recognize that not just global markets but the concept of the global itself can be a powerful marketing tool.

In the domain of film, the global processes I have been describing are perhaps most apparent in the break-up of the domination of First World movie screens by Hollywood and the European cinemas. More than at any other time in the history of cinema, the films available in First World cities such as New York, Toronto, London, Paris, and Sidney today come in global rather than just Euro-American varieties. Film festivals devoted to South American, African, and Asian cinemas complement the increasing number of transnational and diaspora films. Ethnographic film, once a specialized subfield of anthropology, today attracts sizable audiences to events such as the Margaret Mead festival in New York. For consumers in such cities, going to the movies and eating out have become more or less equivalent activities, with choosing a movie, like choosing a restaurant, a matter of selecting from a repertoire of available ethnic options.[15] While the audience for these multicultural cinemas is no doubt in large part white and middle class, it would be mistaken to assume that they cater solely to Euro-American exoticism. Indeed, in cities such as those I have mentioned, the audiences for multicultural films may be as transnational as the films themselves, and watching them may be as much a way of reconnecting with one's own culture as of indulging a touristic curiosity about someone else's.

A second consequence of the global processes I have been describing has been the emergence of a global imaginary within Euro-American film, *Baraka* being a case in point. Much of the film's subject matter enacts the global contact zone mentioned earlier, consisting of more or less staged encounters between the First World filmmaker and largely Third World subjects around the globe. As I mentioned earlier, however, *Baraka* is only one of a number of films which collectively attest to the emergence of a global imaginary in Euro-American cinema since the 1950s. Three main categories may be distinguished: the global exploitation film of the *Mondo Cane* variety; the conspicuous cosmopolitanism of the international avant-garde (Wenders, Herzog, Jarmusch, Aki and Mika Kaurismäki, Ottinger); and the coffee-table globalism of *Powaqqatsi* or *Baraka*. Each of these varieties exemplifies a particular mode of engagement with the world they depict:

the carnivalesque (Mondo movies), the ironic-supercilious (the international avant-garde), and the humanistic (*Baraka* and similar films).

Although their origins may be traced to the colonial adventure films of the 1930s, *Mondo Cane* (1963) and the increasingly grisly series of films it inspired are among the earliest examples of the emergence of a global imaginary in Euro-American commercial cinema.[16] The world they depict is recognizably the voyeuristic one of P. T. Barnum, freaks, and carnival sideshows, an exotic, grotesque world of "bizarre" rituals and cultural practices, even though these are drawn as much from "civilized" as "primitive" societies. Significantly, however, given that the original Mondo films date from the decade immediately after the independence of Europe's former colonies, the world they depict is also a world in chaos, in which the fragile infrastructure of "civilization" erected by the European powers has been quickly swept away by primitive savagery (*Africa Addio*); their vision of the world thus remains a recognizably colonialist one.

The cosmopolitan cinema of the international avant-garde constitutes a second mode of the cinematographic global imaginary. In the films of Marker, Wenders, Herzog, and Jarmusch, they take the form of a detached, sardonic observation of an increasingly transnational world order and the cultural change associated with it. Paris, Berlin, New York, Rome, Helsinki, São Paulo, Ulan Bator: self-consciously nomadic, they and their insouciant protagonists are the postmodern descendants of Baudelaire's *flâneur*, rootless cosmopolitans threading their way around the globe in search of the ever new and different.[17] Tourism, tourist sites, tourists themselves are typically subjects of disdain or satire, even though filmmakers and protagonists are no less tourists than anyone else. What is perhaps most memorable about films of this type is their cult of cosmopolitanism, with its accompanying disdain for the parochialism of the national. The appeal of such an ideology becomes more understandable when it is recalled that one of the most prestigious forms of bourgeois conspicuous consumption this century has been travel. In the nomadic cinema of Wenders or Jarmusch, Herzog or Kaurismäki, middle-class Euro-American audiences can experience the glamour of cosmopolitanism without leaving home, even if their budget prevents them from traveling the world as effortlessly as the filmmakers and their protagonists seem able to.

What I have called the coffee-table globalism of *Baraka* has a longer history than either Mondo movies or the cosmopolitan cinema of the avant-garde, extending from the founding of the National Geographic Society in 1888, through Edward Steichen's *Family of Man* photography exhibition and book of the 1950s, to the contemporary global mythologies of the Discovery Channel.[18] Ideologically, it takes the form of a liberal humanism whose dominant metaphor is that of the family. In spite of its myriad cultural differences, it affirms the human race is ultimately part of the same global family, sharing a common set of life experiences: birth, death, sexuality, children, food, love, belief in the supernatural, war. This ideology, enshrined for much of this century on the coffee tables (and, since the 1950s, the television screens) of middle-class, middle-brow American households, remains ubiquitous today, from recent books with titles like *Material World: A Global Family Portrait* to the New Age global mythologies of Joseph Campbell.[19]

Baraka's panoramic vision of global natural and cultural diversity, its One World message, its aestheticization of exotic landscapes and societies, locate it firmly within the humanistic documentary tradition of *National Geographic* and *The Family of Man*. While ostensibly celebrating global cultural diversity, the film seems most concerned with framing that diversity within an overarching humanism, affirming a commonality which transcends cultural difference. Like *National Geographic*, Fricke's film is not afraid to face the harsh realities of the twentieth-century world order, as its footage of Dachau, the Cambodian killing fields, the burning oil wells of Kuwait, Tiananmen Square, women workers in Indonesian cigarette factories, or Patpong prostitutes shows; yet at the same time, it avoids taking up "controversial" positions which might be detrimental to commercial success, adopting the viewpoint of the uninvolved witness. Like *National Geographic*, the film seems more concerned with the aesthetic or emotional impact of its subjects than with the global political or economic conditions which account for them. The dominant mood in sequences of global homelessness, poverty, prostitution, and alienated labor is elegiac rather than angry: "If only we could realize that we're all part of the same family!" the film seems to say.

In her articles on *Baraka* and Mondo movies, Amy Staples has described both as being "the antithesis of ethnographic film," raising the question as to the relationship between *Baraka* and films such as *Mondo Cane*. Both in terms of their global subject matter and their formal structure, the two films ostensibly have much in common: like *Mondo Cane*, *Baraka* constructs its picture of the world through a nonlinear, collage structure, disconcerting cuts from one culture to another, and a radical decontextualization of its subjects. Yet these strategies are deployed in the two films for ideologically opposed (if similarly universalizing) purposes: if the worldview of *Mondo Cane* was basically nihilistic, concerned with deconstructing the civilized/savage opposition of its day and affirming the fundamental barbarity of humankind, *Baraka*'s humanistic vision of global spirituality makes it in many ways the antithesis of—even the antidote to—*Mondo Cane*. If *Baraka* is a latter-day descendant of the colonial exhibition and *National Geographic*, the Mondo movie ("the ugly bastard child of the documentary and the peepshow") is its evil twin.[20]

The three categories of global cinema I have identified should be seen not as sequential developments but parallel tendencies within contemporary Euro-American media culture. Far from being a throwback to 1960s neocolonialism, for example, Mondo movies have in recent years been undergoing a revival as part of the current craze for exotic kitsch, from "Incredibly Strange Films" to "Exotica" lounge-music compilations of 1950s movie soundtracks. As the title of David Byrne's recent "alternative" coffee-table book *Strange Ritual* makes clear, the Mondo staples of the "bizarre," the "weird," the "strange" are as popular as ever, albeit in displaced, self-ironic form.[21] The exotic voyeurism of the 1950s and 1960s resurfaces in the postmodern 1990s as global camp.

Imperialist Nostalgia. In an article inspired by recent Euro-American films dealing with the colonial period (*Out of Africa*, *A Passage to India*), Renato

Rosaldo suggests that such films articulate what he calls imperialist nostalgia. The object of nostalgia is not the former imperial or colonial order as such but an order *prior* to it which colonialism was responsible, precisely, for eradicating: the traditional culture and lifeways of indigenous societies. Imperialist nostalgia, according to Rosaldo, thus consists in mourning the passing of what one has oneself destroyed.[22] Such nostalgia, he suggests, ultimately serves to attenuate the guilt stemming from the colonial subject's implication in—even responsibility for—precisely the state of affairs it is lamenting. From Lévi-Strauss's *Tristes Tropiques* to contemporary ethnotourism, Euro-American culture is permeated with such nostalgia, and as the recent documentaries about Herzog's *Fitzcarraldo* or Coppola's *Apocalypse Now* (and those films themselves) show, it is equally pervasive in contemporary cinema.

Baraka's melancholy catalog of global sweatshops, shantytowns, homelessness, poverty, prostitution, civil and international war provides a striking example of what Rosaldo means by imperialist nostalgia. A film such as *Baraka*, Rosaldo might argue, stems precisely from the capitalist First World's guilt at the social, economic, and cultural havoc it has wreaked on the world at large, coupled with nostalgia for a pristine, imaginary world prior to capitalist modernity. This imaginary world, the object of nostalgia, is apparent in the film's reverential treatment of the "unspoiled" natural environment, aboriginal societies, and the premodern religious systems of Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, and Christianity. Watching films such as *Baraka*, it could be argued, enables First World audiences to mourn what capitalism has destroyed while at the same time absolving themselves of any responsibility for it. The fact that it is precisely the global economic order which it decries that makes a film like *Baraka* possible in the first place is not the least of the film's many paradoxes.

Confronted with the uncomfortable realities of the postcolonial world order, *National Geographic* movies, the Discovery Channel, and *Baraka* ultimately serve as a source of reassurance: rather than what separates "us" from "them," they focus on what "we" supposedly have in common. While documenting unpleasant realities, they also persuade us that these realities do not directly concern us, assuaging any anxieties that "we" (nationally, politically, economically) might have any responsibility for them. In a world supposedly made smaller every day by media, it's often overlooked how effective those media also are at keeping that world in its place, making sure—like the fences which separated spectators from the indigenous peoples displayed at world's fairs—that it doesn't come *too* close for comfort.

> Kino-Eye means the conquest of space, the visual linkage of people throughout the entire world based on the continuous exchange of visible fact, of film-documents as opposed to the exchange of cinematic or theatrical presentations.
>
> Kino-Eye means the conquest of time (the visual linkage of phenomena separated in time), Kino-Eye is the possibility of seeing life processes in any temporal order or at any speed, inaccessible to the human eye.
>
> Kino-Eye makes use of every possible kind of shooting technique: acceleration, microscopy, reverse action, animation, camera movement, unexpected foreshortenings—all these we consider not to be trick effects, but normal methods to be fully used.

> Kino-Eye uses every possible means in montage, comparing and linking all points of the universe in any temporal order, breaking, when necessary, all the laws and conventions of film construction.
>
> —Dziga Vertov, "From Kino-Eye to Radio-Eye" (1929)[23]

The Tourist with a Movie Camera. Dziga Vertov was writing not, as he might have been in this passage, about *Baraka* but about his own film practice, exemplified in his 1929 film *Man with a Movie Camera*. The resonance of Vertov's concept of the Kino-Eye in relation to *Baraka*, however, suggests that it might be interesting to explore further the relationship between Fricke's film and Vertov's. For Fricke is, in the fullest sense of the expression, a man with a movie camera—and not just any camera. Both *Baraka* and *Chronos* were shot on 65 mm film stock with a huge camera designed and built by Fricke himself, which, along with a timer mechanism which rotates the camera on its tripod, is responsible for the stunning sequences of time-lapse photography which account for much of the film's aesthetic appeal. Whereas Vertov's film shows us his man with a movie camera striding purposefully around his composite Soviet city with his lightweight camera and tripod tucked under his arm, we can only imagine the heroic efforts of Fricke and his sweating crew hefting their equipment to remote locations literally all over the world.

Comparing *Man with a Movie Camera*, one of the founding films of documentary cinema, with a film such as *Baraka* may at first sight seem far-fetched but proves to be a fascinating experience, precisely because if superficially the two films seem to have certain things in common, they are in fact diametrically opposed.

From a purely technical standpoint, first of all, both Vertov and Fricke can be seen as pioneers of their profession, inasmuch as they push the possibilities of their medium to the absolute limit: Vertov's film is an encyclopedia of special effects available in his time: slow motion, freeze-frame, reverse action, split-screen, superimposed images, and so on. Fricke also uses slow and accelerated motion but adds computer-controlled time-lapse photography, aerial photography, and an image the size of a house. In different ways, both Vertov and Fricke fetishize the camera as an object (see, for example, the sequence of the animated camera and tripod at the end of Vertov's film or the numerous close-ups of the camera lens superimposed on a human eye). Vertov was to become an outcast of the Soviet film industry: his works, "shoved hastily and distractedly into the ash-can of film history, were left to tick away, through four decades, like time bombs."[24] Just as Vertov has only recently come to be seen as one of the founding figures of documentary, so Fricke, his postmodern descendant and no less of a marginal figure in American cinema, may come to be seen as a filmmaker ahead of his time.

Fricke's visual aesthetics also seems indebted to Vertov: a neofuturist fascination with speed, with the repetitive motion of machines, with the rapid motion of vehicles through space; a fascination with technologies of mechanical reproduction (assembly lines, newspaper printing presses); an attention to flows of all kinds: waterfalls, crowds, flocks of birds, information.

It is when we move beyond the technological and phenomenological dimension of the two films and turn to their subject matter, the political and economic

circumstances of their production and distribution, and their respective audiences that the abyss between the two films begins to open up. If *Man with a Movie Camera* is an exemplary instance of filmmaking in what might be described as the age of late socialism, at the threshold of the Stalinist period, which was to see Vertov's marginalization within Soviet filmmaking, *Baraka* is no less exemplary of filmmaking in the age of late capitalism, an age which has seen the collapse of Stalinism's legacy and the globalization of capitalism, together with the culture industries which increasingly sustain it. And it is, of course, to this world that *Baraka* belongs, both in terms of its production and its nature as a commercial product. Indeed, its very existence presupposes an array of economic conditions which are unthinkable in Vertov's world: the existence of a budget capable of funding a crew to produce a ninety-minute feature shot over fourteen months in twenty-four countries; the existence of a highly developed tourist infrastructure in the form of a network of global sites/sights available for consumption and the logistical means of getting there; and, most important, given the film's own economic status, the existence of markets, in the form of audiences, largely in the First World, who are themselves tourists or would-be tourists to many of the Third World sites and societies which the film depicts.

Both *Man with a Movie Camera* and *Baraka* are structured around the trope of presenting "a day in the life" of their respective subjects: in Vertov's case, that of the new citizens of postrevolutionary Russia; in Fricke's, of the citizens of the contemporary global village. Both filmmakers give a prominent place to labor and industrial production: Vertov on a local plane, in the factories of the modern city, Fricke on a transnational one, in the global sweatshops of the Third World.[25] Yet the respective political agendas of the two directors could not be more different: Vertov's celebration of everyday life under socialism is conceived as an active contribution to the process of social transformation; Fricke's depiction of Indonesian women and other Third World factory workers is arguably complicit with the very global economic order which produces them.

The political gulf separating the two films is perhaps most evident when we consider their respective audiences. Just as it incorporates the figure of the filmmaker himself into the film (Vertov's brother, Mikhail Kaufmann) in order to illustrate how film has an important part to play in building the new Soviet society, Vertov's film also incorporates its audience: *Man with a Movie Camera* begins with the arrival of an audience in a movie hall to watch a film which, in a *mise-en-abyme* effect, proves to be the very film we are ourselves watching. The images the audience in the film sees are, in effect, images of itself and celebrate its own everyday life, labor, and leisure. The subjects of the film are also its audience. Further, in dramatizing his film's relation to its audience within the film itself, Vertov seeks to make his film's real audience understand his film's relation to them: the man with a movie camera is acting on their behalf; filmmaking is no longer a staged entertainment but an integral part of their daily lives.

The same cannot be said for *Baraka*, where the relationship between the film and its Third World subjects is above all one of alienation, an aspect most clearly on view in the global *tableaux vivants* of individuals or groups of people

staring directly back at the camera which punctuate the film: Thai prostitutes lined up outside a bar in the Patpong district of Bangkok, Japanese schoolgirls in a subway station, Chinese soldiers on Tiananmen Square, Australian and Brazilian aboriginals. It hardly needs emphasizing that *Baraka* is not addressed to these people nor to the women in the Indonesian cigarette factory, the Brazilian street children, or the Indian women sifting through garbage dumps. While the film has been distributed in as many countries as it was filmed in, its audience is best characterized as people other than those in the film itself, in stark contrast to *Man with a Movie Camera*.

It could be objected that to compare Fricke's film with Vertov here is unfair, since *Baraka* is ultimately a commercial product and would not even exist were it not; or that it is addressed to First World audiences precisely because the conditions it documents are global problems and for this reason is not necessarily any less "progressive" because it does not address its subjects directly. Where is the dividing line between consciousness raising and tourism, politics and profit? While its sympathy for global economic inequality and its social consequences may be commendable, *Baraka* seems unaware of its own place within the very global economic system which bears a large burden of responsibility for the conditions it is sympathizing over. In the end, filmmaker and subjects are left simply staring at each other in silence, lost for words, apparently unable to find a means of bridging the divide between them.

> Seeing Manhattan from the 110th floor of the World Trade Center. Beneath the haze stirred up by the winds, the urban island, a sea in the middle of the sea, lifts up the skyscrapers over Wall Street, sinks down at Greenwich, then rises again to the crests of Midtown, quietly passes over Central Park and finally undulates off into the distance beyond Harlem. . . . To be lifted to the summit of the World Trade Center is to be lifted out of the city's grasp. One's body is no longer clasped by the streets that turn and return it according to an anonymous law; nor is it possessed, whether as player or played, by the rumble of so many differences and by the nervousness of the New York traffic. When one goes up there, he leaves behind the mass that carries off and mixes up in itself any identity of authors or spectators. As Icarus flying above these waters, he can ignore the devices of Daedalus in mobile and endless labyrinth far below. His elevation transfigures him into a voyeur. It puts him at a distance. It transforms the bewitching world by which one was "possessed" into a text that lies before one's eyes. It allows one to read it, to be a solar Eye, looking down like a god.
>
> —Michel de Certeau, from the top of the World Trade Center, New York[26]

Panoramas: An Overview. In 1787, the painter Robert Barker opened an exhibition in Edinburgh which was to have a major impact on the nineteenth- and twentieth-century entertainment industries. It featured a cylindrical painting of the city of Edinburgh which, viewed from the center of the room, gave the spectator the illusion of reality. During the nineteenth century, panoramas and related forms of visual illusionism—dioramas, moving panoramas, peep shows—became an early form of popular entertainment in European and American cities.[27]

The panoramic view itself was not new: panoramas are at least as old as the Bayeux Tapestry, and artists had been painting bird's-eye views of cities long before the invention of manned flight made them a reality.[28] What was new was the idea of putting the painting into a circular room and attempting to deceive the eye into believing that it was looking not at a painting but reality itself.

The history of panoramas is entangled with that of photography throughout the nineteenth century, each playing an important part in the other's development. Best known for his invention of the daguerreotype, Louis-Jacques-Mandé Daguerre first began experimenting with photographic processes as early as 1823, around the same time as his invention of the diorama (a variant of the panorama with special effects).[29] Panoramic views were a common theme in the works of early photographers, while photographs were used increasingly as models by panorama painters.[30] Eadweard Muybridge, the celebrated photographer of motion, was also a great panoramic photographer: one of his works included an eleven-segment panorama of Guatemala City.[31] In 1900, the Lumière brothers, better known as the inventors of motion pictures, exhibited a "photorama" at the Paris Universal Exhibition which projected circular film loops of photographic panoramas onto a 360-degree screen.

Both as one of the dominant forms of entertainment throughout the nineteenth century and as an attempt to simulate reality, panoramas were a precursor of the cinema.[32] Yet if the popularity of the panoramas themselves quickly faded after the invention of motion pictures, their history was not so much displaced as taken up by them. The panoramic as a mode of vision persists throughout the twentieth century, from Hale's Tours, through Abel Gance's use of multiple cameras to project panoramic battle scenes in his film *Napoleon* (1926), Fox's Grandeur (70 mm) version of Raoul Walsh's *The Big Trail* (1930), Cinemascope in the early 1950s, to the 360-degree Soviet Circlorama in 1962 (in panoramic cinema as in space travel, the Russians got there first).

Today's descendants of the panoramas are the virtual reality headset and the IMAX and Omnimax film theater.[33] Like the panoramas, both technologies aspire to immerse the spectator in the representations they project. The Omnimax theater of the Géode at the Cité des Sciences et de l'Industrie in Paris literally adds an extra dimension to the panoramic experience by placing its audience not in a circular rotunda but in a sphere and projecting images onto a 180-degree hemispheric screen. Sony's IMAX-3D theater in Manhattan combines the IMAX format with stereoscopic projection of the type which enjoyed a short-lived popularity during the 1950s, except that the geeky 3-D glasses (immortalized in *Life* magazine's famous photograph) have been replaced by futuristic, VR-like headsets through which audiences observe three-dimensional images eight stories high.[34] IMAX films have consistently drawn on panoramic subjects (*Grand Canyon*), while the panoramic views opened up by the invention of flight no doubt explain the popularity of films about aviation.[35]

Fricke's film *Chronos*, as I mentioned earlier a prototype for *Baraka*, was made specifically for screening at the Géode of the Cité des Sciences et de

l'Industrie in Paris. *Baraka* itself, while filmed in 65 mm and produced in 70 mm, was distributed to conventional rather than IMAX/Omnimax theaters—presumably for commercial reasons, given the relatively small number of such theaters worldwide. While in this sense it may not be, strictly speaking, an IMAX film, it belongs very much within the panoramic tradition I have outlined. Like *Chronos*, the film includes numerous panoramic views of spectacular landscapes, often compensating for the limitations of its already expanded visual field with slow pans, called *panoramiques* in French. The natural and manmade wonders of the world which appear throughout the film (waterfalls, volcanoes, the pyramids, the Grand Canyon) have been the stock in trade of panorama painters since the nineteenth century.[36] As in many IMAX films, extensive use is made of aerial photography, with bird's-eye views of flocks of flamingoes, mountains, cities.

If the panoramas were the virtual reality of their day, *Baraka* aspires no less to immerse its spectators in the world it depicts: at times, as it hurtles, *Star Wars* fashion, through tunnellike spaces, it feels like a videogame or a motion simulation ride; elsewhere, as the camera tracks slowly forward through the temple of Angkor-Wat or Saint Peter's Basilica, it's reminiscent of a virtual reality simulation.

Travel and exoticism supply a further link between panoramas, photography, and *Baraka*. Tourist photography dates from as early as the 1840s, with Maxime Du Camp's images of Egypt, and photography quickly assumed the role of making the world visible to those unable to travel to distant locations. In this, however, it had already been anticipated by panoramas: although the earliest panoramas depicted views confined to the immediate location where they were shown (Edinburgh, London, Paris), it soon became common to exhibit paintings of locations which its spectators may never have visited. In London, "views not only from Europe but from all parts of the globe appeared at the Leicester Square rotunda."[37] Like photographers, panorama painters traveled widely in search of new, increasingly exotic subjects. "The panorama provided not some pale reflection of a distant scene but an almost palpable sense of its reality"; as such, it provided an experience of surrogate travel. It was even suggested that the panoramas were preferable to real travel as a means of experiencing distant and exotic cultures.[38]

> To those who would never see the real locations, panorama images were a surrogate reality, against which other representations, either verbal or pictorial, could be weighed. To those who would later visit the sites represented, the panorama image provided a framework for the actual experience of reality. . . . To those who had already visited the sites or experienced the events, a panorama, if we can believe the anecdotes, brought back the reality.[39]

The panoramic view of the world's cultures in *Baraka* provides a similar experience of exoticism for tourists and would-be tourists around the globe who cannot afford to travel to the places it depicts, a model for those who can and will, and a souvenir for those who already have.

But the panoramic nature of *Baraka* is not confined to the literal sense of showing panoramic views. Its vision of the world and the societies which inhabit it

aims to be no less all-encompassing. *Baraka*'s wide-angle lens aspires to offer a panorama of the entire world; it is as if its panoramic gaze were seeking to embrace the total surface of the planet itself. Apparently unconstrained by the limits of mere mortals, now soaring above lakes, now moving unseen among the world's peoples as they go about their daily business, its omniscient gaze resembles nothing so much as the eye of God. God's view of things, moreover, takes in not just Space but Time, ranging over the history of civilizations, from ancient prehistory to the postmodern metropolis. The film's time-lapse photography compresses hours of events (the movement of shadows, clouds, tides) into a mere few seconds, a temporal panorama which is the equivalent of the spatial one.

> From the earliest days of the manned space program, earth watching has been one of the favorite pastimes of the astronauts. . . . Only about 200 people have seen the earth from space, but many astronauts have become avid photographers and filmmakers, so they can share with us the stunning images provided by their privileged vantage point.
>
> —Lydia Dotto, *Blue Planet*[40]

> Le cinéma ce n'est pas je vois c'est je vole. [Cinema isn't I see, it's I fly.]
>
> —Paul Virilio, paraphrasing Nam June Paik, *Guerre et cinéma* (1984)[41]

Into Orbit. One image which is surprisingly absent from *Baraka*, given its panoramic ambitions, is what is arguably the ultimate panorama: the image, still barely three decades old, of the earth seen from space. Evidently even a budget the size of *Baraka*'s could not stretch to a ride on the space shuttle. Other filmmakers of course, *have* been able to boldly go where the makers of *Baraka* could not, and they also had IMAX cameras with them: "more than three dozen [astronauts] have been trained to use the large-format IMAX camera, which has been flown on eight shuttle missions so far," wrote Lydia Dotto in 1991.[42] The panoramic footage of the earth shot by NASA space shuttle crews has in fact spawned a minigenre of IMAX films, including Graeme Ferguson's *The Dream Is Alive* (1985), the Smithsonian Institution/Lockheed Corporation's *Blue Planet* (1991), and, most recently, James Neihouse's *Destiny in Space* (1994). While *Baraka*'s global photography remains confined to earth atmosphere, both its use of the IMAX camera and its panoramic view of the world lend it evident affinities with such films.

NASA's IMAX filmmakers were by no means the first astronauts to produce images of the earth, of course. Ever since John Glenn, the first American to orbit the planet, sneaked a portable camera into space with him in 1962, NASA's astronauts have spent much of their time in space photographing and filming the earth. Al Reinert's film about the Apollo program, *For All Mankind* (1989), includes a memorable sequence of NASA technicians staring in wonder at the first live television images of the earth transmitted by the Apollo 8 mission in 1968, the first manned space flight to leave earth orbit. This image of the "whole earth," as it has become known, may be seen as the culmination of a project dating back at least several hundred years, the historical moment at which the coincidence of technologies of vision and aeronautics made it possible for the first time to obtain a panoramic view of the entire planet.[43] A visual symbol of McLuhan's global

village, the image of the "whole earth" played a key role in the sense of global "imagined community" (in Benedict Anderson's phrase) which was the basis for a number of global movements in subsequent decades, from the ecology movement to the "We Are the World" message of the music industry's 1980s campaign against global hunger. Coinciding with the American counterculture of the late 1960s, the image became the central symbol of the ecological movement, organized around the appropriately named *Whole Earth Catalog*. It is no coincidence, then, that the ecologically-aware *Baraka*, avowedly inspired by the synthetic mythology of Joseph Campbell, should have emerged from the spiritual heir of that sixties counterculture, the Californian New Age. Welcome to the global village, nineties edition.

The Book of the Film: Rethinking "World Cinema." In 1994, the British Film Institute published a book entitled *World Cinema: Diary of a Day*, one of a number of books produced in recent years in conjunction with the centenary of the cinema.[44] The book was the result of a project whereby around a thousand people who work in all sectors of the film industry worldwide were asked to keep a diary of their activities on a more or less randomly chosen day (June 10) during the summer of 1993. The diary entries produced were then edited and reorganized into a series of chapters roughly corresponding to the various stages in the production of a film itself, from initial ideas to the first public screening, thereby providing a global snapshot of "a day in the life of the film industry."[45]

The book is perhaps most interesting for what it reveals about the transnational dimension of filmmaking worldwide today and the global cultural economy within which it takes place.[46] More generally, it provides a fascinating and often decidedly unglamorous picture of a typical day in the business of making films and the frustration often associated with it. At the same time, the book has a number of problems. One of the most obvious is that while telling us a lot about film *making*, it tells us nothing about the equally important matter of film *watching*. In focusing exclusively on film production, not consumption, it arguably presents us with only half the picture of contemporary World Cinema, completely ignoring its other half: film audiences.[47]

A second problem lies in the universalizing—one might say globalizing—assumptions underlying the category of "World Cinema" itself. Whatever the political and economic conditions underlying its historical emergence (colonialism, capitalism) and however varied its countless local manifestations, it is assumed, filmmaking is today a global cultural form. On the face of it, this assumption might seem indisputable, a simple observation of fact, and I do not intend to dispute it here. At the same time, certain things need to be kept in mind. First, it is interesting that the category of "World Cinema," as exemplified by books such as the one in question here, has been used exclusively (to the best of my knowledge) by First World film scholars and critics, rather than those from the major postcolonial film-producing nations. Second, the ostensibly neutral observation of "World Cinema" as a fact of the contemporary world needs to be situated within the larger historical context of European imperialism and of similar at-

tempts by the colonial powers to impose ostensibly "universal" categories on the world at large. Third, it is worth remembering that precisely because of the historical entanglement of cinema with colonialism, many postcolonial filmmakers—I am thinking of Third Cinema filmmakers in particular—have been concerned precisely with defining their film practices in opposition to American and European cinemas. While such filmmakers today have to operate within the global cultural economy like anyone else, it seems likely that they might be more uneasy about having their work assimilated into the category of "World Cinema" than, say, a French or a British director. In short, the category of "World Cinema" proves on closer inspection to be less "natural," less ideologically innocent, than it may at first appear and can even be seen as a globalizing construct which in some ways makes it the film studies counterpart to *Baraka*.

A third problem of *World Cinema*, and one more directly relevant to the present discussion, is that while, as I have suggested, the book reveals much about the global processes which affect how film production takes place today, it tells us little about the impact of these same processes on the subject matter of films themselves. What is clear, at least, is that global processes have had, and continue to have, a significant impact on the actual content of films, whether they are made by an American ethnographic filmmaker, a European avant-garde filmmaker, an African filmmaker living in Paris, or an Iranian one in Los Angeles.

Comparing *World Cinema* with *Baraka*, one is led to the conclusion that we need to rethink the concept of "World Cinema." While both "World Cinema" and "global cinema" have in recent years been the subject of increasing critical attention, a substantial body of films, of which *Baraka* is only one example, which are clearly relevant to such a discussion seem to have been left out of it. If this is correct, it is worth reflecting on why it may be so. One reason may have to do with a conceptual confusion around the uses of the term "World Cinema" itself, which although increasingly ubiquitous these days, is used in a very different sense from a term such as "World Music." As we saw a moment ago, the term is most often used to mean "the global film industry," rather than in the narrower sense in which I have been using it in this essay of films which are in different ways *about* something called "the world." Quite apart from the ideological implications of such a globalizing term, one might also wonder about the analytical usefulness of a conceptual category which—in the sphere of film production, at least—includes potentially everything.

Another reason why discussions of "World Cinema" and "global cinema" seem to have overlooked the kinds of films I have been discussing here may simply be a suspicion of the global itself. We have become accustomed to valorizing local particularity and dismissing globalizing discourses, with their claims to speak for everyone, as monolithic and hegemonic. This may be no bad thing, but while we may have good reason to be suspicious of the global, this does not mean that if we ignore it, it will simply go away. In fact, the opposite seems more true: the more we ignore it, the more pervasive it seems to become. Studies of "global" or "world" cinema, however, have tended to focus primarily on transnational or local film practices, defined by *resistance* to the global (often treated these days as a synonym for capi-

talism), rather than on the global as such.[48] Without denying the importance of practices of resistance, we also need to ask what is at stake in the continuing Euro-American desire to frame multicultural diversity within its all-encompassing gaze, and whether films such as *Baraka* are not the mirror image of today's transnational cinemas of difference. In a postcolonial world order in which First World societies have found themselves increasingly fragmented by Third World immigration, their cultural homogeneity destabilized and contested by the cultures of their former colonies, the global vision of *Baraka* can be seen as a reaction to the threat such a world poses to Euro-American cultural authority, which, in reinscribing the world within the reassuring field of a Euro-American gaze, seeks to reimpose a neocolonial order on a world slipping increasingly beyond its control.

Rethinking "World Cinema" today in the first instance involves differentiating it both from the global film industry, a category which potentially includes everything, and from transnational cinemas, defined by their affirmation of difference rather than commonality. It also involves resituating film within the larger context of what I have been calling the global culture industry. This means treating film not, as has historically been the case, in isolation from other media but as part of a larger continuum of media today, from travel writing to fashion to popular music, which articulate Euro-American responses to—and in certain cases, as I have suggested, seek to reassert control over—the new multicultural realities of the postcolonial world order. Euro-American film has played and will continue to play a significant role in articulating these responses, but this role has to date remained relatively unexamined. Focusing on it more directly may lead to an admittedly less globalizing but ultimately clearer understanding of the place of "World Cinema" in the contemporary global culture industry.

Notes

1. Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (New York and Scarborough, Ontario: New American Library, 1964), 20.
2. See, for example, Roy Armes, *Third World Film Making and the West* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).
3. I am thinking here of Djibril-Diop Mambety's film *Hyènes* (1992).
4. See, for example, Hamid Naficy, "Phobic Spaces and Liminal Panics: Independent Transnational Film Genre," in Rob Wilson and Wimal Dissanayake, eds., *Global/ Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary* (Durham/London: Duke University Press, 1996), 119–44.
5. "An ancient Sufi word with forms in many languages," the film's promotional blurb explains, the term *baraka* "can simply be translated as a blessing, or as the breath, or essence of life from which the evolutionary process unfolds."
6. The only academic article I have found on *Baraka* to date is Amy Staples, "Mondo Meditations," *American Anthropologist* 96 (1994): 662–68.
7. See Bill Nichols, "At the Limits of Reality (TV)," in *Blurred Boundaries: Questions of Meaning in Contemporary Culture* (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1994), 43–63.
8. Even in sequences of dance performance where the accompanying music may have been recorded at the same time, the soundtrack is not "natural" but has been overdubbed

afterward. I am grateful to David Tamés for pointing this out to me.

9. On World Music, see my article "'World Music' and the Global Cultural Economy," *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 2, no. 2 (1992): 229–42. Treating World Music not as an ethnomusicological but a commercial category, as the music sold in the "World Music" section of mainly First World record stores, the article set out to identify some of the conditions underlying the emergence of World Music as a new kind of commodity in the global marketplace.
10. Tony Gatlif's film about gypsy music, *Latcho Drom* (1993), could be described as a World Music film and has close affinities with *Baraka*. Wim Wenders's *Until the End of the World* (1993) features a generic World Beat soundtrack, including pygmy chants of the *Deep Forest* variety.
11. Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 4.
12. See George E. Marcus and Michael Fischer, eds., *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: an Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).
13. On ex-primitives, see Dean MacCannell, "Cannibalism Today," in *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 17–73. For an amusing account of ethnotourism, see P. J. O'Rourke, "Up the Amazon," *Rolling Stone*, 25 November 1993, 60–72.
14. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, 9.
15. In this context, it is no coincidence that exotic food is often the central subject of exotic films themselves (*Tampopo*, *Eat a Bowl of Tea*, *Dim Sum*, *Como Agua Para Chocolate*): one can watch Ang Lee's *The Wedding Banquet* or *Eat Drink Man Woman* and eat out at a Chinese restaurant afterward. In such cases, the difference between eating and watching, consuming exotic food and exotic film, becomes virtually imperceptible; the consumption of the exotic is literalized within the film itself.
16. On Mondo movies, see Amy Staples, "An Interview with Dr. Mondo," *American Anthropologist* 97, no. 1 (1995).
17. On the *flâneur*, see Charles Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne," in *Curiosités esthétiques: L'Art romantique et autres oeuvres critiques* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 1962), and Walter Benjamin, *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism*, trans. Harry Zohn (London: Verso, 1983). The literature on *flânerie* is extensive; for an introduction, see Keith Tester, ed., *The Flâneur* (New York: Routledge, 1994). The *flâneur* was (and is) by no means exclusively male, of course, and *flânerie* as a specifically female activity in the nineteenth century has also been well documented: see Janet Wolff, "The Invisible *Flâneuse*: Women and the Literature of Modernity," *Theory, Culture and Society*, special issue on "The Fate of Modernity," 2, no. 3 (1985); Rachel Bowlby, *Just Looking: Consumer Culture in Dreiser, Gissing, and Zola* (London: Methuen 1985); Elizabeth Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991). The *flâneur's* latest incarnation is the electronic *flâneur*, wandering the global computer network of the World Wide Web as his Baudelairean counterpart wandered the nineteenth-century city; see William J. Mitchell, *City of Bits: Space, Place, and the Infobahn* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995), 7.
18. For a historical overview of *National Geographic*, see C. D. B. Bryan, *The National Geographic Society: 100 Years of Adventure and Discovery* (New York: H. N. Abrams, 1987). For a critical history, see Catherine Lutz and Jane Collins, *Reading National Geographic* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1993). On *The Family of Man*, see

Edward Steichen, *The Family of Man* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955).

19. Peter Menzel, *Material World: A Global Family Portrait*, introduction by Paul Kennedy, text by Charles C. Mann (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1994).
20. Charles Kilgore (aka Dr. Mondo), quoted in Staples, "An Interview with Dr. Mondo," 111.
21. David Byrne, *Strange Ritual: Pictures and Words* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1995).
22. "Imperialist nostalgia revolves around a paradox: A person kills somebody, and then mourns the victim. In more attenuated form, someone deliberately alters a form of life, and then regrets that things have not remained as they were prior to the intervention. At one more remove, people destroy their environment, and then they worship nature. In any of its versions, imperialist nostalgia uses a pose of 'innocent yearning' both to capture people's imaginations and to conceal its complicity with brutal domination." Renato Rosaldo, "Imperialist Nostalgia," in *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989), 69–70.
23. Dziga Vertov, "From Kino-Eye to Radio-Eye" (1929), in Annette Michelson, ed., *Kino-Eye: The Writings of Dziga Vertov*, trans. Kevin O'Brien (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 87–88. On *The Man with a Movie Camera*, see also Vlada Petric, *Constructivism in Film* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
24. Michelson, "Introduction," in *Kino-Eye*, xiv.
25. Both Vertov's and Fricke's films include footage of workers producing cigarettes, but whereas in *Man with a Movie Camera* they are citizens of the new Soviet society, in *Baraka* the factory is in Indonesia, and its women workers may be among the thousands in Third World nations employed by multinational tobacco companies such as Philip Morris.
26. Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 91–92. "Depuis le 110ᵉ étage du World Trade Center, *voir* Manhattan. Sous la brume brassée par les vents, l'île urbaine, mer au milieu de la mer, lève les gratte-ciel de Wall Street, se creuse à Greenwich, dresse de nouveau les crêtes de Midtown, s'apaise à Central Park et moutonne enfin au-delà de Harlem. . . . Etre élevé au sommet du World Trade Centre, c'est être enlevé à l'emprise de la ville. Le corps n'est plus enlacé par les rues qui le tournent et le retournent selon une loi anonyme; ni possédé, joueur ou joué, par la rumeur de tant de différences et par la nervosité du trafic new-yorkais. Celui qui monte là-haut sort de la masse qui emporte et brasse en elle-même toute identité d'auteurs ou de spectateurs. Icare au-dessus de ces eaux, il peut ignorer les ruses de Dédale en des labyrinthes mobiles et sans fin. Son élévation le transfigure en voyeur. Elle le met à distance. Elle mue en un texte qu'on a devant soi, sous les yeux, le monde qui ensorcelait et dont on était «possédé». Elle permet de le lire, d'être un Oeil solaire, un regard de dieu." "Marches dans la ville," in *L'Invention du quotidien I: Arts de faire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1990), 139–40.
27. On panoramas, see Ralph Hyde, *Panoramania! The Art and Entertainment of the 'All-Embracing' View* (London: Trefoil Publications in association with Barbican Art Gallery, 1988); and Stephan Oettermann, *Das Panorama: Die Geschichte eines Massenmediums* (Frankfurt: Syndikat, 1980).
28. On bird's-eye views of cities (or prospects, to use the technical term), see Hyde, *Panoramania!* 45–51, which includes a number of historical examples; and Louis Marin, *Utopiques: Jeux d'espaces* (Paris: Minuit, 1973).
29. Aaron Scharf, *Art and Photography* (New York: Penguin, 1983 [1968]), 24.
30. Scharf's *Art and Photography* includes a photographic panorama of Paris by Daguerre

(29), while a Daumier lithograph titled *Nadar élevant la photographie à la hauteur de l'art* [Nadar raising photography to the heights of art] (1862) depicts the photographer squinting through the eyepiece of his camera at Paris from a hot-air balloon (152).

31. Hyde, *Panoramania!* 180.
32. Perhaps because panoramas and the cinema ostensibly belong within the purview of different disciplines (art history and film studies), the role of panoramas as precursors of the cinema has long been neglected by art historians and film scholars alike. This is no longer true, however, and in recent years a substantial body of work on the prehistory of cinema and on panoramas as a precursor of motion pictures has emerged: on the latter, see Scott Macdonald, ed., "Movies before Cinema," *Wide Angle* 18, nos. 2–3 (1996), notably Angela Miller, "The Panorama, the Cinema, and the Emergence of the Spectacular," *Wide Angle* 18, no. 2 (1996): 34–69. The interdisciplinary work on cinema of film scholars and cultural historians and the resituating of motion pictures within the larger context of modernity has been one of the most interesting developments in film studies in the 1990s; see, for example, Linda Williams, ed., *Viewing Positions: Ways of Seeing Film* (Rutgers University Press, 1995); Leo Charney and Vanessa R. Schwartz, eds., *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).
33. The IMAX format originated at the Expo 67 World's Fair in Montreal, Canada, in 1967, where multiscreen projection proved to be one of the most popular attractions. A group of Canadian filmmakers who had made some of the films shown decided to design a new system using a single powerful projector rather than the multiple projectors used at the time. The IMAX projection system was first used at the 1970 World's Fair in Osaka, Japan, and the first permanent IMAX theater opened in Toronto in 1971. Omnimax, a related format in which the film image is projected onto a 180-degree dome screen, was inaugurated at the Reuben H. Fleet Space Theater, San Diego, in 1973. There are currently some 129 IMAX/Omnimax film theaters in 20 countries. (Source: Houston Museum of Natural Science, Texas, World Wide Web site, 1995.)
34. On IMAX 3-D, see Paul Arthur, "In the Realm of the Senses: IMAX 3-D and the Myth of Total Cinema," *Film Comment* (January 1996): 78–81.
35. Notably, Jean-Jacques Annaud's recent *Wings of Courage* (1995), billed as the first dramatic film made specifically for the IMAX format.
36. Hyde, *Panoramania!* 182. Other IMAX films have focused on similarly panoramic subjects, notably *Grand Canyon*.
37. Scott B. Wilcox, "Unlimiting the Bounds of Painting," introduction to Hyde, *Panoramania!* 36.
38. Ibid., 40.
39. Ibid.
40. Lydia Dotto, *Blue Planet: A Portrait of Earth* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1991), 19. This large-format book (in effect, an IMAX book) accompanied the release of the Smithsonian Institution/Lockheed Corporation's film *Blue Planet* (1991), an IMAX film of images of the earth filmed by astronauts on the space shuttle.
41. Paul Virilio, *Guerre et cinéma I: Logistique de la perception* (Paris: Cahiers du Cinéma, 1991 [1984]), 15.
42. Dotto, *Blue Planet*, 7.
43. On the "whole earth" image, see Yaakov Garb, "The Use and Misuse of the Whole Earth Image," *Whole Earth Review* 45 (1985): 18–25.
44. Peter Cowie, ed., *World Cinema: Diary of a Day* (Woodstock, N.Y.: Overlook Press,

1994). See also Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of World Cinema* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); and Judy Stone, *Eye on the World: Conversations with International Filmmakers* (Los Angeles: Silman-James Press, 1997).

45. In recent years, these "Day in the Life" books have emerged as an interesting variant of what I called earlier "coffee-table globalism." Having begun *their* life as a series of overviews of national cultures (*A Day in the Life of America*, *A Day in the Life of Japan*, etc.), they have recently moved beyond the national, as Rick Smolan's recent *A Day in the Life of Cyberspace* attests. The panoramic, globalizing ambitions of such books lend them strong affinities with films such as *Baraka*; one wonders how long it will be before the publication of *A Day in the Life of the World*.
46. On the global cultural economy, see Arjun Appadurai, "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy," in *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Public Worlds 1 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 27–47.
47. Elsewhere in contemporary film studies, considerable attention has focused on the study of global audiences: see, for example, Ien Ang, *Desperately Seeking the Audience* (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), and *Living Room Wars: Rethinking Media Audiences for a Postmodern World* (New York and London: Routledge, 1996).
48. See Fredric Jameson, *The Geopolitical Aesthetic: Cinema and Space in the World System* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, and London: British Film Institute, 1992); Scott MacDonald, "Premonitions of a Global Cinema," in *Avant-Garde Film: Motion Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 123–25.