



Advertising and Film: A Topological Approach

Yvonne Zimmermann

This chapter is concerned with outlining a framework for the study of advertising film: a framework that embraces research into the objects, screens and practices of moving-image advertising. I suggest a topological approach and consider what the question ‘Where is advertising film?’ can contribute to conceptualising the ephemeral practice of advertising with moving images. I focus on the exhibition and consumption of advertising film in different times and *dispositifs* to outline the productivity of a topological approach in more detail. There are other related topics that would be worth considering, such as the place of advertising in production culture, but they are outside the scope of the present chapter.

The chapter ties research on moving-picture advertising into recent debates by addressing the notions of topography and spectatorial experience. These two aspects have become core interests of film studies, not least as a consequence of the fundamental changes in the media sphere. Mobile media, satellite signals, cable, digital channels and global digital networks have increased and altered the spaces, places and trajectories of moving images. With media progressively converging, moving images have transgressed traditional media boundaries and become ubiquitous and ever present. These modified constellations challenge media studies, and film studies in particular, since film studies’ classical central object – the cinema – is no longer the primary site of film consumption. A focus on the largely under-researched object of advertising film can further contribute to the field, not only by refining our historical knowledge and current understanding of this ephemeral media practice, but also by eventually speaking to questions raised by digital technology.

DEMARCATING THE OBJECT OF STUDY

Although the focus of this chapter is on the spatial dimensions of moving-picture advertising, responding to the question of ‘Where is advertising film?’, it still seems useful to begin with the ontological, Bazinian question of ‘What is advertising film?’, if only to delineate the very object of study considered here. At the same time, this is an admission that it is impossible to separate clearly the ‘where’ from the ‘what’ (and the ‘when’), as will become evident later in this chapter. The 2009 Amsterdam Workshop on advertising film displayed the vastness and richness of the field: under the umbrella of the term ‘advertising film’, scholars and archivists presented moving images that varied

in format (celluloid, video, digital), in length (from one-minute clips and shorter to feature length), in representation modes (fiction, nonfiction, animation), in style, in rhetoric and in audience address. Defining advertising film is tricky, given the ubiquitous yet ephemeral, multiform, shape-shifting, performative and transgressive character of moving-picture advertising. The elusiveness of this media practice makes it difficult even to determine the very object of study and to demarcate the research field.

In the history of advertising film production, a basic distinction would be made between advertising film in a narrow sense and advertising film in a broad sense.¹ This distinction, as simple as it is, can still help to conceptualise the object of study today. Advertising film in a narrow sense includes short movies, often called ‘commercials’, ‘spots’ or simply ‘ads’ that advertise a product, brand, service, or behaviour. If the predominant purpose of commercials is to raise sales, the aim of advertising in business practice can also be to out-compete other companies, as Michael Schudson argues in his classic 1984 study *Advertising, the Uneasy Persuasion*.² Building a brand and ensuring customer loyalty are other objectives of commercials. Even if commercials in the western world pursue different aims in the short run and have symbolic and cultural utility that transcends the mere selling of merchandise, as Schudson claims, in the end and from the advertisers’ perspective, they serve the capitalist logic of economic growth. For several decades, the prevalent places of commercials or spots were cinema and television. The last twenty years or so have seen a fundamental diversification of channels for motion picture advertising: the mobilisation and multiplication of screens, ‘the explosion of cinema’,³ ‘the dislocation of television screens’⁴ and the emergence of social media networks have provided commercials with the potential to inhabit virtually any screen, whether private or public.

To label this probably most blatant category of advertising films *commercials* or *spots* helps to distinguish it from a second body of advertising moving images: that is, advertising films in a broad sense, understood as a rhetorical type of moving image that intends to influence audience opinions, attitudes and behaviour. Such films are ‘made to persuade’, to quote the theme of the eighth Orphan Film Symposium, held in New York in 2012. Moving-picture advertising in the broad sense has a rhetorical ‘brief’ and the ‘charge’ to affect spectatorial thoughts and actions, to borrow two terms art historian Michael Baxandall (1985) uses to reconstruct the historical intentions behind art in order to explain its formal appearances. Historically, the broad category of advertising film overlaps to a large degree with another prominent category in film history, the (sponsored) documentary, and embraces a variety of genres: it includes travelogues and tourist films, industrial and corporate films, many *Kulturfilme* (cultural films) and educational films, social and political campaign films, as well as sanitation and recruitment films. Such moving pictures would normally range from ten or twenty minutes to feature length, be predominantly instructional in tone and often pursue their advertising goals in a discreet and indirect manner (without mentioning either commissioner or product/brand).

Two other types of advertising films that specialise in advertising movies – the trailer and the making-of – can also be added to this category. Finally, more recent audiovisual forms of buzz and viral marketing that work through social media networks can be incorporated into the category of advertising film in a broad sense as well.

To include these highly ephemeral and complex forms of moving-picture advertising into the study of advertising film is to acknowledge not only the impressively wide range of historical and current screen advertising practices that go way beyond the explicit advertising of brands, products and politicians; it is also to acknowledge the pivotal role that these implicit, latent advertising forms played and play in shaping media culture and consumer culture and in building communities and identities. From a historical perspective, these films often interlaced consumer education and civic education. They were the products and promoters of a joint venture of business and state, of corporation and nation, of an alliance of capitalism and democracy that has made advertising pervade our daily life.

IS ADVERTISING FILM A GENRE?

The question whether moving-image advertising can be conceptualised and studied as a genre lends itself to vivid debates. Such debates are often undermined by category misunderstanding and may benefit from a clarification of the term ‘genre’ and its various semantic implications. It is quite obvious that the question of genre is appropriate only in regard to advertising films in the narrow sense – that is, to commercials or spots – and is not relevant for the discussion of advertising films in a broader sense, given the generic diversity that characterises this latter category. To decide whether commercials or spots constitute a genre depends on how genre is defined. The German language distinguishes between the term ‘*Genre*’ and the term ‘*Gattung*’. This distinction may be helpful to frame the complex phenomenon of advertising film more precisely. Following Knut Hackett’s comments on genre theory and analysis, the German term ‘*Genre*’, on the one hand, describes a formal or structural category that includes films that share a story formula, narrative convention, a particular milieu, specific character and conflict constellations, or specific emotional and affective constellations.⁵ The German term ‘*Gattung*’, on the other hand, refers to particular modes of representation (fiction, nonfiction, animation film) or to specific functions and uses of films. *Gattung* is therefore a predominantly pragmatic category. If we relate this to advertising film, we can state that, essentially, advertising film is defined by the function it performs, namely advertising, and not by intrinsic properties that perform this function. It is, therefore, primarily a *Gattung*, a functional and thus pragmatic category, rather than a *Genre* that builds on intrinsic properties. Yet, this general classification of moving-picture advertising as *Gattung* (or what could translate as ‘pragmatic genre’) does not preclude the possibility of commercials forming distinct bodies of films that share formal features and thus qualify as *Genre* (or what could be termed ‘formal genre’). Indeed, there are commercials that do share story patterns, character constellations and other similarities in form and content and thus do qualify not only as a pragmatic genre, but also as a formal one.

In a larger perspective, moving-picture advertising can be understood as a pragmatic subgenre of the category of *Gebrauchsfilm* (utility film), or what in Anglo-Saxon media studies would be called *useful cinema*. This research field has recently emerged both in Europe and in the USA and has been very productive for the study,

preservation and presentation of ephemeral or orphan films – that is, neglected moving images such as science and industrial films, educational films, newsreels and home movies. Among the pioneering studies in the field are *Films that Work* edited by Vinzenz Hediger and Patrick Vonderau (2009) on the use of moving images in industrial contexts, Charles R. Acland and Haidee Wasson's anthology *Useful Cinema* (2011) on functional films in classrooms and civic circuits and the two collections of essays on educational and classroom films *Learning with the Lights Off* (Orgeron et al., 2012) and *Lights! Camera! Action and the Brain* (Bahloul and Graham, 2012). The concept of useful cinema refers to a wide range of films beyond the commercial mainstream and beyond the art film canon; it includes a large body of films that were neither primarily produced as commodities to make money with or as pieces of art, but that were used as instruments to produce knowledge and to influence audiences in the context of an 'ongoing struggle for aesthetic, social, and political capital'.⁶

To approach screen advertising within the theoretical and methodological framework of useful cinema studies⁷ means to acknowledge the pragmatic logic of advertising film as being not an end in itself (to make money or art), but a *means* to influence minds, shape tastes and affect behaviour. Inducing cooperation on the part of customers, workers, citizens and authorities with the advertiser is among the predominant missions of motion picture advertising. In other words, advertising films, like *Gebrauchsfilme* in general, are not commodities, but instruments in the service of the advertiser. The exploitation logic of commercials, therefore, differs from that of mainstream cinema and the entertainment industry: instead of *making* money with the production, distribution and exhibition of moving pictures, advertisers *pay* money for their films to be exhibited and watched. This general rule primarily applies to commercials, whereas in historical practice less explicit forms of advertising films such as instructional documentaries, cultural films and other sponsored movies with educational value could find audiences for free in commercial cinemas, classrooms and other non-theatrical venues. Still, the question of 'Who pays for screen space?' can be helpful when trying to locate advertising film; even more so since the identification of motion-picture advertising has become increasingly challenging in today's media landscape, not least because of buzz or viral marketing strategies that use digital social networks as platforms to spread advertising in disguise.⁸

WHY SPACE MATTERS

Digitisation and cinema's loss of indexicality have not only contested the very concept of cinema and its material condition, film's chemical and photographic base;⁹ digital and mobile media are also widely perceived as having plunged cinema as the predominant site of filmic experience into a crisis. As Francesco Casetti has put it, cinema begins to disentangle itself both 'from its exclusive medium (film – projector – screen) and from what has long been its privileged place (film theatre)'.¹⁰ Cinema screens dislocate, and filmic experience relocates to find new media and new environments. Rather than perceiving cinema in the digital era as being threatened in its very existence, André Gaudreault and Philippe Marion diagnose a 'kinematic turn', a shift from the medium of cinema to a convergence of moving-image media, arguing

that cinema has always been more an 'evolving patchwork of "federated" cultural series' than a static form with a fixed identity.¹¹ The authors see in today's media landscape an eerie reflection of early cinema with roots in an intermedial mash-up culture in the late nineteenth century. Gaudreault's theory of 'cultural series' draws attention to the variety of cultural practices that moving images were part of in the 1890s and 1900s – such as stage entertainment, photography, magic lantern and lecture, to name but a few – before they were perceived to form their own separate cultural series – cinema – around 1910.¹² If the so-called digital revolution and mobile media have put the place of filmic exhibition and experience into question,¹³ the notion of cultural series can serve as a conceptual directory to a topological approach. And advertising film lends itself as a paradigmatic object of research to illuminate and explore the many sites of moving images, with cinema being but one among many others.

Across the humanities and social sciences the spatial turn has fostered an understanding of space as *produced* (and not given), and has called attention to the role of space in the construction and transformation of social life.¹⁴ Also in media and cinema studies, space has been acknowledged as a central methodological and analytical category. Most notably, the spatial turn has fostered a better understanding of the *site-specificity* of moving images. In the introduction to their collection of essays on the spaces of filmic knowledge Vinzenz Hediger, Oliver Fahle and Gudrun Sommer claim that film cannot be understood without an examination of the places of the moving image.¹⁵ The spatial and experiential transformation of the exhibition sites of moving images through digital media have also prompted a re-evaluation of space and exhibition sites in cinema history. In his essay 'The Place of Space in Film Historiography' (2006), Robert C. Allen draws on geographer Doreen Massey's relational notion of space –that is, that space is a product of interrelationships and interactions, constructed through embedded material practices and in itself eventful, to elaborate a theoretical and historiographical model that would take the multiform experience of cinema into account.

To contribute to this scholarship by studying advertising film within a spatial framework is significant for at least three reasons. First, the more ubiquitous and ephemeral an object of study is, the more attention has to be paid to retracing and locating it. Space matters, as Barney Warf and Santa Arias remind us, 'not for the simplistic and overly used reason that everything happens in space, but because *where* things happen is critical to knowing *how* and *why* they happen'.¹⁶ The mapping of the sites and networks of moving-image advertising is thus essential to an understanding of advertising film. Second, I argue that looking at the place of advertising film in cinema and on television sheds new light from a different, so far neglected angle on these traditional sites of moving-image exhibition, and recalls spectatorship and experience into question. Finally, a cartography of moving-image advertising will reach beyond the classic domains of cinema and television and their correspondent studies. It will expand into the vast territory of non-theatrical film and useful cinema, which includes advertising films as 'other' to the predominant cultural series of cinema and television. Such an approach can essentially contribute to a larger film-historical project: to an archaeology of moving images in the many cultural series and institutional practices that shaped and informed private and public life. Given the

manifold intersections of moving images with other media in these spaces, such an endeavour is at the same time an archaeology of intermediality.

ADVERTISING'S PLACE IN COMMERCIAL CINEMA

Exhibition and consumption present a vast territory to map the past and present sites of moving-image advertising, from cinema and television to the internet and mobile phones, from town and union halls to libraries and sports stadiums, from city squares to private and public transportation. I suggest that we put the building of a typology of the sites of screen advertising on the agenda of advertising film studies. It is evident that all studies of films, whether advertising or not, can benefit from attention to the context of their exhibition. But there is more at stake in a typology of the sites of moving-image advertising than learning about exhibition context. Arguing in the line of Warf, Arias and others, exhibition sites are not containers for films to be screened; rather, exhibition sites are *produced* by the films on screen just as much as the *films* are produced by the exhibition sites. Exhibition sites co-produce the screened objects. In this sense, exhibition sites are formative in that they format the films to be screened and, as a consequence, they are also normative. A typology of the *sites* of moving-image advertising will therefore produce a typology of the *forms* or *formats* of advertising film.

To illustrate this point, I focus in the following on the exhibition site of cinema and draw on two studies, one published in the USA in 1916, the other in Europe in 1949. The first provides an insight into moving-picture advertising's struggle for a place in commercial cinema, the second a reference for its successful institutionalisation.

Journalist and self-proclaimed expert in motion pictures Ernest A. Dench's 1916 *Advertising by Motion Picture* is a handbook for advertisers published in a transitional period of cinema history, when the era of the nickelodeons was on the verge of declining and movie theatres, specifically built for the purpose of screening moving images, were becoming the predominant site of film exhibition, offering longer and better programmes and more comfortable surroundings. The institutionalisation of cinema was on its way, with the star system being introduced and the feature film slowly becoming the standard format of fictional entertainment. Yet, as Dench perceived it, in 1916 'the motion picture has not reached maturity'¹⁷ and advertising film in particular 'is practically only in its infancy today'¹⁸ and therefore still negotiating for a place in cinema. Slide advertising seems to have been institutionalised as an advertising practice by then, given the regular projection of a series of twelve slides at most in the intermission and standard rentals varying from \$5 to \$10 per month, according to size and location of the theatre.¹⁹ The exhibition of motion-picture advertising, however, was not standardised. Dench deplores this situation: 'What is sapping the progress of film advertising is that no systematic method of circularizing exists, for, naturally, this end of the process is as important as the picture itself.'²⁰

Piecing together Dench's scattered remarks on advertising film exhibition in commercial cinemas in the first half of the 1910s, the following picture emerges: if advertising films were screened, they were part of the regular cinema programme and

placed at the end of it as an extra reel. Most programmes changed daily and had an average length of two hours. Advertising films were a supplement to the regular programme for which the advertiser paid a fee to the exhibitor. Rentals varied from \$12.50 to \$50 per week – a considerable range compared to the average costs of a one-reel industrial film that amounted to \$500 for the negative and to \$100 for each print. Only one advertising film was screened per programme, and the standard length was one reel – that is, eleven to eighteen minutes, depending on projection speed. One reel was still the standard film length in cinema exhibition at that time (although films with two and more reels were becoming more customary). We also learn from Dench that the most common type of advertising film was the 'industrialog, portraying the process by which certain goods are manufactured',²¹ or what cinema studies call fabrication film or process film today to designate a highly standardised genre within the category of the industrial film that typically demonstrates the trajectory from raw material to product and consumption step by step.²² This instance underlines that advertising films in the broad sense must be included in the study of moving-image advertising in order to capture the full range of advertising forms and practices.

Dench's manual attests to a variety of experimental practices to bring advertising films into cinemas, among them, for example, a weekly newsreel produced by a company that in the first half comprised topical events while the remaining portion was a booster for the firm's goods and was offered to exhibitors for free.²³ In the struggle for an institutionalised place in commercial movie theatres, Dench suggests that advertising motion pictures imitate established film genres and insert advertising points into comedies, dramas, serials and newsreels, thus combining advertising with entertainment and instruction. Dench also advocates that movie stars be coaxed to feature in advertising films. The strategy was to blend advertising films into the regular cinema programme. Hence the films adapted to movie-theatre pictures in length (one reel), in style (documentary, comedy, drama, newsreel) and in marketing (star system). As advertising film had not (yet) carved out its own separate place in cinema, we can conclude it had not (yet) found its own separate formula, the commercial.

INSTITUTIONALISED COMMERCIALS IN 1940S CINEMA IN WESTERN EUROPE

The second example to illustrate the formative and formatting power of space in the cinema exhibition practice of advertising films is situated in Western Europe in the late 1940s and paints a different picture. In a manual for advertisers titled *Die Grundlagen der Filmwerbung* (Fundamentals of Advertising Film), published by the Swiss Advertising Association in 1949, there is a table that draws a transnational comparison between the theatrical exhibition of commercials in seven European countries or regions, namely Switzerland, Belgium, England, France, Holland, Italy and Scandinavia.

Country	Length of films (in metres)	Number of advertising films per running week	Placement in the programme	Method of cost calculation
<i>Switzerland</i>	Up to 120m	1	Programme of shorts	Price per film Consistent price for all cinemas in a list
<i>Belgium</i>	10–70m	3–6 in total 150m	Intermission	Price per metre according to cinema category
<i>England</i>	65–70m	1	Programme of shorts	Price per metre according to cinema category
<i>France</i>	10–70m	3–6 in total 150m	Intermission	Price per metre according to cinema category
<i>Holland</i>	50–120m	1	Programme of shorts	Price per metre individual per cinema
<i>Italy</i>	30–100m	1–3 in total 120m	Partly intermission, partly programme of shorts	Average price per film according to selection of cinema
<i>Scandinavia</i>	35–70m	1–4 in total 140m	Intermission	Price per metre individual per cinema

The table considers four features for comparison: the length of the films, the number of commercials screened per week, the place of the commercials in the programme and the method of cost calculation. The comparison in film length shows a range between 10 metres and 120 metres per commercial, equalling a running time between twenty-two seconds and four minutes and twenty-four seconds (at a projection speed of twenty-four frames per second). The average length is 70 metres (two minutes and thirty-five seconds). Commercials are longest in Switzerland and Holland, and shortest in France and Belgium. From this information a contemporary advertiser with transnational marketing ambitions would have taken the advice to commission a commercial of 70 metres in length in order to have the largest possible theatrical distribution options. The number of commercials screened per theatrical week ranges from one in Switzerland, England and Holland to up to six in Belgium and France. We can deduce from the table that the total length of the commercial

programmes is between 120 and 150 metres (four minutes and twenty-four seconds to five minutes and thirty seconds). The third column locates commercials in the cinema programme and assigns them two possible slots: either in the programme of shorts that precedes the screening of the feature film or in the intermission. Commenting on this situation the manual notes that ‘a completely satisfying placement of the film in the programme’ only exists in Switzerland, England, Holland and, to some extent, in Italy;²⁵ that is, in those countries that grant commercials a place *within* the movie programme. Being part of the cinema programme meant that commercials were screened in the dark and addressed a seated audience that (eventually) was in an attentive and receptive mode. Or, as Dench puts it in his study, ‘you obtain a hundred per cent attention, for folks, in the darkened hall, must concentrate upon the screen’.²⁶ The last column lists cost calculation for cinema exhibition (either per metre or per film and whether depending or not on the movie theatre category), reminding us that, in the case of cinema commercials, advertising space is paid-for space.

The table is instructive in many ways and inspiring for further research. First of all, it tells us that there *was* a place in cinema for commercials in Western Europe; that there *was* a programme section assigned to films that use explicit rhetoric to advertise brands and products. With Dench’s study at the back of the mind one can conclude that, at some point in time, both the commercial as a separate type of film and its separate place in cinema had been institutionalised (in Western Europe at least), although the details of this process are largely obscure and await further study. This institutionalisation is no matter of course, not even in the capitalist stronghold of the USA, where, despite the occasional inclusion of advertising films in the early days of cinema programmes, commercials had no lasting place in regular movie theatres. Commercials came and went from American screens from 1894, as Kerry Segrave’s study on product placement in Hollywood films illustrates,²⁷ but did not gain acceptance on American screens until the mid-1970s.²⁸ After the institutionalisation of cinema, moviegoers in the USA came to expect, as Douglas Gomery writes, one feature, a couple of shorts, a newsreel and possibly a stage show, but no commercials. Commercials continued to be largely absent from movie screens in the USA when, in the early 1930s, the double feature was introduced as a programme formula that would function as the standard in movie exhibition through the 1940s.²⁹

Regarding the formative and formatting power of space, the table shows that the granted place in the programme regulates the length of the commercials.³⁰ This, in turn, affects narrative; it affects what stories commercials tell and how they tell them. To advertise a product in twenty-two seconds or in four and a half minutes makes a difference in scope and pace, in rhetoric and audience address. Swiss commercials from that period, for example, are epic, often veritable mini-features starring vernacular stage and film stars in short comedies, detective stories and melodramas (thus pretty much following the formula that Dench suggests). Whether screened as a stand-alone item in the commercial programme or together with up to five other spots competing for audience attention also affects form and rhetoric. The same applies for a screening slot in the dark with a seated audience compared to during the intermission when the lights are on and audience attention is distracted from the screen.

The space of cinema produces a public arena that attracts, involves and interacts with audiences of particular social formations in terms of gender, age, race, ethnicity

and religion. From an advertising perspective, these are target audiences and, as such, they also affect the commercials: they affect both *what* is advertised and *how* it is advertised. From this point of view, the table reflects on how commercials are co-produced by their position in cinema and how commercials, in turn, also co-produce the experiential space of cinema in interaction with audiences, thus pointing to the complex, heterogeneous interrelationships that produce space.

RECONSIDERING PROGRAMME AND SPECTATORSHIP IN CINEMA HISTORY

Furthermore, and probably most importantly, the table calls attention to the question of the programme and to advertising film as a programme category. In explicating this point, I refer to the typical cinema exhibition practice in Switzerland that, from the 1930s to the early 1970s, remained rather constant and was, at least in the German-speaking part of the country, modelled after cinema exhibition in Germany. During this period commercials were but one of three distinct categories of advertising film (both in the narrow and broad sense) in regular cinema programmes. The second category consisted of trailers³¹ and the third category comprised so-called *Kulturfilme*, cultural films that explore foreign and local cultures, customs, landscapes, art, science, architecture, industry and manufacturing. One such short, predominantly nonfiction film of an average length between ten and twenty minutes, would be screened before the main feature. The *Kulturfilm* category calls to mind the one-reel process film in early cinema advertising practice that Dench mentions. Cultural films were screened for free, but to qualify for the *Kulturfilm* category they had to comply with certain conditions: the films had to renounce explicit advertising and the disclosure of sponsors (this stipulation has resulted in the sponsorship of cultural films being often overlooked). Instead, they resorted to discreet and indirect ways of promoting modernisation, consumerism, gender roles, bourgeois culture and citizenship. This illustrates the normative and formative power of space. With this third category, cinema offered a place for advertising in disguise of bourgeois civic education, which, in turn, also advertised bourgeois values and culture. The *Kulturfilm* was institutionalised in German cinemas in 1926 (when tax breaks motivated cinema owners to screen cultural films) and adopted in Austria and Switzerland (and other European countries at certain points in time) to domesticate the institution of cinema by counterbalancing entertainment with education in the above-mentioned sense.³² All three categories of advertising film, together with the newsreels (which, contrary to Dench's hopes, remained free of commercials, but, of course, could also have indirect advertising aspects),³³ were part of the so-called *Beiprogramm* – that is, the programme of shorts that preceded the screening of the main attraction, the feature film – which, for its part, may or may not have included product placement. In interaction and exchange with other advertising media and practices present in the space of cinema, such as cinema billboards, advertising slides and giveaways, advertising film in its multiple shapes co-produced cinema as a hybrid multimedia advertising space.

A topological enquiry of advertising film shifts the focus from the single space in cinema that has been researched in depth so far – that of the feature narrative – to the largely under-researched field of the programme of shorts and, in so doing, calls for a

reconsideration of the programme formula of cinema. As I have argued elsewhere,³⁴ research into historical programming has predominantly been concerned with early cinema,³⁵ with avant-garde and experimental film³⁶ and with television.³⁷ With the industry-wide institutionalisation of the full-length feature film in the mid-1910s, scholarly interest in theatrical programming has largely come to an end. Even though scholarship on exhibition and presentation in commercial cinema has increased and research into cinemagoing and movie memories proliferates,³⁸ these studies predominantly focus on cinema's main attraction: the movies – that is, mainstream feature films and their importance in daily life as social practice and object of remembrance. Nico de Klerk's essay on nonfiction films in commercial cinema theatres in the Netherlands in the 1930s is a rare exception in that it considers the programme of shorts in more detail.³⁹ De Klerk mentions musical shorts and singalongs to have been regular components in the programme of shorts in Dutch cinemas (some of them might also have had an advertising aspect), whereas in Switzerland, at least to my knowledge, they did not have a standard place in commercial movie theatres – an example that points to the need for comparative transnational research (see below). Research into advertising film and the programme of shorts highlights that cinemagoing was (and still is) more than watching movies: it included the experience of a variegated programme of shorts, plus a feature or two. Thus, advertising films teach us *not* to reduce cinema to a space for feature-length movies and suggest instead that we reconsider cinema in the light of programme variety.

Concurrently, advertising films call film consumption and spectatorship into question. Studies on film reception and spectatorship in 'classical' cinema centre on the reception of narrative feature film and foreground diegetic absorption, 'attendance'⁴⁰ and 'individual spectatorship'⁴¹ in distinction to the early cinema mode of collective audience. Spectatorship of the programme of shorts is neglected, and with it possible alternative forms of attraction, distraction and diversity. Even if such different forms of address and attractions predominantly acted as a foil to the feature to maximise their difference, as de Klerk argues, the following question may still be worth considering: what if early cinema's paradigm of attraction and pre-classical forms of direct audience address and collective spectatorship were *not* expelled from cinema by the introduction of feature narratives (to go underground in non-theatrical venues before resurfacing in the post-cinema area), but continued to exist – in modified forms – in the programme of shorts?⁴² The assumption that there were remnants of early cinema in the programme of shorts needs to be validated by further research, but I think it is safe to say that advertising films and commercials, in particular, do attest to the co-existence of different modes of audience address and spectatorship in movie theatres, to a heterogeneity of forms of film consumption and experience and, as a consequence, to a practice of mode switching in institutionalised cinema.

TRANSNATIONAL COMPARATIVE RESEARCH

To conclude this short transnational exploration of the space of advertising film in commercial cinema, let us return to the table and take up what is probably its most

compelling feature: its comparative approach. The table illustrates national differences as well as similarities between some European countries and regions and draws attention to the need for comparative transnational studies of the spaces of advertising film in cinema (where the programme of shorts could serve as comparative object of study), but also on television (where the introduction of commercials and their place in the programme flow of state-regulated public broadcasting and commercial television might be a reference for comparison). Here is not the place to further elaborate on such projects which, in terms of methodology, might profit from Andreas Fickers and Catherine Johnson's thoughts on a comparative approach to transnational television history.⁴³ Suffice it to say that the presentations at the second International Workshop on Advertising Film, held in Stockholm in 2012, revealed compelling national dissimilarities (as well as similarities) regarding the historical place of advertising film in cinema and on television within Europe, between Europe and the USA and between capitalist and non-capitalist countries; these findings call on future studies of advertising film to invest in transnational research.⁴⁴

EXPANDING THE FIELD

A mapping of the sites of advertising film expands beyond cinema and television into fields that for many years were blind spots in film history. Recent studies have started to chart this territory; they have mined the home movie and excavated amateur film practices,⁴⁵ they have explored film in the museum and the gallery⁴⁶ and they have traced distinct uses of moving images in schools, universities, science, business, surveillance and the military. Or, to formulate it with Gaudreault's notion of cultural series, they have started to retrace the place of moving images in the many cultural series and institutional practices other than cinema that have included moving pictures in their concerted use of various media. Thomas Elsaesser has hinted at a possible relation between new technologies and the increasing academic recognition of this field:

Even before the advent of digitization, it was obvious that the cinema also existed in what one might call an expanded field. ... What is new – and perhaps a consequence of the new digital media – is that we are now willing to grant these uses the status of parallel or parallax cinema histories.⁴⁷

Since the rise of digital technology and media, it has become customary to break down film history into the three successive periods of early cinema, cinema and post-cinema.⁴⁸ This periodisation suggests a linear history of one cinema evolving from the previous. But, as Gaudreault and others have argued, institutional cinema cannot be understood as having grown out of early cinema's diverse practices around the *kinematograph*. Likewise, post-cinema cannot sufficiently be explained by mere transformations of the institution of cinema. Scholars have pointed out the parallels between pre-classical and post-classical forms of spectatorship, between early modern and postmodern forms of distraction and diversity, between new media and old media.⁴⁹ Even if it is not their intent, these comparisons demonstrate that cinema

cannot provide historical explanations for the post-cinema condition in which – we sometimes have to remind ourselves – cinema still exists.

Instead, we have to look for answers elsewhere. The expanded field of 'useful cinema', 'non-theatrical film', or 'other cinemas' provides alternative grounds for media archaeology to excavate the spaces, networks and flows of moving images within institutional practices at the crossroads of other media and cultures; it presents alternative grounds in which moving images in alternative media constellations provided 'possible futures' for media practices to eventually resurface in the era of post-cinema. This is also to state that, since the early days of the *kinematograph*, moving images have never stopped being also part of other cultural series and media constellations, even after moving images found their 'own' and 'proper' space in the institution of cinema. The institutionalisation of cinema has not rendered these alternative practices extinct, but obscured them until cinema itself has become part of other media constellations as well.

It is within this framework that the topological study of advertising film can essentially contribute to a media archaeology of the digitally expanded places of moving images, to a media archaeology of the post-national 'space of flows'⁵⁰ and today's mediascape.⁵¹ It might be particularly interesting to retrace the place of advertising film within the institutional context of the advertiser, of corporations, business organisations, non-profit organisations and other commissioners. To take the example of the business world, one could focus on the place of advertising film within different industrial sectors⁵² or within a single corporation and centre on screen advertising as part of the corporate media mix (*Medienverbund* in German) to study moving images in relation to other media, thereby examining both the various levels of inter-, trans- and cross-media relations and exchanges and what Raymond Bellour calls 'the passages of the images'.⁵³ That is the exchange and collision between different media images (cinema, photography, video and the digital). Individual products or individual advertising campaigns, their spaces and trajectories over time or at a certain moment in time, could be the objects of such institutionally framed studies. Since screen advertising is not an exclusive business practice, but widespread among non-profit organisations ranging from health organisations and educational boards to political and social interest groups, there is a large variety of institutional spaces to put the research focus on.

A second point of departure from a topological perspective could be to undertake explorations into the place of advertising film within the cultural series of exposition. The multimedia spaces of expositions, fairs and trade shows are alternative *dispositifs* that lend themselves to a study of the role of moving-image advertising (in interrelation and exchange with other media) in experimenting with production and exhibition technology and in co-producing alternative experiential spaces and public spheres. Outdoor spaces with their transformation into mediascapes constitute yet another cultural series to explore moving images, intermediality and media convergence. Shibuya Crossing in Tokyo and Times Square in New York City would be emblematic places in the eastern and western world for this endeavour. Among many aspects, such an enquiry could reflect anew, in a different setting and timeline, on the transition of still image to moving image upon considering the transformation of billboard advertising to moving-picture advertising. And it might have us re-examine

to what extent the multiplication of screens in urban environments and public spaces is, in fact, a transformation of pre-existing billboards and screens to digital screens. Moreover, places like Shibuya Crossing and Times Square could also be studied as a mediascape of attraction in which media exposes itself and creates a self-reflective media space, a meta-mediascape, so to speak, in which advertising film itself is on display.

ADVERTISING FILM AS PERFORMANCE

The last section of this chapter responds to the question of ‘When is advertising film?’ rather than to the question of ‘Where is advertising film?’, even though the approach is still topological.⁵⁴ Issues of time and temporality surface when setting out the pragmatic essence of moving-image advertising: its persuasive rhetoric, or, if you will, the ‘advertising’ part in moving-image advertising. In the case of commercials, the answer is simple: the ‘advertising’ is in the film; persuasive rhetoric is part of the cinematic text. However, persuasive rhetoric is not necessarily a textual feature; it can also be a contextual factor. The institutional framing of a film screening, the embedding of moving images in a marketing event, and its accompaniment by performative activities such as lectures, can provide external advertising rhetoric and turn the screened film into an advertising film. In these moments, the exhibition of an advertising film has the character of a performance. This particular *dispositif* evokes early cinema again, when live music, sound effects and lectures would add meaning to and complete the projected film. The instance calls attention to the highly ephemeral character of advertising-film exhibition as a live event and a performance, and to the particular experiential space that it creates. A map of advertising film will also have to hold on to and register those ephemeral moments when moving-picture advertising is a performance, which is only possible when focusing on the very moment of exhibition.

In lieu of a conclusion, I return to cinema’s contested future in the digital era. One of the goals of topological research into advertising film would be to contribute to illuminating a topography that is composed of the various cultural series that moving images were and are part of. In such a landscape, cinema would appear only as one among many other cultural series. To de-centre the place of cinema this way could be a conceptual tool that averts us from looking at moving images beyond cinema merely from the vantage point of cinema and from perceiving it as *other* than cinema. In expanding André Gaudreault’s methodological claims for the study of early *kinematography* into later periods,⁵⁵ I argue that it would be preferable to look at moving images not only *before* cinema, but also *beyond* cinema (and, if you will, *post-cinema*) from the perspective of the other media and cultural spaces that moving images are part of. However, linking cinema to other cultural series and media constellations and studying it as one node in a ramified network of moving-image practices is to integrate cinema into the larger picture of moving-image culture. Even if such cartography does not challenge cinema’s historical status as the primary site of feature-film exhibition and consumption, it still shifts perspectives given the scale and scope of moving images that circulated for other than entertainment purposes.

Advertising film is one case in point. This is not to derogate the space of cinema, but to advocate for the place of the moving image in the twentieth and early twenty-first century and for studies that invest in exploring its place.

NOTES

1. See, for example, in the context of Switzerland, the issues on advertising film published for *Schweizer Reklame und Graphische Mitteilungen* (1937) and *Die Grundlagen der Filmwerbung* (1947).
2. Michael Schudson, *Advertising, the Uneasy Persuasion: Its Dubious Impact on American Society* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).
3. Ji-Hoon Kim, ‘The Post-Medium Condition and the Explosion of Cinema’, *Screen* vol. 50 no. 1 (Spring 2009), pp. 114–23; Francesco Casetti, ‘Die Explosion des Kinos: Filmische Erfahrung in der post-kinemaotgraphischen Epoche’, *Montage AV* vol. 19 no.1 (2010), pp. 11–35.
4. William Boddy, ‘“Is It TV Yet?” The Dislocated Screens of Television in a Mobile Digital Culture’, in James Bennett and Niki Strange (eds), *Television as Digital Culture* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), pp. 76–101.
5. Knut Hieckethier, ‘Genretheorie und Genreanalyse’, in Jürgen Felix (ed.), *Moderne Film Theorie*, 2nd edition (Mainz: Bender, 2003), pp. 62–96.
6. Charles R. Acland and Haidee Wasson (eds), *Useful Cinema* (Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press, 2011). The term ‘useful cinema’ is one of several designations for this emerging research field. ‘Non-theatrical’ is another term that is widely used. It refers to the production, circulation and exhibition of all sorts of moving images beyond commercial cinema circuits. See also Anthony Slide, *Before Video: A History of the Non-Theatrical Film* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1992) and Dan Streible, ‘Introduction: Nontheatrical Film’, *Film History* vol. 19 no. 4 (2007), pp. 339–43. Equally inclusive is the term ‘other cinemas’ in its embracing all films outside the mainstream of commercial cinema such as amateur, educational, industrial and other sponsored films (see 22nd International Screen Studies Conference 2012 dedicated to *other cinemas*). Other terms are more specific: Barbara Klinger’s ‘extra-theatrical’ cinema describes cinematic experience beyond the multiplex (Barbara Klinger, *Beyond the Multiplex: Cinema, New Technology, and the Home* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006]). The term ‘expanded cinema’ emerged in the experimental film movement in the 1960s and refers to moving images within the art scene (see Gene Youngblood, *Expanded Cinema* [New York: E. P. Dutton, 1970]). Similar to that is Raymond Bellour’s use of ‘*autre cinéma*’ to describe media installations in the gallery (Raymond Bellour, ‘D’un autre cinéma’, *Traffic* no. 34 [2000], pp. 5–21).
7. See Yvonne Zimmermann (ed.), *Schaufenster Schweiz: Dokumentarische Gebrauchsfilme 1896–1964* (Zurich: Limmat, 2011).
8. On virality as a theory of contagious assemblages, sociological events and affects in network cultures see Tony D. Sampson, *Virality: Contagion Theory in the Age of Networks* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012).
9. See, among others, Philip Rosen, *Change Mummified: Cinema, Historicity, Theory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001); Tom Gunning, ‘Before Documentary: Early Nonfiction Films and the “View Aesthetic”’, in Daan Hertogs and Nico de Klerk (eds),

- Uncharted Territory: Essays on Early Nonfiction Film* (Amsterdam: Stichting Netherlands Filmmuseum, 1997), pp. 9–24; Mary Ann Doane, 'The Indexical and the Concept of Medium Specificity', *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* vol. 18 no. 1 (2007), pp. 128–52; David Norman Rodowick, *The Virtual Life of Film* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).
10. Francesco Casetti, 'Filmic Experience', *Screen* vol. 50 no. 1 (2009), p. 62.
 11. André Gaudreault and Philippe Marion, *The Kinematic Turn: Film in the Digital Era and its Ten Problems*, trans. Timothy Barnard (Montreal: Caboose, 2012), p. 32.
 12. André Gaudreault, *Film and Attraction: From Kinematography to Cinema*, trans. Timothy Barnard (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2011 [2008]).
 13. See the numerous essays that retrace cinema and filmic experience in today's multimedia environment (Casetti, 'Filmic Experience'; Casetti, 'Die Explosion des Kinos'; Casetti, 'Rückkehr in die Heimat: Das Kino in einer post-kinematografischen Epoche', in Irmbert Schenk, Margrit Tröhler and Yvonne Zimmermann [eds], *Film – Kino – Zuschauer: Filmrezeption/Film – Cinema – Spectator: Film Reception* [Marburg: Schüren, 2010], pp. 41–60; Malte Hagener, 'Where Is Cinema [Today]? The Cinema in the Age of Media Immanence', *Cinema & Cie* no. 11 [Autumn 2008], pp. 15–22; Francesco Casetti and Sara Sampiero, 'With Eyes, With Hands: The Relocation of Cinema Into the iPhone', in Pelle Snickars and Patrick Vonderau [eds], *Moving Data: The iPhone and the Future of Media* [New York: Columbia University Press, 2012], pp. 13–32; Alexandra Schneider, 'Kann alles ausser Popcorn, oder Wann und wo ist Kino?', in Philipp Brunner, Jörg Schweinitz, and Margrit Tröhler [eds], *Filmische Atmosphären* [Marburg: Schüren, 2012], pp. 91–106).
 14. Barney Warf and Santa Arias (eds), *Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (Florence: Routledge, 2008).
 15. Vinzenz Hediger, Oliver Fahle and Gudrun Sommer, 'Einleitung: Filmisches Wissen, die Frage des Ortes und das Pensum der Bildung', in Gudrun Sommer, Vinzenz Hediger and Oliver Fahle (eds), *Orte filmischen Wissens: Filmkultur und Filmvermittlung im Zeitalter digitaler Netzwerke* (Marburg: Schüren, 2011), p. 9.
 16. Warf and Arias, *Spatial Turn*, p. 18 [emphasis in the original].
 17. Ernest A. Dench, *Advertising by Motion Pictures* (Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1916), p. 203.
 18. *Ibid.*, p. 156.
 19. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
 20. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
 21. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
 22. See Gunning, 'Before Documentary', pp. 17–18; Zimmermann, *Schaufenster Schweiz*, pp. 266–85.
 23. Dench, *Advertising by Motion Pictures*, pp. 62–3.
 24. Chart reproduced from Schweizerischer Reklame Verband (ed.), *Die Grundlagen der Filmwerbung: Eine Wegleitung für Auftraggeber* (Zurich [1949]), p. 20 (translated by the author).
 25. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
 26. Dench, *Advertising by Motion Pictures*, p. 198.
 27. Kerry Segrave, *Product Placement in Hollywood Films: A History* (Jefferson, NC, and London: McFarland, 2004).
 28. Deron Overpeck, 'Subversion, Desperation and Captivity: Pre-film Advertising in American Film Exhibition Since 1977', *Film History* vol. 22 no. 2 (June 2010), pp. 219–34.
 29. Douglas Gomery, *Shared Pleasures: A History of Movie Presentation in the United States* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), pp. 77–8.
 30. Cinema space and television space were also formative for the use of colour. Colour film became standard for cinema commercials in the early 1940s, whereas television commercials were black and white until the introduction of colour television broadcasting in the 1970s.
 31. On American movie trailers, see Vinzenz Hediger, *Verführung zum Film: Der amerikanische Kinotrailer seit 1912* (Marburg: Schüren, 2001); Lisa Kernan, *Coming Attractions: Reading American Movie Trailers* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004); Keith M. Johnston, *Coming Soon: Film Trailers and the Selling of Hollywood Technology* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2009).
 32. See Klaus Kreimeier, Antje Ehmann and Jeanpaul Goergen (eds), *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 2: Weimarer Republik 1918–1933 (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005); Peter Zimmermann and Kay Hofmann (eds), *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 3: 'Drittes Reich' 1933–1945 (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005); Ramón Reichert (ed.), *Kulturfilm im 'Dritten Reich'* (Vienna: Synema, 2006); Zimmermann, *Schaufenster Schweiz*.
 33. Unlike advertising films, newsreels were commodities. The production of newsreels was a business whose return on investment came from cinema exhibition. In other words, cinema owners paid for newsreels to be part of the programme.
 34. Yvonne Zimmermann, 'Nestlé's Fip-Fop Club: The Making of Child Audiences in Non-Commercial Film Shows (1936–1959) in Switzerland', in Schenk *et al.*, *Film – Kino – Zuschauer*, pp. 281–303.
 35. Frank Kessler, Sabine Lenk and Martin Loiperdinger (eds), *KINtop: Jahrbuch zur Erforschung des frühen Films* no. 11: Kinematographen-Programme (Frankfurt Main, Basel: Stroemfeld/Roter Stern, 2002); Thomas Elsaesser, *Filmgeschichte und frühes Kino: Archäologie eines Medienwandels* (Munich: Edition Text und Kritik, 2002); Ivo Bloom, *Jean Desmet and the Early Dutch Film Trade* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2003); Andrea Haller, 'Das Kinoprogramm: Zur Genese und frühen Praxis einer Aufführungsform', in Heike Klippel (ed.), *'The Art of Programming': Film, Programm und Kontext* (Münster: Lit, 2008), pp. 18–51.
 36. Malte Hagener, 'Programming Attractions: Avant-garde Exhibition Practice in the 1920s and 1930s', in Wanda Strauven (ed.), *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), pp. 265–79; Ansje van Beusekom, "'Avant-guerre" and the International Avant-Garde: Circulation and Programming of Early Films in the European Avant-garde Programs in the 1920s and 1930s', in Frank Kessler and Nana Verhoeff (eds), *Networks of Entertainment: Early Film Distribution 1895–1915* (Eastleigh: John Libbey, 2007), pp. 285–94.
 37. Raymond Williams, *Television: Technology and Cultural Form* (Glasgow: Fontana, 1974); Toby Miller (ed.), *Television Studies* (London: BFI, 2002); Robert C. Allen and Annette Hill (eds), *The Television Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2004); Jonathan Bignell, *An Introduction to Television Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2004).
 38. Melvyn Stokes and Richard Maltby (eds), *Hollywood Spectatorship: Changing Perception of Cinema Audiences* (London: BFI, 2001); Annette Kuhn, *An Everyday Magic: Cinema and Cultural Memory* (London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2002); Gregory A. Waller (ed.), *Moviegoing*

- in America: A Sourcebook in the History of Film Exhibition (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002); Jon Lewis and Eric Smoodin (eds), *Looking Past the Screen: Case Studies in American Film History and Method* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); Richard Maltby, Melvyn Stokes and Robert C. Allen (eds), *Going to the Movies: Hollywood and the Social Experience of the Cinema* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2007); Richard Maltby, Daniel Biltereyst and Philippe Meers (eds), *Explorations in New Cinema History: Approaches and Case Studies* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011); Daniel Biltereyst, Richard Maltby and Philippe Meers (eds), *Cinema, Audiences and Modernity: New Perspectives on European Cinema History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2012).
39. Nico de Klerk, 'The Moment of Screening: What Nonfiction Films Can Do', in Peter Zimmermann and Kay Hoffmann (eds), *Triumph der Bilder: Kultur- und Dokumentarfilme vor 1945 im internationalen Vergleich* (Konstanz: UVK, 2003), pp. 291–305.
 40. Janet Staiger, *Perverse Spectatorship: The Practices of Film Reception* (New York: New York University Press, 2000), pp. 11–27.
 41. Thomas Elsaesser, 'Wie der frühe Film zum Erzählkino wurde: Vom kollektiven Publikum zum individuellen Zuschauer', in Irmbert Schenk (ed.), *Erlebnisort Kino* (Marburg: Schüren, 2000), pp. 34–54.
 42. Miriam Hansen has called attention to the persistence of early cinema exhibition practices through and even beyond the nickelodeon period, claiming that these practices provided the condition for an alternative public sphere (Miriam Hansen, *Babel and Babylon: Spectatorship in American Silent Film* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991]). A salient example for such an alternative public sphere building on early cinema modes in the context of advertising and marketing is Nestlé's Fip-Fop Club, a film club for children that was immensely popular in the 1930s through the 1950s (see Zimmermann, 'Nestlé's Fip-Fop Club').
 43. Andreas Fickers and Catherine Johnson, 'Transnational Television History: A Comparative Approach', *Media History* vol. 16 no. 1 (2010), pp. 1–11.
 44. I do not advocate for an Anglo-Euro-American approach in particular, but summarise the conference outcomes. It is understood that the objective must be a topology of advertising film that spans the globe and allows for worldwide transnational comparison as well as for research into the transnational flows of advertising film in digital media channels and social networks.
 45. Patricia R. Zimmermann, *Reel Families: A Social History of Amateur Film* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); Alexandra Schneider, *Die Stars sind wir: Heimkino als filmische Praxis* (Marburg: Schüren, 2004); Karen L. Ishizuka and Patricia R. Zimmermann (eds), *Mining the Home Movie: Excavations in Histories and Memories* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).
 46. Haidee Wasson, *Museum Movies: The Museum of Modern Art and the Birth of Art Cinema* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).
 47. Thomas Elsaesser, 'Early Film History and Multi-Media: An Archaeology of Possible Futures?', in Wendy Hui Kyon Chun and Thomas Keenan (eds), *New Media, Old Media: A History and Theory Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2005), p. 20.
 48. On the notion of 'post-cinema', see Casetti, 'Rückkehr in die Heimat'.
 49. Miriam Hansen, 'Early Cinema, Late Cinema: Permutations of the Public Sphere', *Screen* vol. 34 no. 3 (1993), pp. 197–210; Elsaesser, 'Early Film History and Multi-Media'; Hui Kyon Chun and Keenan, *New Media, Old Media*; Gaudreault and Marion, *The Kinematic Turn*.
 50. Manuel Castells, *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring, and the Urban Regional Process* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989).
 51. Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996).
 52. The objects, screens and practices of advertising film depend heavily on 'what' is to be sold to 'whom' and, as a consequence, differ most notably from sector to sector: the place of advertising film in the consumer goods industry, for example, is different from the one in the chemical industry (Yvonne Zimmermann, 'Target Group Oriented Corporate Communication: Geigy Films', in Museum für Gestaltung Zurich [ed.], *Corporate Diversity: Swiss Graphic Design and Advertising by Geigy 1940–1970* [Baden: Lars Müller, 2009], pp. 48–57).
 53. Raymond Bellour, 'The Double Helix', in Timothy Druckrey (ed.), *Electronic Culture: Technology and Visual Representation* (New York: Aperture, 1996), pp. 173–99.
 54. Thomas Elsaesser has brought up the question of 'when is' in regard to Dada films (Thomas Elsaesser, 'Dada/Cinema?', in Rudolf E. Kuenzli (ed.), *Dada and Surrealist Film* [New York: Willis Locker & Owens, 1987], pp. 13–27) and renewed it in regard to cinema in the age of post-cinema ('Early Film History and Multi-Media').
 55. Gaudreault, *Film and Attraction*, p. 63.