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communication between the islanders, and between the islanders and government agencies. The future of the audio-visual revolution, for him, lay in the small screens, the do-it-yourself technologies of video and community-based television that, for a brief time (and arguably to this day), enabled greater citizen participation and democratic expression. This is the model of decentralized communication that defines today’s alternative media networks. While the synesthetic multi-screen cinema did not grow into the new revolutionary medium many thought it would, one can see in the expanded-screen experiments at Expo a foreshadowing of the intermedia networks, the mobility of images, the cultures of the Internet, and the concomitant multiplication of screens in everyday life around the world.
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(3) enrichment of image by juxtaposition of several elements of the same event or location;
(4) possibility of a kind of visual metaphor or simile; and
(5) representation of two or more events converging and merging into a single event or a single event fragmented into several images.

The principle aesthetic quality of the multi-screen cinema was simultaneity. It is this ‘single quality’ which calls up memory (sometimes ‘long-forgotten’) and imagination to make sense of the stimuli. Multi-screen, according to Roman Kroitor, ‘is to single-screen what the language of poetry is to the language of prose.’50 As McLuhan, who was no doubt referring to Labyrinth, noted: ‘Multi-screen projection tends to end the story-line, as the symbolist poem ends narrative in verse. That is, multiple screens in creating a simultaneous syntax eliminates the literary medium from film.’51 Multi-screen cinema as a synesthetic medium was understood by the Labyrinth producers as a new language capable of accessing the unconscious mind and releasing new kinds of associations deeply buried in the human psyche. A multi-channel soundtrack helped to create focal points in relation to the ‘total image.’ Indeed the multi-image was conceived as sound, that is, as boundless, simultaneous, multi-directional. Sound liberates the image from the constraints of the single screen as ‘images are merged in the same way it is possible to merge sounds.’52

The image in the multi-screen cinema is liberated not only from the screen but also from the constraints of traditional forms of drama, story, and plot. For Youngblood, this represents the natural evolution of the cinema. Synesthetic cinema transends the old languages just as television transforms the earth into software. It is the reflexivity of television that brings everything, including the act of viewing, into view as a world of simultaneous becoming.53

The Labyrinth theatre had all the spatial attributes of the mega-city as Reyner Banham described Expo, replete with ‘mechanical movement, a multiplicity of levels, emphasis on fun or ludeique experiences, people in complex environments, and information saturation.’54 Traffic flow was strictly controlled by a master programmer who oversaw the flow in a time sequence organized ‘like a sausage machine.’55 One may wonder how the Labyrinth theatre functioned as a space of drift aimed at exercising areas of the brain generally not used if the movement was so orchestrated. Yet it was the space between the images of the theatre, the arrangement of the screens and mirrors, their multiplicity, and the extensive range of documentary information that created an open space for audience participation. It is here that the senses were invited to wander across possible paths, which required an act of both memory and imagination. This is precisely where the synesthetic cinema and the act of flânerie come together in the future city as Youngblood explained it:

We have learned that synesthetic cinema is an alloy achieved through multiple superimpositions that produce syncretism. Syncretism is a total field of harmonic opposites in continual metamorphosis: this metamorphosis produces a sense of kinesthesia that evokes in the inarticulate consciousness of the viewer recognition of an overall pattern event that is in the film itself as well as the subject of the experience... A mythopoetic reality is generated through post stylization of unstylized reality.56

The design for Labyrinth did not simply include multiple screens but, rather, a fluid space for viewing as a transformative ‘artistic’ activity. Low spent much time designing the mezzanine area, which included several dramatic displays of labyrinths throughout time. The material space of viewing and the very act of viewing are very much part of the films. This is the temporal dynamic that is included in Labyrinth as a theatrical performance of expanded screens and intermediality – the merging of screen and architecture. The pavilion was designed so that audience members would exit with a view of the St Lawrence River. In keeping with the humanist spirit of Labyrinth, the final view also included Safdie’s utopian vision of community living, Habitat.

The Labyrinth Project can be read as the sensory training ground for the new global citizen, where simultaneous information inputs create a world of confusion that numbs the senses yet also takes in a new ‘oceanic consciousness.’57 This represents the world in all its plurality, which in NFB style, in the Canadian Liberal government’s style, was read as the mythological cultural mosaic of humankind that was the basis for Pierre Trudeau’s new plan for Canadian federalism.

Colin Low did not continue to work on the project with Roman Kroitor, who was able to develop it into a new technology called IMAX. He left the project just as it was being redeveloped as a commercial technology. Instead, he went to work on the anti-poverty program at the NFB called Challenge for Change. A citizen’s action media experiment that began on the Fogo Islands in Newfoundland, this community-based project used 16 mm, Super 8, and video to foster inter-community
and transmitted a multiplicity of different flashing lights that were triggered by an experimental soundtrack combining electronic and animal sounds. The installation was meant to enhance the sense of disorientation, to break down boundaries between identities, human and non-human, creating an endless, acoustic, decentralised space. When the light caught a person in the mirror, the image was dissipated across an infinity of spaces. Once the audience had walked down the intimate corridor, they entered the final phase of their journey.

Chamber 3: Death/Metamorphosis (35 mm x 5)

The last chamber resembled a standard theatre with seats. An arrangement of five screens in cruciform shape, meant to reference the tree of life, created a visual climax. Both films produced for Chambers 1 and 3 were close to twenty minutes in length and contained images shot in half a dozen countries including Cambodia, Japan, Ethiopia, Greece, and Russia. The films included all ages and genders and focused on cultural rituals and everyday gestures in these different countries: a crocodile hunt in southern Ethiopia, baptism in Greece, childbirth in Montreal, a ballet lesson in Russia, a traffic officer, train commuters, Montreal streets during a snowstorm, landscapes. The soundtrack for both films included snippets of voice-over, recorded location sound, and a music score composed by NFB staff composer Eldon Rathburn. Tom Daly devised a special system of vertical editing for both films which juxtaposed lengthy, unedited sequences so as not to 'oversaturate' viewers with too much information.48

Scenes were sometimes continuous over the screens; in Chamber 1, for example, a boxer falls to the ground from one screen onto another, or a child feeds a goldfish which swims on a lower screen. Actions were also fragmented and repeated across the multiple screens. Colin Low breaks down the new compositional possibilities offered by the technology whose 'ultimate image' would no doubt be 'electronically, with stereoscopic images, perhaps a development of holograms':

(1) flexibility in alteration of image composition;
(2) simultaneous representation of events:
   (a) different events occurring at different times or in different locations,
   (b) different time segments of the same event, and
   (c) the same event seen from different positions and points of view;
They [spectators] will be distributed in groups through the three chambers, and at one stage will be surrounded by reflected images on all sides. At another point, they will gaze down from ramps on a huge screen 40 feet below and be subjected to sensations so strong that some will want to grab the handrail. Film for Labyrinth has been specially shot by cameramen in many countries. There are no name stars to this movie – the main character is Man! In the second chamber, visitors move along walkways set between mirrored glass prisms. In the final chamber, the audience faces a multi-screen battery of unparalleled scope – using five screens, so that areas of the mind are exercised that almost certainly have not been exercised before.42

The guide reinforced the sense that this cinema experience would irrevocably transform viewers – it promised a visceral and unforgettable experience. Labyrinth proved to be one of the most popular highlights of Expo 67 with audiences waiting in line for up to seven hours to get into the forty-five minute screening.43

Chamber 1: Childhood, Confident Youth (70 mm × 2)

The theatre in the first chamber was designed in a horseshoe form with the screens organized in an L shape both vertically and horizontally (fig. 1.4). From eight balconies on four levels on either side, audience members could peer over to a screen that rose forty feet in height or down onto the floor at one long horizontal screen. Five sound systems and 288 smaller speakers throughout the theatre ensured that the sound reinforced a powerful illusion and increased the sensation of vertigo created by looking down on the images. In fact Chamber 1 was able to reproduce such powerful sensations of moving through space that NFB officials were worried that the film would induce anxiety, depression, or even suicide in spectators.44 No such thing happened, but this possibility of course increased the notoriety of the screen experiment.

Chamber 2: The Maze

'The Desert' or 'The Maze' was to be, Frye suggested, like 'the city on a hot summer day.'45 Wendy Michener described it as a kind of acid trip.46 Colin Low, who designed it, described it in the following way:

The maze was three prisms in an octagonal room full of mirrors on all the
over images. I will explore this point further on, but for now, suffice it to say that both Low and Kroitor believed that the synesthetic cinema they were designing for Expo was a new medium that could well revolutionize visual culture.

**Labyrinth**

(...)
The river is moving
The blackbird must be flying

It was evening all afternoon
It was snowing
And it was going to snow.
The blackbird sat
In the cedar-limbs.

Wallace Stevens, ‘Thirteen Ways of Looking at a Blackbird’

*Labyrinth* originated from Colin Low’s idea for an *in situ* film. As he describes: ‘The audience walks through a door into a darkened room and everything is subdued. Suddenly, the room lights go out and they are standing on a glass floor looking down 1,000 feet into the middle of Montreal.’ The first image for the screen experiment was an aerial view of the city in which the audience was suspended in space. The experiment did not quite work, but the entire structure grew out of this idea of space travel which they had already pioneered in several award-winning animation films: *City of Gold* (1957) and *Universe* (1960). As is mythological by now, the filmmaker Stanley Kubrick was deeply impressed by *Universe* and approached Low (who met him several times) to work on the space design for his film *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968). But Low was busy with The Labyrinth Project, which took five years to make.

Briefly, *Labyrinth* dealt with Man’s conquest of himself. The approach was framed by the Greek myth of Theseus and the Minotaur, which was a half-man and half-bull creature that lived inside the Labyrinth of Crete. Theseus’s quest was to find his way through the labyrinth and slay the Minotaur. Low and Kroitor used the story in consultation with Northrop Frye as a frame in which to design a narrative about individual self-realization, whereby the beast to be killed is the one that lives in all of us. The aim was to produce a ‘ritual’ or ‘artistic’ experience to create a ‘state of mind.’ Low and Kroitor’s production notes describe the methodology:

We are making a pictorial labyrinth of ‘life,’ as it now is on this planet. In a labyrinth, the point is to choose the path that leads to the goal, i.e., to avoid the false turns, the cul-de-sacs. In life, there is no way of knowing beforehand what these false turns may be before one gets into them. There is no royal road to wisdom. Only experience can teach that, if it ever does. The labyrinth we are making is therefore not with the point; ‘do this’ or ‘do that.’ The only ‘guide’ there can be in life is a state of mind...
The point of the labyrinth is the discovery that such a state of mind exists. In order that this discovery can take place (to whatever degree), a journey is undertaken, in ‘ritual’ form. By ritual form is meant that the participant partakes of certain experiences, but is not actually personally involved in them. (Perhaps the correct technical word is not ‘ritual’ but ‘artistic’).

Low had been particularly interested in the myth from Mary Renault’s book *The King Must Die*, which was a popularization of the story. The Labyrinth Project was working with a ‘common story’ or a ‘proto-story’ that is structured through different stages corresponding to different ‘states of being’ which the exhibition would induce. The myth itself is a narrative that appears in different religions and cultures, and the use of it in this project lends an experience of objectivity: ‘This is not a matter of personal opinion, it is part of current knowledge, mostly expressed either in academic writing or in veiled fashion in various religions, etc., neither area of which is really part of the present “world psyche.”

Northrop Frye was a crucial consultant for the project, and several of his essays appear alongside production notes. He also attended meetings at various stages of the project’s development. An excerpt from his newly published book *Fables of Identity: Studies in Poetic Mythology* (1963) that appears among Tom Daly’s production notes might shed some light on the suggestion that ‘artistic’ experience be the ultimate goal of *Labyrinth*. Looking to Wallace Stevens’s speculations on the imagination, Frye explains that art is ‘a unity of being and knowing, existence and consciousness, achieved out of the flow of time and the fixity of space.’ Stevens’s poetry, with its emphasis on multiplicity and facticity, is particularly apt for understanding synesthetic cinema. We can also comprehend the logic of how temporal flow and spatial fixity come together in the merging of architecture and cinema.
this as the fundamental shift in the popular imaginary towards understanding simultaneity as a space to be controlled. McLuhan would state in *War and Peace in the Global Village*: "As visual space is superseded, we discover that there is no continuity or connectedness let alone depth and perspective." This is where space becomes acoustic (space-time).

This idea of cinema as environment was intrinsic to The Labyrinth Project, and the influence of television on the Unit B directors is well known. The shift from theatrical to non-theatrical distribution of NFB films in the early fifties began an involvement with television that would influence how documentaries were being made. Essentially, when the Film Board began to make content for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), the Unit B in particular was involved in making short documentaries for television with *The Candid Eye* series. The films for *The Candid Eye* were akin to "found stories" (Kracauer), which had no beginning, middle, or end. The films were heavily influenced by the realist aesthetics of Cartier-Bresson in which everyday life reveals itself photographically and phenomenologically in a 'decisive moment.' This shift to television affected the way films were produced, exerting an increased demand on film production. Not only was there a growing need for more films, but the films had to be produced more rapidly. The demand was for Canadian realities, for multiple realities distributed to multiple destinations around Canada.

One fact that often goes unrecognized is the NFB's substantial technological innovations in the areas of sound recording, film cameras, and projection. These contributions were all geared around mobility of the camera in both animation and live action, and of film exhibition. Two of the most important technological innovations towards this 'quest for mobility,' as Gerald Graham has called it, are the first synchronous sound recording technologies produced by the Board in 1955, which enabled a greater flexibility for location shooting and helped to consolidate the NFB's reputation in the area of cinema direct. The other innovation, pioneered at Expo, was the development of largescreen projection using 70 mm and 35 mm film, which eventually grew into IMAX's 70 mm film projection. For The Labyrinth Project, the NFB developed a synchronous multi-screen shooting apparatus made out of five Arriflexes mounted in a cruciform shape (fig. 1.2). The cameras could operate all together or in combinations. The films were projected using five synchronized projectors set out in a similar shape. Both the camera and projection apparatus adapted the principles of television studio switching technology, which enabled greater flexibility in covering simultaneous actions.

Thus, we find two kinds of screen expansions developed by the NFB. In the first, we are dealing with the content of the frame – the camera and sound apparatus are set free to document the outside world because they are no longer tied to studio shooting (the division between outside and inside breaks down). In the second, which builds on the first, the spectator is set free in a new cinema architecture to create individualized views through screens that exceed any one person's perception. Both of these innovations are geared towards greater participation and interactivity on the part of filmmakers and spectators. Arguably, this increased mobility and expansion, the opening up of new spaces of apprehension, is tied to the contradictory forces of capitalist media expansion: these produce a greater democracy of image production and consumption, and greater social and economic control.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>3rd Man Pops Up by Board - 4th Man Wins by Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- All times are in Coordinated Universal Time (UTC).
- Events may include: Pops Up by Board, Wins by Board, and so on.
to the ‘Expanded Cinema University,’ that is, to universal knowledge. Just as his geodesic dome was designed for mobility, as a ball in movement, so too was the synesthetic cinema designed for process-oriented experiences.

The notion that film technology could create a new awareness and an expanded consciousness for the new age of simultaneity was repeated frequently at Expo. The cover story of the 14 July issue of Life was called ‘A Film Revolution to Blitz Man’s Mind,’ a revolution that ‘showed us the future’: ‘London’s Crystal Palace in 1851 did this with iron and glass architecture, the Paris 1889 fair with steam engineering, the 1904 St. Louis Fair with the auto. Expo 67 does it with film and, through images that assault the senses and expand the mind, explodes the world into a revolution in communications.’ Expo offered a variety of new forms of participatory multi-screen cinema (fig. 1.1). Canada 67, a part of the Telephone Pavilion, was among the most spectacular and nationalistic with a film made by Walt Disney Studios. Using a nine-camera apparatus to create a 360° circle vision screen, the spectacle enveloped 1,500 viewers at a time. The twenty-two-minute film began on the east coast with the Canadian Mounted Police, moving to Quebec’s Winter Carnival to a Toronto Maple Leafs’ hockey game to the wild west and Canada’s national parks. For Robert Fulford all of the multi-screen presentations were disappointing, but Canada 67 was among the most ‘blatant in its chauvinism.’ CPR Cominco Pavilion’s We Are Young by filmmakers Francis Thompson and Alexander Hammid, who also made To Be Alive for the 1964 World’s Fair, used six screens to devise a documentary about the trials and tribulations of being a teenager. Polar Life by Graham Ferguson displayed eleven screens with two or three visible at a time as viewers sat in four revolving theatres on one large turntable. Perhaps the most theatrical of the presentations was the Kino-Automat (movie vending) on three screens, devised by cinematographer Raduz Cincera, which incorporated live theatre at the Czechoslovakian pavilion. Audience members had a red and a green button in front of them and were invited to vote on the actions to be taken by characters in the film. A live performer from the film would emerge at different points to ask the audience to vote. The voting itself was a ruse, and although each interval did allow for two choices, all paths ended in the same place. For Cincera, this illusion of interactivity was to be a comedy, a comment on democracy.

Writing under the influence of both McLuhan and Fuller as well as all of the multi-screen experiments at Expo and the emerging field of experimental media art, Youngblood posits synesthetic cinema as a new revolutionary form. This is the age of ‘cosmic consciousness,’ in which intuition and reason are joined once more. Youngblood theorizes that it is the cinema’s role to approximate consciousness, which he defines according to R.G. Collingwood’s specification as the kind of thought which stands closest to sensation or mere feeling. All thought grows out of this and ‘deals with feeling as thus transformed into imagination.’ Consciousness is not simply static. Moreover, it is in the process of expanding through technology. ‘This consciousness expansion is created on the one hand by mind manifest hallucinogens and on the other by a partnership with machines.’ Synesthetic cinema is the only language suited to the post-industrial and post-literate age with its ‘multi-dimensional simul-sensory network of information sources.’ An increasing number of inhabitants, he writes, live in another world, and the synesthetic cinema belongs to this other counter-culture world, a world that is other to commercial media.

Although this form existed at the turn of the century and Abel Gance’s three-screen manifesto Napoleon (1927) sought to revolutionize visual culture just as sound was coming to the cinema, Youngblood asks why it took so long for the multi-screen cinema to come of age. The answer to this question is simple, ‘television is the software of the earth.’ It has made film obsolete as a documentary technology (transformed it into art) and connected it into and helped to consolidate the ‘intermedia network’ of magazines, books, radio, recorded music, photography. All media are the new environment; they are nature as McLuhan would posit: discontinuous, fragmented, and interconnected like a labyrinth. Screens become architecture because of television’s self-reflexive ubiquity – there is no outside or inside to televisual images: ‘The videosphere is the noosphere transformed into a perceivable state.’ It is not that the screen disappears but that the screen as support is materialized as an object alongside or within another screen ad infinitum. The ‘medium is the message’ and thus the screen and the building that houses the screen and the city that houses the theatre are all part of the ever-expanding or imploding picture of the earth which the Russian satellite Sputnik had delivered in 1957.

While we might have seen screens within screens in the history of cinema, multiple screens or video walls became a common prop in the popular television culture (especially American) of the fifties and sixties. So often science fiction and spy serials used television monitors to connote the surveillance and high-tech control of space. We could read
Sainte-Hélène) offered something unique in the way of urban design: a utopian non-place that combined a unified system of signs with a highly diverse cultural representation of a new sense of globality. Expo was built to reflect certain trends in international art and architecture of the sixties. These trends towards openness to the present and connection to the world as a diversity of perspectives encompassed central themes of hybridity and multiplicity.

The three-chamber installation that made up *Labyrinth* was designed by Colin Low and built by the architectural firm of John Bland, Roy E. Lemoyne, Gordon Edwards, and Anthony Shine, with Harry Vandelman as the project supervisor. Inspired by McLuhan's anthropological writings on the media as well as Northrop Frye's theories of archetypes, the installation served to highlight a new awareness of simultaneity and new concepts of space-time created through media technologies. McLuhan's intellectual collaborations with the British-born urban planner Jacqueline Tywhitt, who taught urban design and landscape architecture at the University of Toronto up until the mid-fifties, might shed some light on this new context of architecture in the sixties. Tywhitt was the editor of the journal *Ekistics* and translator and editor of many of Siegfried Gideon's writings – an important influence on McLuhan's media theories. We can see in *Understanding Media* (1964) precisely this influence on his views of the media as archetypal, environmental, and process-oriented fields rather than as simply virtual or static containers. A member of the Toronto Explorations Group in the early fifties, Tywhitt was also connected to architects in Montreal, not least the firm that employed Moshe Safdie, the designer of Habitat – the ultimate encapsulation of Expo's humanist intent. What grows out of the exchanges between urban and media theory with the Explorations team, a research group connected to an international interdisciplinary enterprise, is an anthropological approach to the built environment and an understanding that communications media as extensions of the human body produce environments that carry their own hidden biases.¹⁵

McLuhan's research aimed to uncover media biases through the creation of anti-environments, which the successful work of art could produce. His critical pedagogy maintained that the meeting of new and old technologies could generate new forms of awareness. He does not separate different media but rather seeks to understand them in terms of whole networks of obsolescences, absorptions, and hybrid energies. All media come in pairs, with one acting as the content of the other.¹⁶ The usefulness of the electric light as an example of a medium (one that Eco objected to) stems from its lack of content. Students of media can observe the ways they transform the structures of time and space, work and society. They will come to understand the 'form of power that is in all media to reshape any lives they touch.'¹⁷ All other media are hybrid; they are the result of a meeting which produces 'a moment of freedom and release from the ordinary trance and numbness imposed by them on our senses.' The interface between two different media has characterized the undertakings of the best artists: Dickens, Shaw, Eliot, Joyce, Eisenstein, the Marx Brothers, Chaplin, and many more, who were able to produce new forms of entertainment and art. It often takes a great artist to anticipate the hybrid created by the clash of cultures, which often occurs during wars and migrations.¹⁸ This idea of the 'interface' between old and new technologies was central to the new synesthetic cinema that was pioneered at Expo and later theorized by Gene Youngblood in his landmark study, very much inspired by Expo 67, *Expanded Cinema* (1970).

**Mind-Expanding Screens**

The relation between screen and architecture, the screen as architecture, was endemic to the humanist design of Expo. Whereas classical depictions of dehumanization staged the cinema screen as precisely that which alienates humans from the social fabric of everyday life – Fritz Lang's *Metropolis* (1922) is a great example of this idea – Expo's image of the screen, as we shall see, was just the opposite. R. Buckminster Fuller, whose geodesic dome was an important milestone for those multi-screen experimenters at Expo, wrote the wonderful introduction to Youngblood's book. Fuller's planetary vision of an 'earth space' challenged the view of the earth that portioned it into tiny static cubes of property, an idea based on a two-dimensional picture of the world that did not include the space above the ground, that is, the universe. Instead, Fuller counterposes Einstein's larger view of a non-linear universe, a complex of frequencies, waves, broadcasts, and instantaneous communication within the context of the universe. For Fuller, Youngblood's book is important because it uses the 'scenario-universe principle': 'a scenario of non-simultaneous and only partially overlapping transformative events.' Youngblood's theorization of synesthetic art is most valuable for its educational potential: it will synchronize the senses and humankind's knowledge in time to ensure 'the continuance of the ... Space Vehicle Earth.'¹⁹ The new ecological art forms will lead
1. A picture of a scene shows a child standing in front of a large screen. The child is looking at the screen with a surprised expression. The screen displays an image of a model of a spaceship. The child is wearing a school uniform. The text on the screen is not visible.
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