Heath Ferreira
Bruno
3/7/06

Giuliana Bruno in her essay "Site-seeing: Architecture and the moving Image", introduces how architecture and the way it is used to represent modernity, gender, and the American experience. Bruno introduces concepts such as "by way of architecture that film turns into cinema" (2). The ways that "The filmic path is the modern version of architecture itinerary and the geographic exploration" (3). The ways in which the evolution of modern America and the impact that film, architecture and the symbols associated with them are major themes in Bruno's essay.

Bruno emphasizes the journey that one viewer takes while experiencing the film. Bruno states that "One never sees the same film twice" (3). The experience that one has while viewing a film through the architecture in time and space is inherently an individual experience. While reading this essay, one question arose in my mind. Does art truly imitate life? Or, does life imitate art, through the lens of art imitating life? The panorama and its influence is a large part of how art with the introduction of film, through film began to put cameras everywhere "film cameras are placed on railroad cars, incline rail-cars, subway cars, boats, moving street vehicles, and even balloons for attempted aerial"(4). Film and the "itinerary" that Bruno implies begins to emerge as a dominant theme in Bruno's essay.

The way that film began and still continues to take the viewer to their own place, Bruno says that "The camera becomes the vehicle: it becomes, literally, a spectators means of transportation" (4). The film itself acts as an individual, a character who is compatible with every viewer in the theatre. The acts of everyday life and each individual's own experiences are projected onto the screen, "The language of cinema was born not out of static theatrical views, but out of urban motions" (4). The projection of ones self onto the screen through the

architecture and the panoramic structures is a way for the viewer to become a "tourist" (5). The way that film has laid out a kind of social map and the way that the topography is viewed by each individual is a "view painting"(4), a masterpiece drawn by the viewer and then redrawn again. Bruno states that "The trajectory similarly drawn by a visitor or dweller of a city, who projects herself onto the city space" (4). Which leads me to wonder. Are the various paths that each individual takes through the multitudes of cities, streets and architecture a representation of themselves? Is the path we take a subconscious representation of ourselves. This sort of self projection in our every day lives is transferred to other aspects of our lives, for example, the ways that we watch movies.

Architecture, signs and symbols stand out differently to each person because of each individual predisposition. Bruno also sees the progress of women and the mobility of females greatly affected by architecture. The word voyageur is defined as "a guide", Bruno states that "Through the shift from voyeur to voyageur my aim is to reclaim female mobility"(1). Acting as a guide Bruno's evaluation of film and its "constant reinvention of space"(2), is a way for Bruno to rediscover the female identity. Bruno is emphasizing that by "Film viewing an imaginary form of flanerie, a "modern" gaze that wonders through space, fully open to woman" (5). The emergence of modern film and the application of architecture during a time of great struggle and progress for women's rights is in underlying tone in Bruno's essay. The street and the rapid expansion of cities in the modern era was a figurative symbol for the emergence of woman, "The city space becomes a genre in the German street dramas and in the Italian cinema of the street, both of which opened the road to women"(2). Bruno's essay juxtaposed architecture, film, and the use of cinematic tools to represent social progress. The ways in which a viewer can apply film and the architecture in those films to represent, symbolize and embody particular facets of their existence.