The San Francisco of Alfred Hitchcock's *Vertigo*

Place, Pilgrimage, and Commemoration

Edited by
Douglas A. Cunningham

THE SCARECROW PRESS, INC.
Lanham • Toronto • Plymouth, UK
2012

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Proposed Locations

On Postmodern Tributes to Vertigo *and Place*

Cindy Bernard in Conversation with
Douglas A. Cunningham

Cindy Bernard is a practicing artist who lives and works in Los Angeles. Her series *Ask the Dust*, completed in 1992, features twenty-one locations from films produced between 1954 and 1974 (including one location from *Vertigo*) rephotographed out of filmic context. Her installation *Location Proposal #2*—completed in 2001—rear-projects eighteen separate digital images that evoke shots from the "Muir Woods" sequence of *Vertigo*. In addition to the images included here, additional photos from the exhibitions mentioned in this interview may be seen in color at Bernard's website, http://www.sound2cb.com. This interview was conducted in December 2009.

When did you first see "Vertigo"?

This is a hard question because I don't remember. What I recall is that I saw it in 1984 when it was rereleased. That said, I'm fairly certain that I saw it in 1979 when I studied film at Cal State Fullerton with documentary filmmaker and producer Mitchell Block. And I'm fairly certain that since I was a film buff and a Hitchcock fan as a teenager that I had probably seen it on *The Million Dollar Movie* prior to that. But my first hard and fast memory of seeing it is the rerelease—so fairly late, really.

Photo 11.1. Cindy Bernard's *Ask the Dust:* Vertigo *(1958/1990).* (Cindy Bernard.)

Did the film have any kind of impact on you when you saw it, or did that build over time?

I remember people talking about how amazing it looked—the depth of the color. I specifically remember intense reds, I don't know why, and, of course, the beauty of Madeleine's white coat. Aesthetically, the film is such an amazing object. I have to admit . . . I've never bought a copy of the DVD. You know it's odd, I have no way of really explaining this . . . but I've never made a concerted effort to purchase the DVDs for the twenty-one films I covered in the *Ask the Dust* series, and I think it's because I worked on the series for so many years that they're kind of ingrained. That said, if I come across *Vertigo* or *The Searchers* [1956] on cable, I can't take my eyes away from it.

Would you please talk about the ideas behind your Ask the Dust *series?*

The original question behind the work [asked], "Could you see a rise in cynicism in American consciousness between the years 1954 and 1974, that is, between *Brown vs. Board of Education* and Nixon's resignation?" The United States fundamentally changed—as we all know—it became a slightly more cynical place. Would you be able to see that in the way landscape was depicted in American film? Landscapes sometimes come to stand in for certain kinds of values—the way that Monument Valley comes to stand for conservative values, and so Dennis Weaver does the Great Western Bank ads with Monument Valley in the background, a landscape already infused with the values that were so much a part of all the John Ford films.

So that was the initial thesis of the project.

Would you please describe some of the challenges you experienced in trying to rephotograph the fifth location of your series, "Ask the Dust: Vertigo *(1958/1990)"?*

All of the images are to aspect ratio of the original theatrical release. You have to remember that when I started the project in 1987, it was pre-DVD. Laser disks were relatively recent, and of course you had VHS tape. But letterboxing the cinematic image was rare. There wasn't connoisseurship of film happening at the consumer level of distribution—except on releases like the Criterion laser disks. In those years I worked for the artist John Baldessari, who's also a huge film buff, and I used his laser disk to work on *North by Northwest*. And in fact, he owns a *Vertigo* print from *Ask the Dust*.

So, in order to match the original aspect ratio, I'd find the film on VHS tape, then I would shoot the shot I was interested in re-creating off my television set—or a selection of shots if I hadn't quite figured out what shot I wanted to use. I'd then find a print at a film archive and draw in the details missing from the TV "pan-and-scan" version.

Draw in? On your photograph?

Not exactly—I mounted the image on a piece of paper and drew in the details that were cropped out because of the square television ratio. I used the *American Cinematographers Manual* and research to determine the original aspect ratios. So that's what a lot of the work of completing *Ask the Dust* involved—finding films in archives so I could match the framing of the shot in the original film.

What archives did you visit for your research on the "Vertigo" image?

There isn't that much extra detail in my *Vertigo* drawing. It's just a little bit to either side, and I don't seem to have any notes about where it was I found it. But in general, I went to the UCLA Film and Television Archives as well as to the archive at MOMA [the Museum of Modern Art in New York City]. Every once in a while, if a film I intended to rephotograph was screened at a revival house, I would just go see it and use a little flashlight so that I could see to draw in the details. I just did the best I could. That Fort Point shot in *Vertigo* repeats a couple of times, so it wasn't so difficult. In truth, in terms of the project as a whole, I had a lot of information on the Fort Point shot, because the Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences archives [at the Margaret Herrick Library in Los Angeles] has all the *Vertigo* stuff in it as a part of Hitchcock's archives. Xeroxing [at] the archives wasn't allowed, so I hand copied the location-scouting notes and the production notes for that scene. I have the lens length, I have the camera height, and I knew the shot had been a cheat anyway. [*Bernard references some paperwork from the production files of "Vertigo" that indicate differences between the geographies of the actual Fort Point location and the geographies as represented in the*

film. She reads from a shot list.] "134A: Scottie crosses to the corner of fort. 135: Holding corner of [fort] key, close [fort], key right. Scottie appears off screen. Note: the corner used in this shot is not the corner we see Madeleine disappear behind but is the second corner of the fort. 136: The key angle of it shot, the camera is moved around fort. Return courtyard. We see Madeleine standing in silhouette with the bridge above and behind her."[1] So what that told me was that if I tried to shoot based on the narrative sequence in the film, I might end up in the wrong place. So I had to look at the shot from different corners of Fort Point to make sure that I was landing in the right place to shoot my photograph. Because it sounded to me like the filmmakers didn't follow the logical narrative layout of the actual place when they shot.

Suffice to say it wasn't one of the more difficult shots to do in the series because—unlike, say, my shooting of *3:10 to Yuma* [1957], where I was driving around Tucson looking for the way the mountainside aligns with a Saguaro cactus—Fort Point is an obvious location! [*Laughs.*] Everybody knows where the Golden Gate Bridge is. I didn't really have to guess at that one like I had to do for so many of the pieces.

It's very important that we see a correlation between your photograph and the shot from the film.

I worked very hard to have a correlation, to have it be as exact as I could make it. As we prepared for this interview, you asked me, "Why *Vertigo*?" So, I went back and pulled my notes to just see what the other films were on the list for 1958, because I'd forgotten. And now that I look, the question doesn't make any sense at all because the other films were *Touch of Evil*, *The Line-Up*, *Man of the West*, and *The Left Handed Gun*. When I look at the list I think, well, given where the project eventually goes, how could it have been any of those other films?

Martha Langford notes, "Bernard's Ask the Dust *appeals more powerfully and directly to the poetic soul. In spirit and content, it is a direct descendant of nineteenth-century Romanticism."[2] Do you, in fact, see connections between your work and Romanticism? Does your "Vertigo" image hold a special place in the series because of these connections?*

When doing the initial research for *Ask the Dust*, I was looking at the work of Albert Bierstadt and Frederick Church. Early threads in the work were depictions of the West—I'm talking about *Ask the Dust* and the series as a whole—depictions of the American West, Manifest Destiny, the concept of the West as a safety valve for disgruntled labor in the East. I was reading *Virgin Land*, by Henry Nash Smith [1958], and I was also looking at a book called *A Writer's America: Landscape in Literature*, by Alfred Kazin [1988], and that had a lot of illustrations of the American branch of nineteenth-century Romanticism, at least as it found its way into painting. I was looking at *Overland Trail*, by Bierstadt, *Twilight in the Wilderness*, by Church, and "Yosemite Valley" by Thomas Hill, among others.

At the time, I saw *Vertigo* as breaking the formula I'd layed out for *Ask the Dust*. I had a rule that landscape had to play a central role in the films I chose, in the sense of being another character, a motivating narrative, and that's why so many of the films used in the series feature vast traversals of the space. The main characters in *The Searchers* are Ethan, Martin, and the aggressive Monument Valley landscape they ride through for five years searching for Debbie.

But what I eventually realized was that the act of retracing that occurs in *Vertigo* is a similar kind of traversal and, of course, Madeleine as a simulacra—or even the name "Madeleine" and its relation to Proust—were equally important themes.

Langford mentions Caspar David Friedrich's 1818 painting Rückenfigur *(English title:* Wanderer above the Sea of Fog*) as a representative example of nineteenth-century Romanticism that relates to your work.*[3]

The lone figure standing in the corner of the landscape—or in that case, centrally within the landscape—in so many other paintings, being inspired by God's creation and overwhelmed by the sublime. . . . I don't know that it was my intention to re-create that spirit in *Ask the Dust*. If anything, I saw my work as countering that in some way, because there's a purity about landscape that seems to be central to that idea. And I never really perceived landscapes to be pure because, inevitably, we're always looking at them through culture, and I don't know that nineteenth-century Romanticism accounts for that.

Do you feel cinephilia contributes to the sublime moment we feel when we visit places where films have been shot? I have argued that, when viewing your Ask the Dust *series and its "Vertigo" image in particular, one "longs for the real . . . but only to the extent that it meets the standards of affect already established by the cinematic experience."[4] To what extent do you agree?*

I used to say in my old artist statements that I've long been interested in how our perception of reality is coded by culture, so I think there's inevitably that overlay when we look at these kinds of spaces—but that doesn't diminish the genuine sense of awe also ingrained in some of these spaces.

Did you experience those kinds of feelings while rephotographing locations for Ask the Dust*?*

For me, it was a very peculiar process because I set out on a semi-feminist project—to recapture the idea of landscape from a long list of male photographers, dating back to the U.S. Geological Survey and Timothy O'Sullivan.

I'm going to go into theses spaces to make these photographs with my 4 × 5 camera all by myself, and there's this act of recapturing that space away from this male-dominated perspective. All the directors of the films in the series are men, as well. But in truth, in the performative act of going back and standing in those places, there was a thrill, "Well, I'm standing where Hitchcock stood," or [Francis Ford] Coppola, or even Russ Meyer. [*Laughs.*]

The process, then, involved an interesting contradiction. On the one hand, you stood in awe of these spaces while, on the other, you worked against the way they've become iconic in our collective consciousness.

It seems to be implied that *Ask the Dust* was an homage, but it wasn't an homage at all—it was an exorcism. That's what I set out to do—not to necessarily make photographs as an homage to these films but, in fact, to exorcise that narrative content out of those spaces, to empty them completely, so that you'd be free to refill them with your own narrative content. It's only over the course of the project that I realized the inevitable—that there's no way to get away from homage. And this came up in the titling, because I never wanted to put the film titles in the title of the work. I wanted *Ask the Dust* to stand as landscapes; you would bring your own memory to that space, be it a filmic memory or not. I wanted it to be powerful enough where perhaps you might associate it with that filmic location, but maybe you wouldn't, and that would be ok. But my gallerist at that time was just really insistent that if I didn't give people some hook into the work that they just wouldn't get it, they would have no way in. I'm a long believer in titling as auxiliary information for the work, as a way of pointing toward my intent. So, I listened to the gallerist, for better or worse. But that's also why the other work of the trilogy, this *Two Roads* piece, doesn't have any of those references in the title. It's completely blank. That was my response to the titling in the *Ask the Dust* work.

Do you feel, then, as if the inclusion of film titles with the Ask the Dust *pieces upsets the overall project?*

I never wanted people to read a one-to-one relationship between the film and the image. I don't want people to see the image and say, "Oh, that's *Easy Rider*!"—even though I sometimes talk about them that way—but it's really not *Easy Rider* [1969], it's a photograph of a location where a film was shot, and there are several overlays that influence that way that we see it (one of which is *Easy Rider*). And in fact, when I put the photographs on the wall, the titles are never right next to them. There's almost always more than one being shown, and the titles are usually in a list to the side. So you don't necessarily see the title before you see the image, which is important to me.

You just mentioned a piece you consider part of what you call the Ask the Dust *trilogy, which consists of the twenty-one aforementioned film location photographs, twenty additional photographs taken by your grandfather across various parts of America (the* Grandfather Photographs*), and two much larger photographs of roads in Monaco you've titled together as a pair—*Two Roads*). Do viewers of "Two Roads" make connections to Grace Kelly, Hitchcock, and the famous scene they shot on these Monaco mountain roads for* To Catch a Thief [1954]*? Kelly, of course, later crashed and died on a Monaco road similar to the one featured in the film.*

I subscribe to the idea that once I put the work on the wall, I might as well be dead, and the work is going to be read through the lexicon of the person looking at it. What they choose to get from the work is up to them, and if the work is captivating enough, they'll do a little work and find out what I intended. So if they get the connection, great. But I don't see how they actually would [*laughs*], unless they've been in Monaco on that road (there's nothing in the photograph to tell you you're in Monaco). I believe that the work on the wall is one cog in an array of information that feeds what that work is. Information about the work as commodity, critical information, press releases, reviews, the artist's intent, all of that. And when someone looks at a work, if they come in completely blind—not coming to the space already knowing something about the artist—then they're going to read it the way that they read it, and hopefully they're interested enough that they want to know more, they go back and find out something about why the work was made.

So how did the word about the actual intent behind "Two Roads" actually get out to the public?

I think it was in the press release, which was sitting on the gallery desk, so it wasn't like it was hidden too far back. And you also have to remember that the work was made for a show at Air de Paris when it was located in Nice, which is next door to Monaco. Most of the people from the region would look at that work and probably know what was going on with it pretty quickly, because it's a relatively famous road that has really intense hairpin curves, and goes all the way up the hill . . . and all the way back down again. And anybody of a certain age would know how Grace Kelly was killed. And this just points to the fact that sometimes reads of works are contingent on location, they're contingent on memory. A friend of mine, Morgan Fisher, made a film called *Standard Gauge* [1984]. It consists of Morgan talking about strips of 35-mm and 16-mm film he's collected as he runs them across a light box. It's a beautiful film. And Morgan was beginning to realize that the meaning in some of those bits of film is generationally determined. And at what point does that begin to get lost? The weight of looking at a bit of film from the explosion of the *Hindenburg*, which even at my age still has resonance, the seeing of that footage, which still, for many people, creates

a little bit of a twinge, goes away as generations pass. Morgan's narration is very dependent on that twinge.

Of Ask the Dust, *Julian Stallabrass notes, "Bernard does not generally fix on the idiosyncratic, so the pictures are often just vaguely familiar, inflected with the atmosphere of 100 half-forgotten movies. In this sense only, the pictures rely on the same effect as Cindy Sherman's film stills, but here the land rather than the artist 'adopts' a stereotypical character."*[5] *To what extent do you identify with Sherman's project in her* Untitled Film Stills *series?*

Sherman focused on iconic types, as Stallabrass points out, whereas I shot the spaces where those types played out their roles. I was aware of her project. I don't know that I would say I identified with it, but I of course respected it, as I did all of the "Pictures" generation artists. Richard Prince's rephotographing of Marlboro Man ads and the commentary on representations of American machismo framed by a Western landscape was as important as Cindy Sherman's *Untitled Film Stills*.

This idea of rephotography—did Richard Prince's work inspire Ask the Dust, *or did you come up with the idea on your own?*

I certainly didn't invent rephotography! Mark Klett's *Rephotographic Survey Project* revisited sites from the U.S. Geologic Survey in the 1970s, although I wasn't aware of Klett's work when I started *Ask the Dust*. The idea for *Ask the Dust* came from my experience of Joshua Tree National Park. My grandfather lived in Twentynine Palms, and I spent a lot of time out in Joshua Tree National Park (then Joshua Tree National Monument, or as we referred to it, "The Monument"). I was struck by the overwhelming feeling of *déjà vu* I had when entering that space and the sense that the source of this *déjà vu* had to do with the way it had been depicted in film. From that realization I proceeded to do research and reading—[Jean] Baudrillard's *America*, for instance, where he writes, "The American city seems to have stepped right out of the movies. To grasp its secret, you should not, then, begin with the city and move inwards to the screen; you should begin with the screen and move outwards to the city."[6] So I think that was really the generative moment for the work. . . . Coming out of art school, certainly I was familiar—and had exhibited with—works by the "Pictures" generation of artists. The work that I made immediately preceding *Ask the Dust* couldn't have been more different in appearance. It consisted of photographs of the interiors of security envelopes [the project is entitled *Security Envelopes*]. It was a form of appropriation, so it was picked up and shown with other artists who were producing photographs and other works derived from media and other preexisting cultural sources of images. *Ask the Dust* develops from that atmosphere, the experience in Joshua Tree, and the reading that I was doing at the time. And of course a great love of John Ford's *The Searchers*. The first two pieces in the series that I shot and researched were *The Searchers* and *Easy Rider*. All of those things come together.

You've declared a fascination "with the way landscape has absorbed its cinematic description, in the familiar resonance one feels when seeing it."[7] *Can you describe that "familiar resonance" for yourself? What do you feel when you visit "Vertigo" sites and in what ways have they "absorbed" their "cinematic descriptions"? I assume you've been to many of the sites.*

I haven't really, no. What's interesting to me about this is I think that you're assuming an obsession with *Vertigo* that I don't have. I have used it as the subject of a couple of works, but in fact, I have not enacted the Chris Marker film [*Sans Soleil*, 1983]. I have not visited the sites of *Vertigo* nineteen times. Some of that is I just don't go to San Francisco that often. I've never been to Muir Woods that I remember. I've never been to Big Basin [Redwoods State Park]. I went to Fort Point. I think I have gone to the florist [Podesta Baldocchi]. I might have driven by Eddy and Gough—the intersection that's referred to in *San Soleil*, but my attachment to those locations isn't as obsessive as one might assume given the work.

So there's not a kind of affect? A feeling of the sublime? You did mention these kinds of feelings in reference to several of the other locations.

In *Vertigo*, as well, sure. But there's also quite a difference, I think, between walking into a space and experiencing that sense of surprise at how you feel once you're there. And in fact, maybe the spaces were ruined for me, because I was walking into them in the context of a project, dragging around a pretty heavy tripod and a 4 × 5 camera [*laughs*], and a film-changing bag, having already done considerable research in order to get to that place. So, there was a sense of, "Oh, yes! I have found it!" Yes, sure, that was there! But it was also at the level of "Thank God! I don't have to look any more!" [*Laughs*.] You know? So the sublime was tempered by the practicality of the work I had to do.

May I ask you to talk about the origin and ideas of "Location Proposal #2"?

The first time *Ask the Dust* was shown in Europe was in a group show titled *Spiel der Spur: The Poetry of Chance* at the Shedhalle in Zurich. While in Zurich, I became fascinated by German and Swiss comic books that were based on American Westerns. And of course, the books of Karl May account for a chunk of the European tourists at Monument Valley. So, for the artists' pages in the catalog of *Spiel der Spur*, I traced a Monument Valley–derived rock formation from one of the panes in the comic books. I created the drawn version of *Ask the Dust*, dropping out all of the comic information, and replacing it with the colors of Monument Valley—an intense blue and a

reddish orange. And that was the beginning of thinking about a remodeling of that landscape. And then some years later I started to think about what my position was relative to the *Ask the Dust* landscapes. To what degree had I captured and owned that space? I was also thinking about the way that a monocular lens orders information, and the difference between the monocular lens and binocular vision, and the way that binocular vision picks and chooses information—that the way that we actually see isn't ordered in the way that a camera lens orders things. The way that we see is much more fragmented. So, I was thinking, "How, then, does one begin to depict that fragmented vision? Is that possible?" I can't remember why I made various jumps in logic at the time. There are a couple of quotes I always use when I talk about period in my work; there's a quote from Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus*, something like "A schizophrenic out for a walk is a more interesting model than a neurotic on an analyst's couch."[8] And I thought about that a lot, about the way a schizophrenic views the world, about the sort of hierarchy of the single narrative that's being relayed on the analyst's couch over a fragmented model and how that type of experience might be conveyed.

So, somehow I came to the decision that the way out was through making 3-D digital models. The first one that I built was very similar to that outline for the artist pages I described. It was a model of Monument Valley based on an overhead topographic map and photographs that I had taken of all the formations. And I was interested in—again, going back to some of the ideas of *Ask the Dust*—the way that one's experience of Monument Valley is constructed through film. Literally constructed. Because the road that goes down into Monument Valley, which is the road that tourists are confined to when they drive through that space, is the same road that John Ford used to get his trucks into the valley to make the movies. So the way that you move through the space has literally already been laid out for you . . . in a practical way. So I thought, "Well, what I'll do is I'll build this model of this space, and then in my model, I'll take the little virtual camera, and I'll just run it down that road through the loop that goes through the valley, so that in the little animation, the camera moves down the road, and it stops very briefly at each of the iconic formations, which is where the tourist turnouts are in Monument Valley. You turn out, stop and have a view of the Mittens [the iconic red rock formations seen in so many Ford westerns]. You turn out, stop again and have a view of another formation. So my virtual camera just follows that road, and it stops for a minute . . . or less. It was meant to be shown with a live soundtrack, based on an excerpt from Ennio Morricone's "Man with a Harmonica" [from Sergio Leone's 1969 film *Once upon a Time in the West*]

slowed to the length of the animation and performed on cello. So anyway, that was the first work, which I never completed.

So then, building on that, I was thinking a lot about a mistake in the mythology surrounding *Vertigo*—that everybody believes that it was shot in Muir Woods, when it was actually shot in Big Basin [Redwoods State Park]—and the way this mistake gets perpetuated (especially in *Sans Soleil*, which also places the shoot in Muir Woods). So, I thought, "Well, maybe it would be interesting to just lift it out of that space entirely and build an iconic forest—but base it on a combination of the floor plan of the trail that goes through the Muir Woods crossed with the shot sequence for *Vertigo* that takes place there [but] was never shot there. So again, it's a virtual model of that entire space, and then there's a camera in the model that I move through and point in order to reconstruct the eighteen-shot sequence (photo 11.2).

The Schindler House in Los Angeles served as one of the major exhibition venues for "Location Proposal #2." Do you feel this venue enhanced the larger commentary of this work? If so, how?

Again, this is a long story. That was probably the last time that work was shown, in January/February 2000. When I initially started showing the work—and again, just to explain, because it's usually misunderstood about this work—these are rear-screen projections using a 35-mm slide projector

Photo 11.2. One of the eighteen projected images from Cindy Bernard's installation *Location Proposal #2*. (Cindy Bernard.)

. . . they're static, the shots don't change, you don't see an eighteen-shot sequence. If you walk into a gallery, you're only going to see that one shot, and it never changes. So it's not about re-creating the narrative sequence of the film on a single screen. The images don't change. And at any given time, the most I ever showed, were three of them, on three separate screens. I've never shown all eighteen shots in one place, there's never been an opportunity to move through the entire eighteen-shot sequence as a single installation in the same way that one moves through the forest in the film.

And would that be the way to see it ideally, to have them all in order, all eighteen of them?

No, no, not at all, because again, it's not about re-creating the experience of the film. It's about using the film as a vehicle to look at some other things.

Like the fragmentation and displacement you've mentioned with Sans Soleil*'s confusion about where this sequence was actually shot?*

Yeah, yeah. But also a relationship to the forest as an iconic space for a narrative of one kind or another and one's relationship to images in general. What the model does is refuse specificity. A photograph of a forest is always going to be a specific forest in a specific place. Once that gets removed and I build the model, it initiates a push-pull between the specific and the general or the nonspecific. It could be any forest, even if it's modeled on a specific forest.

Even with the crosscut of the redwood that Madeleine and Scottie examine in the film?

Clearly, that's where it gets more specific, but generally, for the works in that series as a whole, there is, ideally, a little bit of a push-pull going on about what it is you're actually looking at. Is it any forest, or is it a specific place? Because it doesn't have the indexical relationship to place that a photograph has. But of course, once you get into the parts of that sequence where you see the crosscut, you're brought back to something very specific again. Is it *La Jetée* [1962] or *Vertigo*? [*Laughs*.] You know? Which is, of course, the other reason I was really interested in that sequence—the Chris Marker thing, the *Sans Soleil* connection, the *La Jetée* connection, the crosscut, etc.

So, getting back to the Schindler House (photo 11.3), the projections seemed really dead whenever I showed them in white-box-type gallery spaces. I should also add . . . they were never meant to be shown in complete darkness because it wasn't about immersion; it was about a real self-consciousness about one's position relative to the image. I wanted the audience to be as self-conscious about looking as possible, and so everything about it is exposed. The screen is hanging in the middle of the space. The projector is right behind it, also hanging, and one can hear it—the fan is loud. One can see the

Photo 11.3. ***Location Proposal #2*** **in installation at the Schindler House in Los Angeles. (Cindy Bernard.)**

cone of light hitting the screen. Anyway, the galleries weren't working. So then I started to install the projections in different kinds of locations as markers, memory markers for something that occurred in that place. I know it's a stretch, but that's what I did. I began to do guerilla installations in various locations that would take place for the length of time it took to put the screen up, put the projector up, and photograph it. It would go up, I'd take a photograph, and then I would take it down. And these were all sorts of different kinds of locations from Giant Rock out by Landers to the Starkman Building in downtown Los Angeles. Eventually, I received an offer to do a show at the Schindler House, that's the work they were interested in, and it seemed like a great location due to the history of the house. I looked up the artist's statement I did at the time, and it reads as follows:

> My interest in the Schindler House as a site for this work stems from Schindler's utopian social vision as realized in the division of rooms and articulation of indoor/outdoor relationships. The heightened acuity to the construction of fictionalized space that I desire to achieve is, I believe, related to the awareness of open space and enclosure that Schindler was interested in achieving at King's Road.[9]

That social-utopian vision was realized in the architectural layout of the house, which was designed for two couples living together communally. So there's that aspect in addition to the House being a nexus for the German expatriates who came over here and became kind of a center of social activity. There are many layers to my statement.

Do you see a connection between the social utopian vision you're describing (the communal living amid the unique architecture, for example) and the exhibition of "Location Proposal #2" in that space?

No, I don't know that I can make that direct correlation, really. It's why I was interested in the place. But does the work speak to that? Ehh, probably not. [*Laughs*.] It was a part of why I was interested in the space, it was a part of why I wanted to do an exhibition there.

Despite all of this, however, I would argue that there is something special about showing "Location Proposal #2" in this space, where the light filters in so wonderfully from the outside—much like the way that light filters in through the "tall trees" of Big Basin Redwoods State Park or Muir Woods National Monument.

That's a nice image to consider, but unfortunately the show took place during one of the wettest winters in recent memory. The windows were covered with neutral-density lighting gels in order to dim the light levels so the rear-screen projections would be visible. Then it rained continuously. In fact in the video walk-through of the show that's on my website, you can see a bucket catching the water from the leaking roof.

You've done important work in examining how our cultural memories affect the ways we view and understand spaces. Do you see yourself exploring this territory further, and if so, will your adventures take you to "Vertigo" yet again?

Thanks for that compliment, Doug! In the last several years, my work has shifted from using cinema as a subject to exploring sound and music—not from the position of a sound artist, but it's evolved into making works which look at the social and economic aspects of those forms of production. One of the key transitional works, *projections+sound*, consisted only of sound and light filtered through theatrical lighting gels and rear-projected onto a screen. It was an attempt to conjure different iconic landscape spaces through sound and color. I'd always wanted to work with the soundtrack for *Vertigo* and this gave me the opportunity! The forest sequence is based on *Vertigo* and uses an altered version of "Scottie Tails Madeline." So in my work over the years, *Vertigo* has been reduced to a single photographic frame, then to a projected digital model, and finally to projected light and sound. I can't predict the future, but it would seem I've reached the apotheosis of immateriality, somewhat like Madeline herself. It's probably a good idea to let it rest there, don't you think?

Notes

1. "Notes during Hitchcock-Burks Survey [of] San Francisco, Big Basin, San Juan Bautista, prepared September 20, 1957, by H. Coleman," *Vertigo* production file, Alfred Hitchcock Collection, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Los Angeles.
2. Martha Langford, "Heaven's Gaze: The Filmic Geographies of Cindy Bernard," *Border Crossings* 15, no. 4 (1996): 53.
3. Langford, "Heaven's Gaze," 54–55.
4. Douglas A. Cunningham, "'It's All There, It's No Dream': *Vertigo* and the Redemptive Pleasures of the Cinephilic Pilgrimage," *Screen* 49, no. 2 (2008): 130.
5. Julian Stallabrass, "Authentic Fakes," *Art Monthly* 187 (June 1995): 12.
6. Jean Baudrillard, *America* (New York: Norton, 1989), 56.
7. "Cindy Bernard: *Ask the Dust*," in *3e biennale de lyon: d'art contemporain* (Lyon, France: Reunion des Musées Nationaux), 313.
8. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 2.
9. Cindy Bernard, "Artist's Statement, *Location Proposal #2*," MAK Center for Art and Architecture at the Schindler House, Los Angeles, January–February 2000.