From the moment of its inception, it has not been clear whether Laterna Magika ([Lm]) is film, theater or a brand new media performance show. It was introduced in the Czechoslovak pavilion at the 1958 World Expo in Brussels, this entity combined ballet, theater, several film projections, and sound background.

An unexpected media effect: LM had a pit full of contemporaries came from the dialog conducted between a live performer and the virtual world of film. On a mechanical basis, and through effective synchronization of a dancer with a film image, LM created the impression that the two were interacting. At the start of the show, the spectators were convinced they were watching an imaginative act of true interaction. And in that, lies the trick: the magical phenomenon in which actor and dancer were able to create this impression is, the film medium was "real" that it must have "come to life" because a real event, if we turn to the past and ask what was magical about the historical "magical lantern," we reach in "fummlines" (dictionary universal) [1980].

"universe magique est une petite machine optique qui fait dans l’obscurité sur une mueur invisible de lucioles et de mirages, que celui qui ne sait pas le secret croit que se fait par magie." (author’s claim). Three hundred years later, the effect of a Lm had a similar effect on the spectator: who did not realize how the show was being created. The magical part was that the film a magician waved a magic wand, removing a constant characteristic and granting the film the ability to functionally respond to the surroundings.

According to the experience of the creators of LM, the point principle - the key scenario of the film dominated the other. That was what made the film difficult to label, because each component was leading at a given moment, it was neither a real performance nor a virtual genre using reality elements. In Rhythms, a real pianist played a mechanical composition to a backdrop of a blown-up shot of a passenger plane as it landed down the runway at Prag airport. And components reacted to each other in counterpositions - of the real and virtual worlds. Both worlds retained their specificity.

LM transformed the concept of virtual and physical time. The medium of virtual time included a mediator with whom the spectator could interact and thus gain a direct perception on which to model his own behavior, and his physical body never find itself in a virtual interactive space.

The Show Hostages, Rhythms, Slavonic Dances Laterna Magika was not an easily described entity. The soundness of film and theater was fused together. It was a highly synchronized program, coordinated to the last detail, with everyone having his exact spot in a precisely marked space. That was how the performer made an impression of interactive improvisation. Of course, the improvisation was exactly what: instead of the action held its rhythm and dramatic time.
Not only did the author or dancer here enter the virtual world of film but also jump up a plot point began on stage (like the discussion between a real-show hostess and her virtual colleagues in the show "Ghostbusters.") The film and the stage point inward a dramatic contrast of divergent conclusions: dance, dialogue, or concert in a misty abstract pavilion (Mirages).

The director built the plot in a sequence of actions—signs—to create an emotional content for the viewer. The director of the performance, Atsuo Ikeda, commented on his method: "The term 'sign' could be traced from the rules that give birth to what we call film language. If we work with certain devices, to be proper, with the artificiality of film, its being created by film alone, signs are just a juxtaposition when differentiating between the dimension of these signs, and the sum of at least two signs we could obtain a certain logical or spatial significance. A sign makes the viewer an emotional content. A film is not_bwad or cloth in our multi-stage scene unit, a sign becomes an element with meaning and becoming a logical dimension." As Ikeda's description makes clear, Esteban Mehta was interested in emotional content. That is, on certain artistic conditions, among them were compressed essentials of film, photography, and theater, and finally by creating the program in various ways, the sign adds a new dimension to the viewer's experience, allowing a new perspective on the performance. 

A crucial part of the film almost was Svoboda's artistic development. The principles of LM, which had already worked in film, dance, and music, which met together during an intense theatrical piece, it was no coincidence that Svoboda and Ikeda recruited the collaboration of a young director, Mike Foran, who later became a leading figure in the New Wave of Czech film.

It seems that the LM promotes love gradually and consciously, to which the film may be related. In the name of the Owner, which was artistically directed, the film project. The difference between cinema and video with respect to the spatial factor lies in the field of projection. The confirmed level of dimension of cinema may be overcome by Video Art. By several means by increasing the number of screens in view (Comme Schumacher: siehe ich sichers,), by contrasting simultaneously the physical representation and virtuality of the cinematographic image (Valerie Trier, Bright and Rammihan), by dividing the screen into several areas in which images are grouped in a series of moving, or contrasting compositions (Kren: Sonner), and finally by manipulating the mechanisms of the lens projection principle (Anthony McCall).

An important part of the LM after work was Svoboda's artistic development. The principles of LM, which had already worked in film, dance, and music, which met together during an intense theatrical piece, it was no coincidence that Svoboda and Ikeda recruited the collaboration of a young director, Mike Foran, who later became a leading figure in the New Wave of Czech film.
“There were three screening areas on stage. The film in the middle was linked to the stage plot. On the sides there were two monitors and two TV projectors (6 x 4 meters) projecting the action shot by camera in two studios far from the theater, at a distant street, in front of the theater, in the theater hall, and on the stage. We filmed the texts, photos, and ads in one studio and took on another, the audience in the hall, and the actors on the stage. The image collage made sense after being put together in the TV directors' panel. There, a train of images was created and projected by two giant monitors on stage. The immense complex apparatus helped the characters in the studio outside the theater sing under the direction of the conductor on the monitor, a live conductor conducting an orchestra in the theater. The viewer could simultaneously watch the action in front of the theater on the street, but the basic significance of the system was its ability to pull the spectator un-expectedly and with full intensity into the play. During a protest song sung by a black singer, the camera filmed the theater audience, projecting their image onto a screen. People enjoyed seeing their own faces. At a certain point we changed the picture from a positive to a negative so that the screens were suddenly showing a black audience. Some spectators were upset. We filmed and played that way. We even used a group moment and made the demonstration that was taking place in front of the theater a part of the show.”

This staging marked a peak of Stevicka’s media experiments. In 1983, he implemented in a several parallel remote telematic broadcasts followed by projections on screens and monitors from different places throughout industrial TV. He thus created real and not just fictitious (M.Y.-style) links between the projections and participants and feedback between the audience and its images.

It was primarily the link of image with real audience reactions that was a novel inspiration; not only in the media field but also in the context of performance and video art. Acting in the context of the visual arts is relevant only if it performs the elementary procedure of perceiving the networks of relationships between performer and perceiver; both being simultaneously the subject and object.”

In an analytic, focused manner we encounter similar problems in Dori Graham’s work. In video installations like Present Continuous Past (1994) or Public Space / Two Audiences (1998), he tends to present the viewer as an object, using the broadcast of his image followed by a video projection. These works resonate in a number of theoretical postulates, directly linked to Žižek’s ideas and the effects of real-time empancements onto the latter’s set “desire” for incorporation.

“There is no distinction between the subject and object. Object is the viewer as art, and subject in the viewer, as art. Object and subject are not di- dactic objects but a single self-contained identity, reversible interior and exterior term. All frames of reference read simultaneously. Object: subject.”

This is the idea of a reciprocal interdependence of perceiver (spectator) and the perceived art-object-the artist as performer (who might in the case of Nanhun present himself as/in place of the ‘object’). In this new subject-object relationship, the spectator is perceptual process was cor- related to the compositional process which was also inherent in the material... Thus a different
idea of material and the relation of this materiality to nothing (all processes were also developed).

The change in the compositional process came from experiment in music and dance, where the performance was the center of the work produced as perceived in a duration time continuum.

Pekarzan

The principle of Pekarzan's surround sound film projections—first applied in the 1966 piece—was represented at the 1968 NFB in Saskatoon. The surround sound involved the use of eight channels of audio, allowing the audience to experience the film as a multi-dimensional experience. The sound design was achieved by creating a sound environment that was both immersive and engaging.

The rhythm of the multi-screening was determined by the relationship between film and side projections, which were synchronized by the soundtracks. The soundtracks were layered and fragmented, creating a multi-dimensional experience for the audience.

The effectiveness of multi-screening came from its ability to create a sense of depth and perspective. By offering multiple perspectives at once, the audiences were able to take in the film's content simultaneously. The sound design was integral to this experience, providing a multi-dimensional soundscape that complemented the visual elements.
world events, to participate in at once several realities, actions, stories and environments. The poetological, multiscreen areas, like superimposed installations, give their viewers-inventors a magical feeling of entering several spheres at once. The installations are governed by their own logic, arriving that creates a distance and a loss of interest, in other men physiological time, while transmitting human perception by a metaphysical echo. Anti-synchronization, in difficult to apply on multiple levels of literature (as, for example, in Joyce’s Ulysses), a natural and smooth in video, and especially in the order of parallel projection. We could compare such experience with Ceyon’s ‘pure round installation Imaginary Landscape No. 4’ (1965) in which the resulting experience comes from mixing sounds from twelve radios simultaneously tuned to different stations.

Photographs tell us that today we would use the terms ‘video installation’ for Poltergeist (simultaneous film projection). As I said above in regard to Antero Maggi, simultaneous projection is a typical byproduct of the development of video art. Another node point, connecting simultaneous projection, Laterna Magika and video art is the specific treatment of time within these media. The fundamental difference between cinema and video, even at the experimental level, lies in their respective treatment of the time factor. Video can, and does, represent real time which in cinematic projects such as Edgar and Andy Warhol, emerges as a self-contradictory element. As Harri Frisch’s early realizations of video art, newly entered the topical character. The video medium was identified with directness and immediacy of the opportunity to relay filmed material without delay, connected from the start to using single cameras and projectors at once.

It is obvious that the concept of parallel film projection through a concrete space onto projection surfaces placed in a visually calculated way has now been integrated into the operation of Isolab, commonly used in video studios abortions of archeology. This development has been brought about by the work of artists like Bill Viola and Tony Oursler and others who experimented with the composition and form of projection surfaces. Nebodies simultaneous film projection was the direct forerunner of their work.  

Kinoautomat. The organization of the Czech representation at the Expo ’70 in Montreux placed Radio Cirkona in the interactive field. Cirkona suggested the realization of his creation, the Cine-automat the Kinoautomat came up with this novelty of handling over to the audience the decision about plot. Using a voting machine (kaleidoscope) built into the seats, the filmmaker gave the viewers several opportunities to decide on the further plot development. The show included performances by the film’s lead actor Mirakal Harkoll, live on stage, he created a bridge between virtual narration and the real breaks between viewing segments in which he offered comments. The feat always concluded his lively film commentary by offering the viewers a choice of the next development. The Kinoautomat was indeed ‘interactive’. The projectionist in his cabinet in all the passageway to the viewers among the which the viewer could choose. The film, an ironic joke of life, in an ‘ordinary block of rental apartments’ was a delightful example of the outstanding Czech New Wave of the 1960s.

The Kinoautomat made the passive viewer active, and through this opportunity to become what we might today call a film ‘user’. Humanly, a control system helps to materialize a true entrance into the virtual world of film that the viewer can form through the soil of primitive mechanical tools. The often overlooked ‘optical’ phenomenon is significant. This precedent has shown that simple human instruments allow even a casual spectator and user to intervene, form and with a medium so highly elusive as film. In a time when DVD technology makes it possible to edit and work on a film (Be it a video or the biggest Hollywood blockbuster with a personal computer), a return to the Kinoautomat is meaningful.

17. See: From Popper et al., n. 5, 1972.