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ABSTRACT. From sweeping panoramas in Westerns to gritty noirscape in Los Angeles to travelogues in places both close to home and faraway, landscape is central in the formation of cinematic space. Landscape gives meaning to cinematic events and positions narratives within a particular scale and historical context. Where place and landscape ground action and the construction of meaning, space provides the stage for the story to unfold. Landscape and film are both social constructions that rely primarily on vision and perception for their very definition. Vision links and distances us from cinema and landscape; it makes it easier for us to be disengaged through the act of viewing. Yet there is an intimate bond in this disengagement, where the viewer must reach out and establish some sense of place whether it is through a windshield, on a movie screen, or standing in the middle of a scape. Our attachments to and understanding of landscapes are necessarily mediated by culture, attitude and experience. There is a link between landscape and cinema, one that is deeply engrained in the American mind and in the land. This essay combines the metaphors of theater and text to explore how landscape functions in cinema and television.

INTRODUCTION

In 1979 excerpts from J. B. Jackson’s Carl O. Sauer memorial lecture were published in Landscape magazine. Aptly titled “Landscape as Theater,” Jackson explored the metaphor and suggested that its popularity peaked in the late 16th century. During that era, theater was often used in combination with travel and geography. Landscape as theater implies the interrelationship of three different items: (1) that theater is a staged production with a set of socially and artistically determined rules, (2) that humans control and design the landscape as if it were a theatrical stage,
and (3) that theater imparts the human ability to see ourselves as occupying the center of the stage (Jackson 1979). According to Jackson, the metaphor of landscape as theater initially focused on spectacle—human control of the stage—and later shifted to drama—the analysis and solution of a problem—before being rejected for more vivid metaphors that define landscape. Theater was, and is, a useful analogy for landscape because it "emphasized the visual, the spectacular aspect of the environment, but it also suggested a spectacle in the sense of a dramatic production with a well-defined space, an organization of place and time, and a coherent action" (Jackson 1979, 4).

Jackson's essay offers a useful starting point for a discussion of cinematic landscapes. Landscape as theater is suited for an examination of cinema because theater is its immediate artistic predecessor. The early film industry lacked 19th century industrial precursors and as such copied craft production techniques from theater (Storper 1989; Musser 1990; Lukinbeal 2002). With its emphasis on the visual, the spectacular, and male control of the stage, this metaphor emphasizes landscape and cinema as a cultural production, a space that is mediated by power relations.

If, as Jackson argues, landscape as theater reflected the 16th century, then landscape as text is the metaphor of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. Landscape as text is the dominant metaphor in film geography because it provides a means to explore the intersection between narration and geography. While a useful and appropriate device to engage landscape, the metaphor also works to constrain the discourse surrounding cinematic landscapes. Tim Cresswell and Deborah Dixon (2002) argue that landscape as text has become hegemonic within the subfield of film geography and may even reinforce the binary logic of real-reel. This logic is clearly apparent in Andrew Horton's (2003, 71) recent essay where he states, "all landscapes in cinema are 'reel.' That is to say, both landscapes that look like we could touch them, walk through them and smell them, as well as those that look entirely fanciful or theatrical, are presented to us through the medium of film."

This type of binary logic privileges material landscapes and firmly positions cinematic landscape as "representation." Academic geography has a long history of privileging the real over the reel, a legacy that goes back to an emphasis on descriptive fieldwork. Christina Kennedy and Chris Lukinbeal (1997) trace the legacy of this binary back to David Lowenthal's (1961) influential paper, "Geography, Experience, and Imagination: Towards a Geographical
Epistemology" where sensory perception and cognition are privileged over social and cultural ways of knowing. A key issue in the debate about new versus traditional cultural geography focused on the overt emphasis placed on the study of material landscapes by traditional cultural geography (Price and Lewis 1993a, 1993b; Cosgrove 1993; Duncan 1993; Jackson 1993). New cultural geographers responded by focusing on nonmaterial landscapes and representations (Cosgrove 1984, 1987, 1993; Daniels and Cosgrove 1988; Daniels 1989; Aitken and Zonn 1994; Natter and Jones 1993).

I have argued that the backlash of these debates was to link film to the negative end of each binary which relieves cinematic research to the back of the cultural geography agenda (Lukinbeal 2004a). While the textual metaphor has its uses when studying cinematic landscapes, it brings with it some added binary baggage that we need to be aware of before deploying it. Landscape as theater points to cinema’s double ontology: as image and industry (Fitzmaurice 2001). Where landscape as text limits cinema’s ontology to the image, theater moves beyond this boundary. Jackson’s (1979, 4) metaphor repositions our focus from only image to the four functions that landscape can serve in narrative film: place (as an “organized place and time”), space (as “a well-defined space”), spectacle (as a “spectacular environment”) and metaphor (as a “dramatic production” and a “coherent action”).

In this essay, I investigate the cinematic landscapes of Hollywood. I do so by drawing on the metaphors of theater and text to explore Andrew Higson’s (1984, 1987) taxonomy of the functions landscape can serve in narrative cinema and on television.

LANDSCAPE AS SPACE

Landscape as space is closely tied to the term “placeless” and generic representations of place (Relph 1976). In this volume, Kevin McHugh’s essay challenges our preconceived notions of placelessness. Wal-Mart is the central focus of Doug Hawes-Davis’ movie, This is Nowhere. Hawes-Davis interviews people who travel the United States and camp in Wal-Mart parking lots. Through weaving disparate interviews with imagery and dissonant music, Hawes-Davis seeks to show how one group of Americans responds to the homogenization and globalization processes in the American landscape. In contrast to Yi-Fu Tuan’s (1977) classic definition of place, Nowhere, or Wal-Mart, is a center of felt values and a community of the mobile.
As space, landscape provides an area in which the drama of the film can unfold. As such, landscape is constantly turned into a space of action. Put another way, social space de-centers the importance of locational place allowing narratives to unfold (Higson 1984; Aitken and Zonn 1994). It is here that mise-en-scène becomes important; where place-space tensions and dynamics occur. Landscape as space is always subordinate to the drama of the narrative. As space, landscape is minimized by the cinematic shot (typically full, medium, and close-up) and the camera angle (eye level or near eye level, and possibly low and oblique angles). With these angles and shots the attention of the viewer remains focused on the social space and dialogue between actors. Close-ups of characters with blurry backgrounds, shots that remove the landscape from view revealing only an object and the sky, or action shots that move rapidly through a landscape, are examples of landscape as space.

Throughout the history of American cinema, there have been times when landscape as space dominated film production. Landscape as space is most frequently filmed on studio sets or on backlots. Sets and backlots offer generic spaces which can be used for multiple narrative purposes. Larry Ford (1994) and Mark Rappaport (1980) argue that American silent films used landscape as a stage upon which live action could happen. While one can point to some staged productions from this era, landscape as space did not become dominant until the coming of sound and the studio system. During that era, landscape was frequently depicted as painted backdrops on sets. The studio system era marked the height of the use of landscape as space in feature films, an era of “constriction and artificiality” that lasted for over three decades (Maier 1994, 3). Landscape as space would dominate television productions (TV series, TV movies) and low budget features from the 1960s to present. While there are always exceptions, most of these productions focus on social narration rather than geographic realism.

**LANDSCAPE AS PLACE**

Landscape as place is closely associated with the geographic expression “sense of place” and refers to the location where the narrative is supposedly set (whether real or imagined). Place provides narrative realism by grounding a film to a particular location’s regional sense of place and history. Landscape as place provides realism and requires the viewer to read the story as taking
place or more precisely, “events take place” (Wollen 1980, 25). In film, events take place and transform it into narrative space. Movies also take place in a particular geographic location. This geography in film holds the action in place. Bernard Nietschmann (1993) argued that there are four ways a film can depict a strong sense of place. First, the narrative is told in such a way that it allows the viewer to understand the various geographic scales that are negotiated throughout the production. By allowing geographic scale to be comprehended, the viewer never becomes displaced, or lost in narrative space. Second, films that use multiple signifiers of place rather than just stereotypical ones allow the everyday complexities of place to be available to the viewer. Third, films can position place in the foreground as a supporting actor, rather than merely as background scenery (Aitken and Zonn 1994). Fourth, narratives can be situated within place rather than simply focused on actions and events. Some directors like Walter Salles, Robert Redford, Clint Eastwood, Steven Soderbergh, Woody Allen, and, importantly in this collection, John Sayles allow place to play a central role in the shaping of the film’s ambience. For them landscape as place becomes a central component of the narrative in that it acts upon social space. This is similar to Don Mitchell’s (2000) claim that landscapes do “work” because they reinforce specific social identities. While landscapes are read and interpreted for visual signs, they also mediate our interpretation (Rose 2003). According to Gillian Rose (2003, 167), a landscape’s “visuality is seen as looking back, if you like, and having an effect itself.”

Landscape as place, through on-location filming, dominated the pre-nickelodeon era. Landscape provides the subject and the purpose of many of these early films. In essence, landscape served as a found event, grounding the entire subject matter for early actuality films (Gasher 1995, 236). Actuality films were grounded by landscape as place and spectacle because the location was the central focus of the film. Landscape as place not only includes the exotic location through the foreign travelogue and newsreel genres, but also the familiar locale in the city film (Fig. 1).² With the travel film, an expert travel narrator would often accompany the production explaining what was being depicted. Of all the early genres the travel genre was, according to Charles Musser (1985, 47), “one of the most popular and developed forms of film practice in the pre-nickelodeon era.” Half of the features listed as headline attractions in Vitagraphs’ 1903 catalogue were travel subjects (Musser 1985).
Landscape as place is often established in the master shot or the establishing shot. The master shot occurs at, or near, the beginning of the film; usually a long shot that is panned or tracked. Master shots may simply be archive footage of locations, second unit productions or first unit production shots. Landscape as place is usually depicted in extreme long shots, long shots and deep focus shots, using a bird’s-eye view or high angle camera setup (the angle is usually situated in a position where the camera’s eye can see a great distance).

For example, in *Class Action* (1991) the master shot is also the opening shot. As intriguing music excites the spectator, an aerial shot, with the top of the Golden Gate Bridge in the foreground, pans across the bay, over the Bay Bridge, Treasure Island, and the Transamerica Building, and ends by zooming on downtown San Francisco. Subsequent shots place the action at the human scale of the streetscape: trolley cars, traffic, people on their way to work, and city hall. Master shots rely on icons and stereotypes of place to establish a cognitive map of the narrative’s geographic location. This cognitive map depends on the audience understanding the central icons of a location (the Golden Gate, Transamerica Building, trolley cars). This does not mean that a person needed to visit the location to understand these icons. The repetitious use of icons by film and television of particular places and buildings can create a representational legacy that works to construct and establish a cognitive map, a sense of place. For instance, the distinctive wrought-iron interior of the Bradbury Building in downtown Los Angeles has its own representational legacy because it has been featured in 20 different films including, for example, *Se7en*, *Blade Runner*, *Wolf* and *Chinatown* (Fig. 2).

Returning to a pan shot of a landscape during the film reestablishes the individual or action in its environment. Place is not simply on display in this case, but positions and authenticates the
Fig. 2. The Bradbury Building located at 304 S. Broadway in Los Angeles.

narrative (Higson 1984). Through repetition these images reinforce and create a bond between narrative and place. For instance, the popular television show *Friends* uses reestablishing shots of Manhattan following nearly all commercial breaks. These re-establishing shots intermix icons of Manhattan at various scales: from the human scale of the street to shots of the skyline. While
most of the narrative action occurs in a landscape of space filmed in a Los Angeles studio, the show's place in Manhattan is reaffirmed and established through the repetitious use of the building at 90 Bedford Street in Greenwich Village (Fig. 3).
LANDSCAPE AS SPECTACLE

Landscape in film can be simply a spectacle—something beautiful and visually pleasant (Higson 1984, 1987). As spectacle, landscape combines a number of functions in one image. For example, in the master shot, landscape functions as place and spectacle. As spectacle, it can be something fascinating in itself, thereby momentarily satisfying a voyeuristic appeal created by the narrative. In this instance topophilia and scopophilia combine when landscape and screen are one with the voyeuristic desire. This can happen when the filmmaker returns to a pan shot of a landscape during the film. Here, landscape is either a spectacle of beauty or a spectacle because it generates curiosity and interest.

Landscape as spectacle encodes power relations within the gaze. Determination of what constitutes beauty, who is gazing and what we are gazing upon, are questions which help expose the inherent power relations embedded within cinematic landscapes. Gillian Rose (2001, 6) calls this the concept of the scopic regime or "what is seen and how it is seen are culturally constructed." This is not a monolithic construction; rather, various scopic regimes exist for different social and cultural groups throughout the world. In her well-known essay, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Film," Laura Mulvey (1975) seeks to expose the scopic regime of Hollywood cinema. Mulvey contends that Hollywood's glamour and charm come from a skillful manipulation of the medium which seeks to establish and codify meaning to deliver scopophilic pleasure. Mulvey argues that Hollywood cinema is dominated by the patriarchal gaze; one where the male character looks, we look, and the female character is looked at. Gillian Rose (1993) would later use Laura Mulvey's arguments to challenge the hegemony of the white male gaze in landscape studies.

Hollywood's voyeuristic pleasure was first codified through the establishment of the classical paradigm. Miriam Hanson (1990, 55) explains that the classical paradigm is a "mode of narration" that makes "films self-explanatory and self-contained, that allowed them to be understood by a mass audience regardless of cultural and ethnic backgrounds." The classical paradigm dominates Hollywood film and was elaborated upon through various codes and styles between 1907 and 1917 (Hanson 1990, 1991). This paradigm transformed cinema "from a primarily working-class entertainment to an ostensibly classless institution of popular culture, as the focus of industrial attention shifted from the
neighborhood nickelodeon to the downtown picture palace" (Hanson 1990, 55). Pre-nickelodeon modes of narration often depended upon the audience having foreknowledge of events, as in the city film, or being mediated by a lecturer, as in the travel film (Kirby 1989). Because of this, many early films were not self-contained representations, but relied on the audience's participation to create the movie-going experience.

With this style of exhibition the meaning associated with the film was highly contingent upon the local, social context of consumption (ethnicity, gender, class, etc.). In other words, the scale of the scopic regime was extremely limited. In contrast, the classical paradigm sought to remove the unpredictability of interpretation and reception by standardizing a film's meaning within narration. Narration in the classical paradigm became a commodity because it elides the social differences of local scale and attempts to move the consumption of a product to a larger scale by standardizing and naturalizing the production of the narration (Hanson 1990, 55). With the implementation of the classical paradigm the scale of consumption shifts from the local to the national and international. In other words, the scopic regime of Hollywood had to be implanted into the narrative style and be accepted as natural by its viewers, something that took a number of decades.

Whereas early cinematic techniques rarely focused the viewer's attention on the narrative, the classical paradigm sought to control the gaze through a detailed articulation of meaning. Rather than closing off the interaction previously associated with film reception, the classical paradigm incorporates the spectator into the film product by anticipating and frustrating the viewer's desire. The viewer becomes "an ideal, textually centered spectator ... spectator-ship became the commodity form of reception" (Hanson 1990, 56). With spectatorship centered on an ideal spectator (typically a white, middle-class male), classic narration allows a barrier to form between the viewer and the image. Interactions between viewer and image become perceptually segregated and enforced through a number of film styles. First, the viewer becomes invisible to anyone within the diegesis, the world of the film's narrative. This allows the viewer to maintain omnipresence in filmic space while becoming removed from that space (sometimes called the "god-trick"). Second, fictional closure with unity and continuity within composition presents an encapsulated insular filmic space. Continuity is also gendered where males dominate narrative through powerful, pre-written characterizations that allow men to command the
center of the stage. In contrast, a woman's glamour is erotically objectified. In filmic space the stage is a “spatial illusion in which he articulates the look and creates the action” (Mulvey 1975, 13). Finally, the mode of reception shifts from a space of interaction between the viewer and a film to one where the "god-trick" replaces interaction with segregation (Hanson 1990, 1991).

LANDSCAPE AS METAPHOR

Similar to landscape as spectacle, metaphor seeks to bridge the tensions created by the transformation of place into space. Herein lies an important way in which cinematic landscapes exceed the bounds of the image. Stuart Aitken and Leo Zonn (1993, 195) explain that, as viewers, “we can ‘suspend our disbelief’ and embrace the ‘dubious’ meanings constructed within the landscape.” Through the use of metaphor, meaning and ideology are appropriated into landscape, the most common example of which is the attribution of human or social characteristics to landscape (Durgnant 1965; Sherman 1967; Rappaport 1980; Higson 1984, 1987; Aitken and Zonn 1994). This process of attribution is more appropriately called naturalization; where a narrative seeks to pass off that which is cultural as natural (Duncan and Ley 1993). The subfield of film geography has primarily engaged issues that illustrate how cultural politics is naturalized in film. Cultural politics refers to the “domain in which meanings are constructed and negotiated, where relations of dominance and subordination are defined and contested” (Jackson 1991, 200). Film geographers have examined the cultural politics of such varied themes as race (Zonn and Winchell 2002; Natter 2002; Aitken 2003; Mains 2004), cultural identity (Smith 2002; Zonn and Winchell 2002), violence (Kirsch 2002) and gender (Aitken and Lukinbeal 1997, 1998; Lukinbeal and Aitken 1998; Aitken 2001; Dahlman 2002; Craine and Aitken 2004; Holmes, Zonn and Cravey 2004).

Johnston, Gregory, Pratt, and Watts (2000, 500) distinguish between large and small metaphors. Small metaphors are rhetoric devices or literary tropes, for instance, a character is sad and it begins to rain. Other examples include the use of the desert to represent a location of evil and/or the supernatural. Small metaphors naturalize prevalent cultural stereotypes about landscape. Stereotypes for the geographer are “a process of categorization through which distinctive features of one place are used to give identity”
Stereotypes link assumptions about cultural and behavioral characteristics to particular places. Stereotypes about place in film can contribute to a sense of place, but also naturalize cultural politics about place and people.

It is also suggested that large metaphors "structure research paradigms" (Johnston et al. 2000). Extrapolating from this, large metaphors in film structure common ways of seeing the landscape for a social or cultural group. Cinematic landscapes are sites where meaning is contested and negotiated, a veritable arena of cultural politics. That which is perceived as natural, ordinary or normal in the cinematic landscape is explained as, "a site of contest in one case, and the landscape as a site for the affirmation of the dominant narratives of identity, in the other ..." (Mitchell 2001, 277). In other words, naturalized meaning only appears natural to the dominant group. Power relations and the mediation of meaning is embedded in the production, depiction, and consumption of every cinematic landscape. For instance, an anti-urban sentiment pervades much of Hollywood cinema (Sherman 1967; Holtan 1971; Clark and Allen 1977; Gold 1984, 1985; Lukinbeal and Kennedy 1993; Ford 1994; McArthur 1997). Cities are commonly depicted in simple terms of country versus city, city and loss of innocence, and movement to country to find happiness (Holtan 1971). Hollywood cinema perpetuates the myth that cities will inevitably be the destruction of humanity, which makes it all the more difficult to create and maintain a livable urban environment. This myth forms the foundation for noir cities. In Gary Hausladen and Paul Starrs' essay, the "city as labyrinth" becomes the dominant metaphor for an impersonal place where dreams are dashed and relationships fail or become destroyed. Frank Krutnik (1997) suggests that the cultural politics inherent in noir cities may be traced back to the Industrial Revolution and Tönnies' distinction between gemeinschaft and gesellschaft. Larry Ford (1994, 119) remarks that "cities have been illuminated in increasingly complex and often contradictory ways in films and that by examining this topic, we may add an additional layer of understanding to our knowledge of place-making and place representation."

Christina Dando's essay shows how the cinematic landscape of Boys Don't Cry encodes the Plains with a frontier metaphor, a powerful and mythical landscape that sits near the core of America's national identity. Both Anna Dempsey and Christina Dando explore Hollywood's dominant patriarchal gaze and how it engenders the landscape in various ways. Dando exposes the
gendered binary of nature/nurture/female and male/civilization/order within the frontier myth and shows how this cultural politic is represented in place, space and social dynamics. Dempsey shows how the production of feminine metaphors in some independent films seeks to disrupt the hegemony of Hollywood’s patriarchal scopic regime.

Daniel Arreola’s essay about *Lone Star* explores the cultural politics of race, ethnicity and power relations embedded in a border town along the Texas/Mexico boundary. A prominent metaphor in *Lone Star* relates to menudo (Mexican tripe soup). In the film, menudo refers to the residential propinquity of racial and ethnic groups. Arreola shows how landscape identity is not simply about the material landscape, but rather, identity is continually constructed and negotiated by the people in the landscape through their narratives and history.

**CONCLUSION**

Through the process of making a location usable for narrative film, place is constantly turned into space. Usually this occurs through the use of landscape as spectacle and metaphor. With spectacle, landscape jumps to the foreground because it is spectacular or a spectacle of the view. With landscape as metaphor cultural politics are made to appear natural. In narrative films, landscape as spectacle and landscape as metaphor can be used as transitional phases between sense of place and placelessness. On the one hand, landscape as spectacle can retain a sense of place and simultaneously disrupt narrative space. When cinema retains its sense of place the mise-en-scène spatial meaning remains open to interpretation. In these instances narrative films may contain a more realistic representation of a landscape where the viewer can begin to establish a cognitive map of the social and physical geography. When landscape functions as a metaphor, spatial meaning is tied to the narrative’s text and thus the viewer’s cognitive map is influenced by the cultural politics embedded in the metaphors. Cinematic landscapes can also serve more than one function simultaneously. For instance, both landscape and cinema are defined through the act of viewing and therefore all cinematic landscapes at some level function as spectacles.

The cultural politics of cinematic landscapes encompass two interrelated themes. The first is mimesis or the "the belief that we should strive to produce as accurate a reflection of the world as
possible" (Duncan and Ley 1993, 2). According to James Duncan and David Ley (1993), mimesis strikes to the very core of ontological debates surrounding cultural geography and the crisis of representation. They argue that Anglo-American geography is constituted by four major modes of representation: two that fall under the mimetic rubric (ethnographic fieldwork and positivism) and two which challenge mimesis (hermeneutics and postmodernism). Landscape as place and spectacle both deal with the mimetic belief. On the other hand landscape as space and metaphor deal with the cultural politics of diegesis and cultural text. To new cultural geographers, landscape, nature and cinema are all cultural texts represented in the built environment, and in writing and audiovisual representations. Whatever form landscape takes, its symbolic qualities sustain and enlighten social meaning and, consequently, have broadened the sources available for cultural geographers (Cosgrove, 1984, 1987, 1993; Daniels and Cosgrove, 1988; Daniels, 1989).

To simply state that the landscape as place is somehow qualitatively better than landscape as space is to miss the multi-layered scales of resolution within cinematic landscapes. Landscape as space, or placelessness, in film and television can be mapped and charted; they simply require us to extend our inquiry beyond the image and into the realm of film production. Film production sites for landscape as space typically occur where it is cheapest to film. In general, landscape as place grounds narrative action to location sites with specific aesthetic qualities, whereas sites for landscape as space are chosen based on cost effectiveness (Lukinbeal 2004b). The tensions and dynamics between space and place extend to cinema as image and as industry. Under cinema’s double ontology, there is a constant dialectic between the economy of production and the aesthetics of narration. For instance, in an effort to save money the producers of Cold Mountain (2003) chose to construct a North Carolina sense of place in Romania. In this example, economy outweighs aesthetics and cinematic space becomes placeless.

To assume landscape as place is somehow more realistic and thus a more accurate representation of reality is to ignore the fact the realism is an aesthetic tool that tries to make a narrative more real to the viewer. This aesthetic tool allows viewers to suspend their disbelief and cross the threshold into representational space. Realism refers to a representational practice that attempts to hide its mode of production—its labor and technology—enabling the representation of reality. Realism is therefore an aesthetic issue
focusing on the relationship between what is depicted in the mise-en-scène and how the viewer receives that depiction (Kerr 1986). Because of this, realism is also ideological because it seeks to hide and naturalizes the production process. Elsewhere I argue that suspension of disbelief is a spatial issue in that an individual seeks to disregard the difference between what is real and reel (Lukinbeal 1998). Cinematic realism seeks to strengthen this disregard by ontologically bridging the divide between real and reel. As long as suspension of disbelief is maintained the viewer’s attention is on the narrative and not on the physical landscape. Suspension of disbelief is destroyed when geographic realism is not maintained. In effect, the viewer figures out that the narrative is lying, that the landscape is not really the location being depicted. Geographers can cite a multitude of these crimes against geography: from Southern California hillsides doubling for Korea in the television show M.A.S.H; the English Patient (1996) using Tunisia to represent 1930s Cairo, Egypt; or 40 Days and 40 Nights (2002) projecting Vancouver to represent San Francisco. A narrative retains its geographic validity and realism and is only guilty of lying if the viewer realizes that the ontological bridge has been destroyed. Consequently, narrative is the dominant and controlling factor of Hollywood’s cinematic landscape and the only thing that trumps narrative is economics. The process of doubling, or using one location to substitute for another, is a common film production practice done to save money and keep a production on budget.

Where the metaphor of landscape as text helps us to explore narration and cultural text, landscape as theatre exposes the interplay between diegesis and mimesis, image and industry. Theatre, text, image, industry, event and narrative all come together in cinematic landscapes. Whether the emotional landscapes of cinematic memories, the downtown marquee of a dying cinema, the filmed locations in our neighborhoods, or the globalized spectacle of Hollywood, cinematic landscapes are not mere representations but are working landscapes involved with cultural production and reproduction. Cinematic landscapes include the world of film production (Lukinbeal 2002, 2004b), distribution (Scott 2004) and consumption (Jancovich, Faire and Stublings 2003; Forsher 2003). In the global cinematic landscape Toronto is the other New York City for Hollywood’s scopic regime and the Alps are the other Kashmir in Bollywood. Cinematic landscape extends far behind the silver screen to intersect how we narrate our identities in our landscapes and
how we define the extent of ourselves within a global cinematic community.

NOTES

1. Mise-en-scène, from the French "putting in the scene," refers to the modification of space, or the arrangement of performers and items within the visual field of the camera. Mise-en-scène is the space framed by the camera's visual field that the spectator witnesses when watching a movie.


3. Second unit production is where a camera crew goes to a location to film the master shot and other locational scenery. Second unit shooting can also take the form of "guerilla filming" or "drive-by shooting." In these cases a filmmaker does not obtain permission from the location film commission to shoot at a location.

4. Ferdinand Tönnies (1957) made the basic distinction between two social groups: gemeinschaft and gesellschaft. Gemeinschaft, often translated as "community," referred to traditional agrarian environments characterized by tight knit social relations based around family and kin. Gesellschaft, often translated as "society," referred to urbanized environments characterized by individualism, anomie and loose-knit relations between people.

REFERENCES


Cinematic Landscapes


Natter, Wolfgang. 2002. ‘We Just Gotta Eliminate ‘em’: On Whiteness and Film in *Matewan, Avalon and Bulworth*. In *Engaging Film: Geographies*


Chris Lukinbeal is Assistant Professor of Geography at Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287.