# THE ROUTLEDGE COMPANION TO HISTORY AND THE MOVING IMAGE

*Edited by Marnie Hughes-Warrington, Kim Nelson, and Mia E.M. Treacey*

# 17

# LIVE DOCUMENTARY

## Social cinema and the cinepoetics of doubt

*Kim Nelson*

# 17

# LIVE DOCUMENTARY

## Social cinema and the cinepoetics of doubt

*Kim Nelson*

Making sense of the past is meaningful and freighted. As Frank Ankersmit attests with more than a dash of angst, "[y]ou can approximate objectivity only as long as you sincerely despair of approximating it" (2012, 244). Similarly, Natalie Zemon Davis claims that history is only pursued through "struggle" (1987, 459). Live Documentaries are in-person spectacles that present images on a predominant screen with the author or co-author addressing the audience. A practice that merges old forms with new technologies, the Live Documentary weaves the *despair* and *struggle* required of any committed truth-seeking quest into the presentation of the work itself. The form offers a compelling model to pursue history, performing the search for historical truth with curiosity, complexity, and reticence while making narrative uncertainty palatable for broad and diverse audiences. Live Documentaries, as exemplified by the work of Sam Green, depicted in Figure 17.1, are an intriguing part of the palette of cinematic engagements with actuality.

Live Documentaries respond to the challenge forwarded by Hayden White in his essay, "The Burden of History," which calls upon historians to get creative, employ contemporary art practices, and embrace innovative models and expressions (1966). The open and malleable form of Live Documentary responds to pressing concerns about the mediation and reception of popular history in moving images, staging a collective historicity by revisiting and digitizing practices from film's deep past. They re-expand cinema into previously explored territory from the origins of film exhibition, reengaging the components of an entertainment designed to introduce the invention of screen technology to an audience. This chapter explores the Live Documentary as a crucial intervention in the expression of history in moving images, interrogating its brand of historiophoty through the work of its twenty-first-century pioneer, Sam Green. Finally, it will describe the unique character of Live Documentary's embodied spectatorship and its increased resonance in an age ruled by binary codes that foster binary points of view. Live Documentaries extend specific benefits to the exploration of the past via the moving image, modelling a metamodern historiophoty that reenergizes communal spectatorship while reclaiming and renegotiating our access to truth in a supposedly "post-truth" world.

*Figure 17.1*  Sam Green performs *Utopia in Four Movements*, which includes the core elements of a Live
Documentary: a narrator, musical accompaniment, a commanding screen, and a live audience.

## Terms of art

Live Documentaries combine moving images with live narration to explore real events of the past
for an audience in-house. They stage a highly accessible form of *Expanded Cinema* that subverts
and "expands" mainstream film practices by recounting the past through *story* and constructing
a discernable but ruptured linearity and argument. In the process, Live Documentary contributes
to the project of public history, decades into our experiment as a "society of the spectacle," by
breaking down silos and bringing people together physically and psychically (Debord 1994).
Stan VanDerBeek coined the term Expanded Cinema in the 1960s, describing it as an experi-
mental film practice defined by blurring or blowing out commercial and conventional boundaries
(Tate n.d.). Francesco Casetti quotes filmmaker Valie Export's definition of Expanded Cinema
as a mode in which "the film phenomenon is initially split up into its formal components, and
then put back together in a new way" (2015, 91). While this explains the fundamentals of the
form, Shana MacDonald turns to the function of the audience, delineating Expanded Cinema as
operating by "situating viewers as a corporeal witness to nuanced iterations of time and space"
that "addresses audiences less as spectators and more as collaborators…construct[ing] liminal,
intermedial, affectively oriented spectatorial environments" (2018, 17). Live Documentaries
belong to an accessible subset of Expanded Cinema. They offer a salve in our fractured political
moment, swapping virtual space for a physical place, setting out in pursuit of historical truth by
assembling a communal search party.

A mode of cinema-verité in its dissemination, Live Documentaries spotlight the role of the author in constructing meaning in *post-production*. They expose authorship in the editing process of assembling meaning from audiovisual materials rather than showing us a director traipsing before the camera in the material-gathering phase. Such authorial openness is crucial for history, committed to the complex, slippery, and vital concept of truth. Live Documentary cultivates critical engagement, which is invaluable to history for mass and diverse audiences. They foreground their mediation through the author's spectral presence manifested on stage and reveal aspects of historiographical process while simultaneously signalling their contingency as channelled through a narrator's perspective. Transporting the rhetoric and address of traditional documentary films to a live experience with an audience, they invert the captivating power of the screen by presenting the director as a corporeal body on stage—a subjectivity that does not need to be explained to be understood.

All edited documentaries forward arguments and perspectives about the real; therefore, they negotiate truth by addressing the past; they historicize (Nichols 1991, x). As such, they benefit from historiographical analysis. Hayden White proposed the term historiophoty as a project for media scholars to tackle and deal with the specifics of historiography in popular moving-image media (1988). Robert Berkhofer defines historiography as attending to (i) the history of historical practices, (ii) theories, and (iii) methods of history (1998, 227–228). It follows that historiophoty pertains to popular moving images and film history, as it relates to (1) the history of history expressed in moving images, (2) theories, and (3) methods of historicization in the moving image.

Given that the terms film, video, cinema, and television are each too specific to describe the medium that propels history in moving images, I propose the term *moving histories* to describe popular works in moving images about real events in the past (Nelson 2022). A platform-agnostic concept, it refers to moving images, whether in cinemas or installations, on televisions or makeshift screens, computers, or mobile phones. Moving histories concern real events that: (a) ended before production began, (b) impact people beyond the community of participants, (c) reveal social or political aspects of culture in the past, and (d) align with at least one of Robert Burgoyne's genres of the history, either epic, war, biographical, topical (about a particular event), or metahistorical film (to some extent concerned with the representation of history) (Burgoyne 2008, 3). A strength of Live Documentaries is that they are intrinsically metahistorical.

As part of an appeal to wide audiences, moving histories make truth claims through adherence to conventions of dramatic storytelling and cinema realism. Unlike avant-garde or experimental works, they do not subsume narrative logic, structure, and flow to subjectivity and contingency. Moving histories may or may not express a sense of *despair* and *struggle* for objectivity, but they always make a historical argument as part of a sensual, visceral portal for time travel (Nelson 2022, 311–313). Their greatest strengths and weaknesses are bound in their mimetic properties. Moving histories deliver mesmerizing audiovisual hallucinations with absolute ease of access, rendering the past in such fine detail that they bury and belie the instability, supposition, and presentism wrapped into their constructions. Unlike written histories that demand much of their readers' imaginations, spectators slip into moving histories as mute, invisibility-cloaked witnesses. Live Documentaries temper the overwhelming power of moving histories to project history without disrupting their magic.

## Sam Green and the invention of the contemporary practice of
## Live Documentary

Sam Green began his career in traditional documentary. His first feature-length film received an Oscar nomination. That documentary, *The Weather Underground* (2002), presents the eponymous group of student protesters from the University of Michigan, who formed in 1969 to resist the Vietnam War and policies of the American government. Seven years after making that first film, Green conceived the format of the Live Documentary from a creative block as he was crafting *Utopia in Four Movements* (2010), a feature-length documentary fuelled by intellectual ideas about "the history of the utopian impulse" ("Sam Green" n.d.). Friends who viewed early cuts of the documentary-in-progress confirmed his impression that the edit was not working. To fix it, he organized a screening with the film's clips loaded onto *PowerPoint* slides. He coaxed friends to play live music as he presented the work in progress for feedback. The reaction to the experiment was resoundingly positive, but rather than focusing exclusively on content, the spectators also applauded the form, encouraging him to continue to develop the piece in the way he had presented it (Sam Green, interview with author, 2019). The result, co-directed by Dave Cerf performing the soundtrack, premiered at the Sundance Film Festival in 2010.

Green has performed across North America, Europe, and beyond. In most cases, his staging includes a proscenium stage with a large screen at its centre. Live music plays from one side as he narrates from the other. Since his first Live Documentary, he has continued working in traditional and emerging forms of documentary while also creating more feature-length Live Documentaries, including *The Love Song of R. Buckminster Fuller* (2012), a collaboration with music group *Yo La Tengo* that presents a brief history of the architect, futurist, and 1960s celebrity; *The Measure of All Things* (2014), a light-hearted reflection and compendium of entries from the *Guinness Book of World Records* performed with the band *yMusic*; *A Thousand Thoughts* (2018) a history of the *Kronos Quartet* featuring live accompaniment by the group. COVID-imposed workarounds forced an online exhibition of the Live Documentary *32 Sounds* (2022) with music by JD Samson at Sundance in January 2022. Green describes *32 Sounds* as a "meditation on the power of sound to bend time, cross borders, and profoundly shape our perception of the world around us" (Green, n.d.). Although online screenings drain the true liveness of the experience, it was accompanied by an outdoor rooftop performance in Los Angeles on January 29, 2022 (Sam Green, email with author, 2022).

The focus of Green's Live Documentaries spans moving histories in the biographical genre, including *The Love Song of R. Buckminster Fuller* and *A Thousand Thoughts,* to topical projects like *Utopia in Four Movements*, *The Measure of All Things*, and *32 Sounds*. Of interest to historiophoty and this chapter are the historiographical affordances of the form rather than the specifics of content. Green's Live Documentaries are always metahistorical. They stage subjectivity and probe the narrative process while disentangling the functions of structure, argument, and music in moving images for scrutiny by the audience. As a narrator, Green approaches each subject with verve and humour. He self-reflexively engages the concerns of historiography by touching upon the research process in the archive. His works include both archival imagery and depictions of Green in the archive. He expresses a metamodern sensibility as he embeds his own questions, concerns, desires, failures, and qualifications about the narrative into the performance in progress.

Live Documentaries enact what Alun Munslow describes as the true sense of history by highlighting the historian's perspective as the adjudicator of "evidence *selected*, sources *chosen*,

concepts and theories *applied*" (2010, 110). They also fit Berkhofer's definition as a new form of historicization, as they:

> breach paradigms and problematics; cross epistemic, interpretive, and political communi-
> ties; and invent new forms of expression, critical reading and reviewing can foster reflexive
> contextualization and multicultural ideals as they (re)construct and (re)construe what a
> textualization achieved and how. Ultimately, the task of the active reader and the critical
> reviewer is to exhibit the same reflexivity that any new historicization ought to manifest.
> How did they themselves put it all together?
>
> (1998, 282)

Live Documentaries do this by making a show out of the assembly of a documentary, foregrounding and performing their mediation.

## Metamodernism and the human scale of history

The thrall of history in moving images is key to their allure—and the problems they pose for histori-ography. Assessing the role of the historian, author, or maker is complicated by the multisensorial spectacle of history in moving images. As Burgoyne explains, films without an on-screen or off-screen narrator present the world as "unmediated" (Burgoyne 1990, 4–5). They present history as *revelation* and all that implies rather than as a story told and a world explained. The inclusion of the author as the source of the cinematic reality, materializing and co-present alongside the audiovisual evidence, characterizes Live Documentary and serves as a visceral reminder of the channelling of a historical argument through an often earnest but always fallible individual. Emile Zola's brilliant and concise description of art as "a corner of nature seen through a temperament" (Morgan 1934) applies equally well to history. Live Documentary foregrounds that temperament. In Live Documentary, however, audience members need not remind themselves of the imprint of the author on the argument; they cannot forget it. The isolation and spotlighting of the author as director, editor, and presenter is essential to the practice.

A traditional film's power to convey a world with incredible scope and fine detail, to speak in overwhelming, larger-than-life close-ups, in captivating tracking and drone shots, crossing bound-aries of time and space in a single cut, is held in check in Live Documentary. First, the director, as author and orchestrator of the world of the screen, stands beside it, acknowledged as the font of the creation. First-person digressions of the narrator allow audiences access to the maker's thought process. Second, as attendees at a public event, Live Documentary spectators are hyper-aware of their physical surroundings and their co-presence with the narrator as part of a community of eavesdroppers shut out from the screen. Archival imagery appears all the more foreign, presenting exotic cultures and mores separated in time and space. One example from *The Love Song of R. Buckminster Fuller* shows Buckminster Fuller in 1967 wearing a wool suit in a park on a hot summer day, holding forth with a congregation of gritty and authentic San Francisco hippies. In *32 Sounds*, black-and-white footage depicts Annea Lockwood experimenting with sound, performing her avant-garde composition "Piano Burning," literally the sound of a piano on fire, in 1968. Scenes like these offer distinct and impenetrable pasts that audience members observe rather than enter. Third, the audience's physical and psychological awareness of the distance between the historicality of what is within the frame versus the creation, transmission, and reception of the spectacle in the shared, unfurling now emphasizes history as imprinted by the present. As ephem-eral events held in constantly rotating venues, Live Documentaries emphasize the play of time

between the footage captured, ordered, arranged, and presented by the performer for the audience. As a mix of projection and performance delivered in ever-shifting times and spaces, no two Live Documentary performances are ever the same.

In emphasizing the role of the author of a moving history, the Live Documentary captures the spirit of metamodernism, the long-awaited theoretical successor to postmodernism. The metamodern offers a moderating and conciliatory philosophy that "oscillates between a modern enthusiasm and a postmodern irony, between hope and melancholy, between naïveté and know-ingness, empathy and apathy, unity and plurality, totality and fragmentation, purity and ambiguity" (Vermeulen and van den Akker 2010, 5–6). It mollifies previous excesses, deploying postmod-ernist irony and its "nihilism, sarcasm, and the distrust and deconstruction of grand narratives, and the singular truth" to temper modernism's "utopianism" and "unconditional belief in reason" (Vermeulen and van den Akker 2010, 4). Postmodernism was urgent as a corrective to unreflective and overconfident histories, dubbed "grand narratives" (Lyotard 2002). But its ideas became corrosive. It is the teenager whose distrust of authority, rules, and institutions serves as an essential stage necessary to understanding the complexity of truth, but it does not offer an endpoint. It is unstable; it asks questions while disavowing answers, asserting that the very act of looking for answers is futile. Postmodernism is a wrecking ball. It cannot build anew.

The spirit of despair and struggle that Ankersmit and Davis refer to remains indispensable to historicizing in metamodernism, but it moves from text to subtext. Despair and struggle transform into humility, self-reflexivity, and doubt. As Jason Josephson Storm explains, "[p]ostmodern doubt can be made to doubt itself, and when cleansed of its negative dogmatism and lingering longing for lost certainties, it can show us the way toward humble emancipatory knowledge" (Josephson Storm 2021, 4). Metamodernism salvages the best of postmodernism, purging it of its frustration born of its unrealizable goals for truth. For example, Munslow expresses a metamodern position when he writes that "no historian can make claims to objectivity and truth—defined at any useful level beyond the statement of justified belief" and "epistemically sceptical historians do not reject realism, or the strong likelihood of the onetime reality of the past, or that we can hold to highly probable beliefs about what once happened" (2010, 10, 22).

Reflexivity offers an effective way to express doubt. To be reflexive is to interrupt the persua-siveness of an argument, to either question its reliability or draw attention to the structure that undergirds it and makes it convincing. This historiographical impulse reaches back to Herodotus. Robert Stam describes reflexivity as a "dialectical struggle between realistic imitation and self-conscious artifice" that invites "the substitution of distanced reflection for suspenseful and empath-etic involvement" (1985, 3, 6). In drawing attention from screen to stage and from narrative to its mediated frame, reflexivity acts to "solicit the active collaboration" of audience members (Stam 1985, xii).

In the face of the climate crisis and increasing vitriolic partisanship about the nature of history and truth, the mainstreaming of postmodernism through the reality-denying word games of post-truth has moved well past its constructive phase. Building on the work of Arran Gare, Andrew Corsa points out the necessity of grand narratives to tackle complex problems while explaining that the metamodern regime pursues a grand narrative redux, taken as "provisional," open to refinement and reappraisal that is "polyphonic–giving due credit to diverse perspectives" (2018, 241). Live Documentary speaks to reality in this register.

Metamodernism establishes a rapprochement between historicism's quest for meaning and postmodern relativism, seeking a knowable past while employing strategies that prod author and audience alike to remain alert and sceptical. It unmasks the documentarian in human scale next to the expansive screen like the Wizard of Oz exposed by Toto as a mere mortal behind the curtain.

Like historians and filmmakers, Oz may be a "good man," but he is a "very bad wizard" (Baum 2015, chapter 15). While postmodernism's crushed idealism focuses on Oz's failure as a magician, metamodernism accepts it and asks what Oz, the human, can do.

Traditional moving histories express reflexivity through post-classical approaches that interrupt linear plots, jarring narrative conventions through expressionistic imagery and sound (Thanouli 2009). Instead of disrupting the illusion inside the screen, however, Live Documentaries disrupt the screen's surroundings. They deconstruct the documentary mode by erecting a set from the editing suite on the stage, inviting audiences to observe the interplay. As Jay Ruby explains of one of its antecedents,

> the illustrated lecture film finds its origins in the lantern slide lecture of the early 19th century. They constitute an unstudied form of cinema and have been overlooked by most histories of documentary film. However, they do contain the earliest evidence of reflexive elements in non-fiction film.
>
> (Ruby 2000, 7)

The reflexivity of this form is intrinsic to it.

## Live Documentary's family resemblances

Green builds his Live Documentaries for international tours in majestic cinemas and the film festival environment. He narrates while advancing slides, including archival pictures, stills, and moving-image sequences, with a clicker tucked into his palm. He cites a range of influences, from Bertolt Brecht's epic theatre to the concept of the *Gesamtkunstwerk* as popularized by Richard Wagner. At times, he even refers to his practice as a "fancy lecture" (Sam Green, interview with author, 2016). It is extraordinarily fancy. It is an enthralling multimedia spectacle with roots in the public lecture, experimental theatre, and early film.

Lecture-Performance is a close cousin to Live Documentary. Referred to most often in European and British art contexts and in education literature, Marianne Wagner describes the practice as a "performative mode of public speaking" that combines performance with the academic lecture that may draw on a variety of artistic disciplines and practices (2009, 17, 18). It is the public presentation of information enhanced by theatricality or audiovisual accompaniment. In the notes to an exhibition on Lecture-Performance that ran from 2013–2014 at the Museo de Arte Contemporáneo de Castilla y León in Spain, the curator Manual Olivera describes the form as a "sub-genre of performance" that emerged in the 1960s as an "expanded art practice" that builds upon the foundation of the academic lecture and its aim to teach that infuses theatricality to channel an "intellectual, emotive and effective" response from the audience (MUSAC n.d.).

Another adjacent form of Live Documentary is Documentary Theatre. Carol Martin calls this genre "theatre of the real" and catalogues its swirl of interrelated practices, including "documentary theatre, verbatim theatre, reality-based theatre, theatre-of-fact, theatre of witness, tribunal theatre, nonfiction theatre, restored village performances, war and battle reenactments, and autobiographical theatre" (2013, 5). Whether based upon past events, the transcript of an interview or a trial, Documentary Theatre represents the real and performs historicity. Jenn Stephenson's description of "Theatre of the Real" (her preferred term) illuminates its shared spirit with Live Documentary; she describes the former as animated by a "profound postmodern, poststructuralist doubt" and the "uneasy awareness that reality is a performative construction and therefore is always open to questioning, which renders it essentially unstable" (2019, 10).

At the edges of each interrelated practice, the lines blur. Nonetheless, there are distinctions between Live Documentary, theatre, and lecture that rest upon whether the centrepiece is the performance or the screen. Consideration of a performer's natural milieu as a theatre stage or film set also influences its interpretation as an expansion of cinema into theatre or the reverse. Despite its parallels to Lecture-Performance and Theatre of the Real, Live Documentary draws its most profound inspiration from early and proto-cinema. Green's performance services the projected audiovisuals by electrifying the space around the screen.

## Screen-centric origins

Live Documentary's software systems and digital tools reinvigorate early film practices. In real-time, presenters may adapt projections at will, stopping, starting, looping, multi-projecting, and achieving a fluidity impossible in the previous age of cumbersome, jammable film reels. It harkens back to the early years of moving pictures, as the medium was finding its way, getting onto its unsteady feet, as all new media do, through the foundations and logic of the modes that preceded it. The form with the most direct line to Live Documentary is what Tom Gunning calls the "cinema of attractions" (Gunning 2006, 384). It is a term he adapted from Sergei Eisenstein's use of the word *attractions* that Eisenstein had, in turn, repurposed from his previous life as an innovator and theorist of theatre to emphasize "an aggressive aspect of theatre" and its "sensual or psychological impact," connecting it to the experience of the fairground (Eisenstein 1974, 78).

In the days of early film exhibition, the human interlocutor's role was to serve as a bridge between the audience and this new medium. As Germain Lacasse explains, the "cinematograph, unlike the sword swallower or gladiator, was a technological attraction," as such, it was "mediated, that is presented, introduced, announced, and familiarized by the speakers and lecturers;" inter-mediaries included the "barker" or "bonisseur," stationed at the theatre door to lure people in (2006, 181). As these roles were automated, translated, globalized, and incorporated into films, editing and titles replaced the announcer while trailers and advertisements usurped the barker. As film became "auto-mediated," another stamp of the human and local was stripped away (Lacasse 2006, 183, 185). Lacasse points out that corporeal, live presenters lasted longer in countries that imported films requiring translation. Many local, human narrators incorporated individual and regional slants on the material, providing an anti-colonial angle on films screened in places under the dominion of other nations. Although the stage presenter initially moderated between "tradition and modernity," in the locations where this practice endured the longest, the role became a site of resistance to the hierarchies and assumptions embedded within the films themselves, framing them within "local, cultural elements, language, accent, practises and context" (Lacasse 2006, 181, 183).

Unlike the hermetically sealed, digital product of traditional moving histories, Live Documentaries translate what Tom Gunning calls the "radical heterogeneity" of early film exposition, offering a robust historiographical methodology for documentary truth (2006, 381). As audiences are now familiar—perhaps too familiar—with screen technology, the human guide now functions as an interpreter and enhancer of the content rather than the medium. The host contextualizes the narrative and argument, operating as an emblem of subjectivity. Ultimately, reinventing the *cinema of attractions* at this moment disrupts the social isolation of pervasive moving media consumed on individual screens, a solitary encounter that, unlike the one-to-one experience of the nickelodeon, no longer requires any human interaction, travel, or effort to procure on a day-to-day, moment-to-moment basis.

Live Documentaries evoke the spirit of Brecht's epic theatre by partitioning narration, image, and score, thereby deconstructing the persuasive sweep of symphonic amalgamation of mainstream

films and streaming series (Brecht 2003, 37). Brecht's comparison of opera and "dramatic theatre" to modern and epic theatre offers a useful contrast between the traditional documentary and the live, as he explains that the:

> 'Gesamtkunstwerk' (or 'integrated work of art') means that the integration is a muddle, so long as the arts are supposed to be 'fused' together, the various elements will all be equally degraded… . The process of fusion extends to the spectator, who gets thrown into the melting pot too and becomes a passive (suffering) part of the total work of art… . Words, music and setting must become more independent of one another.
>
> (37–38)

Live Documentaries make legible the discrete parts of moving-image works. Dissecting as they isolate, they distinguish the transportive force of the screen image from the emotional spell cast by music and the intimacy of the direct address by the narrator. This process of dismantling does not dilute; on the contrary, it magnifies each element as it is laid bare. The thrill of witnessing the creation of music and narration in a shared time and space under a commanding screen only multiplies the energetic dynamism of sharing an experience with a group of strangers.

Unlike Eisenstein's *montage of attractions* or Brecht's epic theatre, however, Live Documentaries do not "guide the spectator in the desired direction (frame of mind)" (Eisenstein 1974, 84). Instead, they alternate between projected scenes and a direct address from the stage, inviting audiences to contemplate a given narrative as filtered through a subjectivity. With the rise of a global commercial cinema around 1907, the cinema of attractions did not become extinct; it merely transformed into an avant-garde mode of cinema, taking its unique relationship with the spectator underground with it (Gunning 2006, 384). Gunning suggests that looking back to earlier modes of engagement and the constellation of relationships between the spectator, screen, and live-action on stage, might be a source for the rejuvenation of a non-commercial cinema (2006, 387). Sam Green makes this experimental art practice accessible and mainstream while its bespoke presentation subverts the mass production and consumption of industrial film. He resists mass media's political pressures and skewed incentives that reward consistently raising the dramatic stakes and trading on emotion over introspection.

Live Documentaries disentangle what André Gaudreault calls the "narrative frontiers" of text, stage, and film" (2009, 41). Rather than mix these elements into a solution as in traditional, "off-line" moving images, Live Documentaries keep these operations suspended. They unmask the role of a film's director as author, that "demi-god capable of synchronizing, modulating, masterminding, and even producing a multimedia performance in which the various elements–images, sound, speech, text, music–are thrown together and intermingled" (Gaudreault 2009, 148). Simultaneously, they unveil the author's hidden tools, including lights, microphones, and projectors. This on-stage narration emphasizes the intentional, personal, and verbalized narrative voice of history as a crafted discourse, while the stage frames and throws into high relief the past-ness of even the most contemporary clips displayed on the screen as remnants of a layered and conditioned history.

Live Documentaries allow historical *movies* to seize the power of the screen image to traverse time and space while reigning in its totalizing grasp, anthropomorphizing the author's channelling perspective, and reminding spectators of the realities of our conditional access to the past. Although the screen launches us into the air, the figure on the stage ties us back down to the earth in the here and now. Rhetorically reflexive in its dual and duelling address, far from being a rarefied hybrid

art model, Live Documentary presents an ideal platform for documentary film's goal of rear-view access and transport via critical thought and reflection.

## Expanding cinema

Gene Youngblood popularized the term Expanded Cinema while critiquing the popular cinema's imperative toward entertainment, nostalgia, and history, at the expense of art, experimentation, and collaborative spectatorship. He advocated for Expanded Cinema as a practice capable of defying a mainstream media that had become irrelevant thanks to a "socioeconomic system that substitutes a profit motive for use value [that] separates man from himself and art from life" (2020, 41–42). In this, he echoes Guy Debord's prophetic pronouncements in *The Society of the Spectacle*, from a few years earlier that declared that "[a]n earlier stage of the economy's domination of social life entailed an obvious downgrading of *being* into *having* that left its stamp on all human endeavour," leading to a present state, "in which social life is completely taken over by the accumulated products of the economy" and a "shift from *having* to *appearing*" (1994, 16). One marvels to think, if this is what Debord perceived in 1967, what might he make of the digital age and social media? Expanded Cinema is grounded in the local, not part of a glossy global business cranking out products for consumer-spectators.

Although punctured by poetic narrative digressions and introspections from the narrator, Live Documentaries belong to a markedly popular genus within Expanded Cinema, set up around a proscenium stage to pursue topics through a dramatic exegesis with a clear beginning, middle, and end. They are produced as scheduled events with causal plot logic for theatrical spaces, attended by bourgeois expectations of audience behaviour: remaining attentive to the spectacle, observing from a distance rather than walking through a display, listening and watching but not touching or talking, and arriving before the beginning and staying to the end. Live Documentary occupies a space in a continuum between Raymond Bellour's conception of traditional "cinema," and the non-mainstream, artist-based installation works that he calls "an other cinema" (2008, 408). It speaks to both film worlds, the mainstream and the avant-garde, operating between them.

Sarah Atkinson's work on experiential cinema elaborates our understanding of these hybrid engagements. She supplies a taxonomy built around temporal distinctions that are especially relevant to historiophoty, making it worth a deep dive here. She proposes the term "simulacinema" to signal the "*simulated*" relationship between audience member and film, citing interpolations of time to distinguish the film's release as future, past, or present, with the terminology "Prochronistic, Parachronistic and Synchronic" (2018, 192, 193, emphasis original). The prochronistic refers to engagements with works in pre-release. They invite the audience to look forward to a future work in anticipation. As an example, she cites *Suicide Squad* (2016), leaving sets in the streets of Toronto for crowds to pass through during the post-production and pre-release phase of the film (193). She defines the retrospective, or "parachronistic," as audience interactions with films after they are complete (195). *Rocky Horror Picture Show* (1975) is an archetype of this form, involving fan practices and participatory actions of dressing up, singing, speaking along, talking back in unison, or throwing things at the screen. Live Documentaries resemble her third "experiential modality," expressing a present-based "synchronic" temporality, a combination of theatre and cinema that exhibits the film production process as performance (192, 195). Atkinson calls this the most "sophisticated and complex" of the three types and compares the reception experience to the act of the director switching attention between performances on set and the display of recorded images on a monitor (195). She evocatively captures the active experience of the spectator in Live

Documentary, describing it as "affectively taxing, and laborious, the viewer has to always shift focus between two realities to grasp the overall production" (201).

While the dichotomy and collision of liveness with pre-recorded screen imagery indeed mimics the attention of the film director on set, split between watching actors directly as quasi-theatre or through the screen of a camera's monitor, it more strongly evokes the role of editing as pageant. The crucial arbiter in documentary film, the editor orders, splices, and layers shots and sounds to create a structured whole. In Live Documentary, the narrator acts as editor, playing clips and interjecting with a direct address that sculpts the narrative. Meanwhile, the spectator also takes on another role of the film editor, parsing material created by another. Each audience member controls the cut through the direction of attention. There are as many edits of a show as audience members, each of whom may focus, at any given moment, on the narrator, musicians, or screen. Unlike the director who shoulders responsibility for the creation of the raw material of scenes on a set or location, overseeing a process with much starting, stopping, and background action, working alongside a jumble of cast, crew, cords, and craft service, where the monitors may be distanced and not within eyeshot of the set, stationed deep inside the video village, Live Documentary displays *post*-production processes from the point of view of the editor, performed as a kind of ballet.

## Live's many lives

Live Cinema supplies an umbrella term for the collected practices of Expanded Cinema and Live Documentary. Francis Ford Coppola and others have appropriated the term for commercial film to describe simulcasts, or in other words, the filming of a traditional scripted show in one go, like *ER Live* (Warner Bros. Television et al., 1997), *Grease: Live* (Paramount Television, 2016), or *Distant Vision* (Francis Ford Coppola, 2016). In these examples, the liveness applies to audiovisual recording and performances synchronous with the viewership in time but not place. Through the sharing of time, excitement lies in the question: will it come together, or will it falter? The liveness of Live Documentary flips this equation. What is live or simultaneous with the audience is not (necessarily) what is projected on screen but what surrounds it. Its thrill is wrapped in time and the possibility of witnessing failure atop the kinetic energy of sharing space with others. It presents images recorded from the past in a shared time and space with an audience. What Coppola dubs Live Cinema seems to describe a remote, recorded, on-location theatre or a high-stakes film shoot that owes more to live television.

Philip Auslander explains that liveness is "a historically variable effect of mediatization" whose original meaning now stretches to include: happenings whereupon audiences and events share time—but not space, for example, (i) live radio, television, streaming, (such as Coppola's Live Cinema) to those (ii) that share a time and space with *an audience* but not the audience in its totality, such as live concert tapings, or sitcoms recorded in front of a live audience to (iii) so-called live iterations, including exchanges with online chatbots, or stretching the term even further, websites that have merely been launched and made available (2012, 3, 6). Live Documentary's power is in providing what Auslander calls "[t]he default definition of live performance," bringing spectators and performers together in time and space (5). This is the original liveness from before the advent of recording media when "live" was not a concept because live was all there was. He ultimately contends that "digital liveness emerges as a specific *relation* between self and other" (5). That "other" includes AI and machines. Although each new media provides expanding and proliferating levels and values of liveness, his "default" mode of the live experience comprises the increasingly rare face-to-face encounter between performer and audience.

## Revisiting the cinema as place

Live Documentaries call strangers to assemble in darkened rooms before screen spectacles, an experience most cinephiles have a passionate nostalgia for as a rite of profound immersion. Judith Aston proposes the term "emplaced interaction" to explain the reception experience of the "live performance documentary," heralding the form for its "potential to bring people together and to engage all the senses…a powerful way to help keep us connected both to each other and to the physicality of the world in which we live" (2017, 223). Live Documentaries grant audiences a hyperawareness of their relationship to the show, the screen, and their fellow spectators through physical co-presence that places their bodies in an imbricated and communal relationship in ways that television and streaming cannot. While the ability to escape the crowd and the self is a concerted lure of the domestic and mobile screen, its pervasiveness has also become a trap, cutting us off from each other and our sense of reality in the lived world.

In "Digital Cinema: Convergence or Contradiction?" Thomas Elsaesser considers how cinema can fortify itself against the incursions of television and the internet into its territory, citing Expanded Cinema as one possible defence. Elsaesser evocatively describes the hallmarks of TV and streaming content as interchangeable forms of "armchair theater," consumed within the private living space as a product, accessory, and element of home décor that differs fundamentally from the delivery and experience of cinema (2013, 14, 16, 19, 23). Live Documentary necessitates the pilgrimage back to the cinema space. It rewinds time and our attention to before video killed the radio star and before broadcast television (followed by the internet and COVID) separated us into private pods, pummelling the movie palace.

Describing cinema's current state of expansion to new spaces, surfaces, and practices of screening and reception, Francesco Casetti, offers the neologism "hypertopia," referencing and riffing on Michel Foucault's concept of heterotopia (2015, 11–12). In "Of Other Spaces," Foucault describes heterotopia as a spin on the idea of utopia, as real locations with symbolic functions that either cordon off deviant or non-normative behaviours (criminality) or biological processes (menstruation, sex) or that conjure other times or places, in the form of gardens, festivals, theatres, and the cinema (Foucault and Miskowiec 1986, 24). Casetti's hypertopia denotes the transformation of cinema spaces from portals we seek out to those that meet us where we are: in our homes, along roadways, on plazas, and tagging along in our pockets. He notes that the cinema of attractions mode of presentation relates to hypertopia in another way by circumventing cinema's call for the viewer to enter the screen world, instead meeting spectators where they are, "engulfed by stimuli wherever they find themselves" (2015, 150). He also expresses the fear that within this hybridity lurks the death knell of cinema.

Laying out his concern, Casetti describes an unrealized Live Cinema experiment by Eisenstein as the essence of hypertopia. The director had initially planned that his first screening of *Battleship Potemkin* (1925) would conclude in a momentous climax in which the actual sailors who had experienced the mutiny would burst through the screen, tearing it asunder. Casetti cautions that as the sailors "enter into the theater [they] also spell the end of cinema" because with "the arrival of reality there is no need of images" (152). But is that the case? His position encapsulates the argument of all those who would say that Live Documentary is not cinema. A live presence on stage does not override or invalidate the wonder of the screen's commanding address. Seeing the soldiers in the space would not undo the magic of the shots and their arrangement in the film that preceded it. What audience member would reflect, "with the soldiers here, why bother with that whole business with the baby carriage on the steps? Why not just ask these veterans to describe their experiences?" Rather than diminish the wonder of moving images, these multimodal spectacles

throw the screen's powers of enchantment into high relief, showcasing its unrivalled ability to summon sounds, visuals, characters, and stories, while bending and manipulating time and space. Live Cinematic interventions create a critical frame around the screen, expanding cinema in both its meanings: as a medium and an arena. Rather than ending cinema, it takes it back to its roots.

## Where the there's there

The retro, pre-internet, pre-digital sense of congregation and being around other people, of taking part, doing something face-to-face in analogue space, is the core element of the experience of the audience-goer in Live Documentary. It supports Thomas Elsaesser's concept of cinema as requiring a zone of "public intimacy" with its "time regime," its "rituals of exclusion and inclusion," and "liminal spaces" (2013, 33). The vitality of the cinema experience is wrapped into its frictions: the effort of travel, the queuing, the exposing of oneself to the risk of other people as germ conductors (all the more threatening since 2020), dealing with the bad behaviour of strangers with their cell phones or their distracting conversations during the show. These rituals require audience effort, which in turn imparts a sense of purpose, accomplishment, and value to the cinematic encounter. This labour and the attention it privileges are distinct from the convenience and ready access of our household screen appliances, in which every screening session melts into the other, day after day, year after year. As a reviewer of Green's most recent Live Documentary, *32 Sounds*, pictured in Figure 17.2, suggests, the "savvy distributor would recognize this very special cinematic achievement as a celebration of the theatrical experience's unique appeal, and it would be an excellent reason for people to return to it after a long break" (Erbland and Kohn 2022). The draw of the cinema as a space is beyond the lure of nostalgia. Public gatherings allow us to access ideas free from ever-present, portable screen-based distraction and the sorting mechanisms of corporate-engineered algorithms, so eager to get into our heads and sell our desires back to us.



*Figure 17.2* Audience participation in a five-minute dance interlude as part of Sam Green's *32 Sounds*.

In the internet age, theatrical space functions as more than the grounds of public intimacy. It doubles as a refuge from our phones, where our tiny screens must be darkened, their incessant rings, alerts, vibrations, and tones muted. Any discourse that requires communal engagement, thought, and connection requires a landscape not conquered by the smart phone. Aside from being a zone free of digital stalking and tracking, the sense of physical space is also essential. Channelling what Gertrude Stein might have made of the web, Andreas Huyssen declares: "[t]here can be no utopia in cyberspace, because there is no there there from which a utopia could emerge;" and further, at a time of "an unlimited proliferation of images, discourses, simulacra, the search for the real has become utopian" (1995, 101). Live Documentaries blow past the false mirage of the utopian, engaging the real as slippery, complex, collective, and worth the effort. They demand careful attention to contest and consider what happened, what it means, and what to do about it. They force us to intentionally locate ourselves and our bodies in a specific time and place. To think, we must put down our phones. To communicate, we need to be with others.

Philosophers and historians have long issued a call to commune in response to the challenges of assessing empirical truth and reality. Reacting to the use of postmodern scepticism by the political right, cravenly deployed as a tool to undermine the mobilization of a response to climate change, Bruno Latour reappraises the work of his early career, set on questioning graspable notions of truth in our changeable and imperfect world. He notes that while the Enlightenment was powered by "*debunking* quite a lot of beliefs, powers and illusions," he sees the future in shifting from critique to "assembling," probing areas of concern and by "gathering" (2004, 232, 245). Drawing a similar conclusion, Ankersmit wagers that given that the "timelessly true rhetorical treatise is rhetorically hopeless…the good rhetorician knows that he must aim for an intensive interaction with his audience" (2012, 252). And where does this intensive interaction take place?

In *Experiments in Rethinking History*, Robert Rosenstone champions the direct address of the reader, conjuring the metaphorical assembly on the page. He cautions that this is not a place where "wisdom is handed down" but where the "author and reader meet" (2004, 5). Live Documentary makes this meeting literal and physical. In the process, it offers a vital tool for renegotiating the concept of truth in moving images in a "post-truth" world. While committed seekers of truth lay out their subjectivities in a tone that respectfully acknowledges truth's contingent nature and the limits of what they can know, the post-truther sets forth with a good versus evil worldview spurred by an ends-justifies-the-means mentality swamped in cognitive bias, enclosed in social media feedback loops, detached from the humanity and physicality of others. Post-truth returns us to the childish, fairy tale stability of right and wrong, a balm to the complicated and uncomfortable business of thinking. Live Documentary offers recourse to its threat.

## Checking in

The layering of displays, holding a mobile screen in front of a larger one, is something we regularly see and have all likely done. The activity differs significantly from the synchronic Live Documentary experience of shifting attention in an artistically curated environment, from stage to screen. Atkinson invokes Linda Stone's concept of "continuous partial distraction" to describe emerging experiential and participatory forms that call on spectators to interact in specific ways with moving image media, from searching the web to using their phones (2016, 219). However, it is the ways that Live Documentary rebuffs this way of watching that are part of its strength. In the late 1990s, Linda Stone, a former executive at both Apple and Microsoft, proffered the term continuous partial distraction to describe the drive "to be a LIVE node on the network," motivated by a fear of missing out and an attendant dread of boredom (2009). Continuous partial

distraction blocks genuine social interaction and saps our "ability to reflect, to make decisions, and to think creatively and creates a state of 'high alert,'" an "artificial sense of constant crisis" that distinguishes continuous partial attention from the older, unmediated inattentiveness of mere multi-tasking (Stone 2009). This is not the distraction of the "absent-minded" cinema-goer ascribed by Walter Benjamin but a zone of commercial and algorithmically engineered hypnosis spiked with anger and alarm that would surely shock Benjamin, one that engenders not the state of being lost in our own fleeting thoughts but in the fleeting thoughts of others (Benjamin, Arendt, and Zohn 1986, 18).

Anne Friedberg's preoccupied wandering flâneuse, the perambulating female window shopper, was granted new freedoms in the mid-nineteenth century to roam the streets in exchange for a Faustian capitalist bargain (1991; 1993). The pact remains and has only intensified as shop windows became cinema screens and multiplied onto the surfaces of public billboards, private televisions, computers, tablets, and phones. The history film or series offers some refuge within the frame. Confounding commodification and product placement, moving histories allow spectators to mercifully bypass what Friedberg calls the "psychic penalty" of the shopper, or in the case of mainstream moving images, the spectator who lacks the means to possess the clothes, sprawling New York apartments, and expensive holidays often on display in the direct marketing of so many commercial films and series (1991, 424). Live Documentaries go even further. They do not lure their audiences into shopping mall adjacent multiplexes or browser windows. Instead, they spring forth to reclaim the sites of our earliest projection spaces, multi-use variety theatres, cinemas, bare black box rooms, and lecture halls.

## Live Documentaries as social cinema

Live Documentary exchanges so-called social media for a truly *social cinema*. Addressing NECS' *in/between: Cultures of Connectivity* conference in Potsdam in 2016, Sean Cubitt's keynote "Against Connectivity" railed against the dangers of our pseudo-connected digital social lives, warning the crowd that "the network condition is a site of profound, even existential unhappiness" (2016, 1). His vigorous and mesmerizing lecture, replete with eminently quotable lines, inform an appreciation of Live Documentary. He wagers that in the promise of connected global commerce, we have lost both our sense of self-reliance and place, trading both for "a marketplace of lifestyles" that perpetuates and profits from division (5). He disputes the conference's optimistic, technophilic byline, suggesting that what we have is "connectivity *against* culture" (5). His warnings emphasize why the quaint and old-fashioned practice of looking someone in the eye is so important. He exposes our misplaced "fantasies of belonging" that require "the interactions of a corporate network, whose economies, politics and cultural forms are structured by the commodification of the social good" (10). Part of the impetus for Sam Green to launch his practice of the Live Documentary was precisely to work outside commercial culture and avoid complicity in the 24-hour hucksterism that surrounds streaming and mainstream film (Green, interview with author, 2016).

With compelling verve, Alison Landsberg explains film's power to communicate in intimate ways while displaying what is remote and other as something affective and relatable (2009, 222). Because of this, she posits that it is a medium well suited to political subject matter and advancing social justice. Historical theorist Marnie Hughes-Warrington similarly reflects upon the possibilities of a cinema for social action and advocates the overturning of evolved conventions of cinema realism (2007). One way to mount such a challenge is by altering content; the other is through adapting form. To the former method, Walter Benjamin cautions in "The Author as Producer" that

regardless of the artist's intentions, industrial and commercial media platforms will resist progressive social change (2005). Within the machinery of mainstream film and streaming series, industrial and commercial goals of profit stubbornly contradict those of social change and human rights. Considering the role of the audience member as arbiter, Hughes-Warrington warns that spectators often mistakenly believe themselves to be "autonomous free agents" able to separate fact from fiction based on a false assumption of "the transparency of empiricism…sustained by society to discourage true social change" (2007, 150). And to where does she point as offering one remedy? She argues that the intermixing of the cinematic with the theatrical in early cinema resulted in a more critical stance on behalf of the audience, explaining that the "juxtaposition" between the live and the projected "undermined a naïve experience of realism and fostered conscious appreciations of them as illusion" (155). Once established to exhibit a mechanical marvel, the comingling of stage and screen in the digital age exposes cinema realism as part of a magic trick.

When film became the business of multinational producers, it shifted from being about and for the audience to being for and about the film. Although this led to clear benefits in the quality and craft of filmmaking, it came with inevitable trade-offs. As film screenings overtook the variety presentation, becoming a global multireel phenomenon, audiences became almost incidental. When sound emerged as part of the show, they were silenced (Hansen 1991, 44). Looking back, it is no wonder classical moving-image storytelling took hold. There is no arguing with the appeal and enchantment of an escape into a seamless narrative of forgetting the self as our metabolisms dip, immersing ourselves into the world of someone else's dreamscape. Live Documentaries will not dislodge us from the joys of streaming and the convenience of our home theatres. They will not replace traditional documentaries. Nor should they. The very aspects that make Live Documentaries such a potent vehicle for historiophoty and effective critical distancing also subvert some of the joys of entering into and being enveloped and absorbed by a screen narrative. But why should it be an either/or? Live Documentaries are less engrossing in some ways than many solo screen encounters. When we watch them, we are less likely to forget ourselves, our bodies, our place in the world, and our seats. After they are over, there is less chance that spectators might lose track of which memories are theirs and which were photographic and implanted.

Live Documentary diverts attention from content to form. When spectators think back to a live show, they will often remember how they got there, where they sat, with whom, the look of the stage, the size of the screen, the frisson of the crowd, and the scene in the lobby afterwards, as much as the spectacle itself, or its story. What Live Documentaries lack in the power of forgetting oneself and transport into the world of the screen, they make up for in their expression of history as ultimately "foreign" and never fully reconstructed, represented, or known in its entirety (Landsberg 2015). There are benefits to combining new digital tools with the resurrection of a ritual of cinematic address that split off from mainstream film's family tree more than one hundred years ago. Beyond what it offers to cinema is what it offers to the negotiation of historical truth by presenting documentary as what it truly is: a process, a construction, an argument, built from traces, and channelled through a temperament. Live Documentaries create art not from the products of history but from the act of historicizing itself.

## Reference list

Ankersmit, F.R. 2012. *Meaning, Truth, and Reference in Historical Representation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Aston, Judith. 2017. "Interactive Documentary in Live Performance: From Embodied to Emplaced Interaction." In *I-Docs: The Evolving Practices of Interactive Documentary*, edited by Judith Aston, Sandra Gaudenzi, and Mandy Rose, 222–236. London and New York: Wallflower Press.

Atkinson, Sarah. 2016. *Beyond the Screen: Emerging Cinema and Engaging Audiences*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Atkinson, Sarah. 2018. "Synchronic Simulacinematics: The Live Performance of Film Production." In *Image–Action–Space: Situating the Screen in Visual Practice*, edited by Luisa Feiersinger, Kathrin Friedrich, and Moritz Queisner, 191–202. Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.

Auslander, Philip. 2012. "Digital Liveness: A Historico-Philosophical Perspective." *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art* 34, no. 3 (September): 3–11. https://doi.org/10.1162/PAJJ_a_00106.

Baum, Frank. 2015. *The Wizard of Oz*. New York: McClelland & Stewart.

Bellour, Raymond. 2008. "Of an Other Cinema." In *Art and the Moving Image: A Critical Reader*, edited by Tanya Leighton, 406–422. London; New York: Tate Publishing.

Benjamin, Walter. 2005. "The Author as Producer." In *Selected Writings. 2,2: Vol. 2, Part 2, 1931–1934*, edited by Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith, translated by Rodney Livingstone, 768–782. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Benjamin, Walter, Hannah Arendt, and Harry Zohn. 1986. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In *Illuminations*, 217–251. New York: Schocken Books.

Berkhofer, Robert F. 1998. *Beyond the Great Story: History as Text and Discourse*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Brecht, Bertolt. 2003. *Brecht on Art and Politics*, translated by Laura Bradley, Steve Giles, and Tom Kuhn. London: Methuen.

Burgoyne, Robert. 1990. "The Cinematic Narrator: The Logic and Pragmatics of Impersonal Narration." *Journal of Film and Video* 42, no. 1 (Spring): 3–16.

Burgoyne, Robert. 2008. *The Hollywood Historical Film*. Malden: Blackwell Pub.

Casetti, Francesco. 2015. *The Lumière Galaxy: Seven Key Words for the Cinema to Come*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Corsa, Andrew J. 2018. "Grand Narrative, Metamodernism, and Global Ethics." *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy* 14, no. 3: 241–272.

Cubitt, Sean. 2016. "Against Connectivity." In *In/between: Cultures of Connectivity*. NECS European Network for Cinema and Media Studies 2016 Conference. Potsdam, Germany. July 28–30: 1–12. www.academia.edu/27430246/Against_Connectivity.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. 1987. "Any Resemblance to Persons Living or Dead: Film and The Challenge of Authenticity." *The Yale Review* 6, no. 4: 457–482.

Debord, Guy. 1994. *The Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books.

Eisenstein, Sergei. 1974. "Montage of Attractions: For 'Enough Stupidity in Every Wiseman.'" Translated by Daniel Gerould. *The Drama Review* 18, no. 1 (March): 77–85. https://doi.org/10.2307/1144865.

Elsaesser, Thomas. 2013. "Digital Cinema. Convergence or Contradiction?" *In The Oxford Handbook of Sound and Image in Digital Media*, edited by Carol Vernallis, Amy Herzog, and John Richardson, 13–44. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Erbland, Kate, and Eric Kohn. 2022. "Memo to Distributors: Buy These Sundance 2022 Films." *IndieWire* (blog). January 31. www.indiewire.com/2022/01/memo-to-distributors-buy-these-sundance-2022-films-1234694372/.

Foucault, Michel, and Jay Miskowiec. 1986. "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* 16, no. 1 (Spring): 22–27. https://doi.org/10.2307/464648.

Friedberg, Anne. 1991. "Les Flaneurs Du Mal(l): Cinema and the Postmodern Condition." *PMLA* 106, no. 3 (May): 419–431. https://doi.org/10.2307/462776.

Friedberg, Anne. 1993. *Window Shopping: Cinema and the Postmodern*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gaudreault, André. 2009. *From Plato to Lumière: Narration and Monstration in Literature and Cinema*. Translated by Timothy Barnard. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Green, Sam. n.d. *32 Sounds*. https://32sounds.com/

Gunning, Tom. 2006. "The Cinema of Attractions: Early Film, Its Spectator and the Avant-Garde." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 381–388. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Hansen, Miriam. 1991. *Babel and Babylon: Spectatorship in American Silent Film*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hughes-Warrington, Marnie. 2007. *History Goes to the Movies: Studying History on Film*. London; New York: Routledge.

Huyssen, Andreas. 1995. *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. New York: Routledge.

Josephson Storm, Jason Ānanda. 2021. *Metamodernism: The Future of Theory*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lacasse, Germain. 2006. "The Lecturer and the Attraction." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 181–192. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Landsberg, Alison. 2009. "Memory, Empathy, and the Politics of Identification." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 22: 221–229. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-009-9056-x.

Landsberg, Alison. 2015. *Engaging the Past: Mass Culture and the Production of Historical Knowledge*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Latour, Bruno. 2004. "Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern." *Critical Inquiry* 30, no. 2: 225–248. https://doi.org/10.1086/421123.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 2002. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

MacDonald, Shana. 2018. "Reimagining Public Space in Expanded Cinema Exhibition." *Canadian Journal of Film Studies* 27, no. 1 (Spring): 16–30. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjfs.27.1.2017-0012.

Martin, Carol. 2013. *Theatre of the Real*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Morgan, Charles. 1934. "TWO CAPITALS: BRITAIN AND CINEMA." New York Times, May 13.

Munslow, Alun. 2010. *The Future of History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

MUSAC. n.d. "New Artistic Formats, Places, Practices and Behaviours at MUSAC León–Artmap.Com." Accessed June 3, 2022. https://artmap.com/musac/exhibition/new-artistic-formats-places-practices-and-behaviours-2013.

Nelson, Kim. 2022. "The Historian is Present: Live Interactive Documentary as Collaborative History." *Rethinking History* 26, no. 3: 289–318. doi: 10.1080/13642529.2022.2103618

Nelson, Kim. 2024. *Making History Move: Five Principles of the Historical Film*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Nichols, Bill. 1991. *Representing Reality: Issues and Concepts in Documentary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Rosenstone, Robert A. 2004. "Introduction: Practice and Theory." In *Experiments in Rethinking History*, edited by Robert A. Rosenstone and Alun Munslow, 1–6. New York: Routledge.

Ruby, Jay. 2000. *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film & Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

"Sam Green." n.d. *Sam Green*. Accessed June 7, 2022. https://samgreen.to/.

Stam, Robert. 1985. *Reflexivity in Film and Literature: From Don Quixote to Jean-Luc Godard*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press.

Stephenson, Jenn. 2019. *Insecurity: Perils and Products of Theatres of the Real*. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

Stone, Linda. 2009. "FAQ." Linda Stone (blog). November 28. https://lindastone.net/faq/.

Tate. n.d. "Expanded Cinema." Accessed March 30, 2022. www.tate.org.uk/art/art-terms/e/expanded-cinema.

Thanouli, Eleftheria. 2009. *Post-Classical Cinema: An International Poetics of Film Narration*. London: Wallflower.

Vermeulen, Timotheus, and Robin van den Akker. 2010. "Notes on Metamodernism." *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture* 2, no. 1. https://doi.org/10.3402/jac.v2i0.5677.

Wagner, Marianne. 2009. "Doing Lectures. Performative Lectures as a Framework for Artistic Action." In *Lecture Performance*, edited by Kathrin Jentjens and Jenny Dirksen, 17–30. Berlin: Revolver Publishing by VVV.

White, Hayden V. 1966. "The Burden of History." *History and Theory* 5, no. 2: 111–134. https://doi.org/10.2307/2504510.

White, Hayden. 1988. "Historiography and Historiophoty." *American Historical Review* 93, no. 5: 1193–1199. https://doi.org/10.2307/1873534.

Youngblood, Gene. 2020. *Expanded Cinema*, introduction by R. Buckminster Fuller. Fiftieth anniversary edition. New York: Fordham University Press.