

Fictional, Virtual, Corporeal, Affective: Perspectives of the Documentary

Ulrich Meurer

Central European University, Vienna

in interchange with

Maria Oikonomou

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

Why choose the documentary as special subject for the *Filmicon: Journal of Greek Film Studies*? Why think about that polymorphous thing (or mode, or strategy) called the 'documentary' at all? We want to propose a possible, and twofold, answer: because the documentary is vanishing; because there is nothing more topical or alive than the documentary.

1.

The first proposition – of the documentary's decline or obsolescence – seems easy to support, if not self-evident, at least inasmuch as one still insists on defining documentary in terms of a 'factual representation of reality'. We are witnessing a denigration of the *factual* and, concurrently, the rise of its 'alternatives'. We have begun to mistrust *representation* in its aesthetic and ontological (and increasingly also in its political) sense, since we are embedded in a sphere of self-generating computed images that no longer *re-present* the actual but *present* the virtual. And we can no longer take *reality* for granted as a stable, pre-existing field of entities; instead, we are called upon to multiply, or condense, or contest, or invent, or unfold various post-human, new-materialist, networked, speculative realities ...

(This, by the way, can be acknowledged without any onto-confessional indignation or well-worn laments about 'postmodern' arbitrariness. The continuing debates about speculative or new realisms in philosophy – as well as new documentarisms in the arts – indicate that even deconstruction, for better or worse, could not affect or erase the wish for a basic 'faithfulness' to reality [thus confirming Jacobson who had declared this faithfulness an inescapable

historical constant in all art that can in principle be implemented by every conceivable poetics [Marszałek, Mersch 2016: 17]]. Therefore – although moving away from naïve notions of a given and knowable reality, and also from its precondition, the hierarchical binary of human subject and object world – the proliferation of such theoretical models does not imply a ‘loss’ of world. It rather suggests its fundamental re-structuring into a plural, decentered, relational, multilayered, multi-species cosmos ... we will have to revisit, presently, this novel conceptualization of the real and its repercussions in the domain of contemporary media.)

In light of this, admittedly very crudely sketched, condition of ‘reality’ and ‘representation’, the documentary cannot allege to correspond or be analogous to an existence before or outside the image. While this has been its main ambition, its beautiful concern for over a century – from the encyclopedic claims of early cinema (Gunning 2016) to Soviet *kino-pravda*, from *cinéma-vérité* to *direct cinema* and the *Sensory Ethnography Lab*; regardless of whether the ‘truest’ gaze would be that which captures, frames and interprets, or that which tries to simply perceive and let the object speak for itself – such a notion of truth loses its validity: the documentary *as truth* is fading before our very eyes.

2.

In accord, however, with the second proposition, we see the documentary genre gloriously reinventing itself and becoming more diversified than ever before. A look at *Docubase*, an MIT-curated interactive archive “of the people, projects, and technologies transforming documentary in the digital age”, shows how a multitude of emerging media triggers fresh grammars, novel styles and ever-evolving processes “that both exemplify and press the limits of the documentary in its many new forms”: *Docubase*, states the website’s Principal Investigator William Uricchio, challenges conventional genre definitions by hosting “webdocs, immersive docs, interactive and participatory docs and all the other names we attribute to these new types of documentaries” (Uricchio n. d.).

But while recent computer-based media seem to have the opportunity to freely experiment and create unthought-of multisensory modes of the documentary, the photographic (moving) image looks back at a history of long established and highly codified methods to capture reality – or rather evoke it through a set of particular *effects*: from the use of black and white footage in photography to the voice-over commentary of classical non-fiction cinema, from interview sequences to handheld cameras. It is this stock of canonized techniques which provides the main site, stimulus and target of the critical ventures and innovations in documentary cinema: its explorations are as much about filmic realism as they are about reality. And as often as the documentary thinks about, processes or revises that realism, as often as it calls into question the inventory of means which are connected to its *effet de réel*, it ineluctably appears to pave the way for the ‘unreal’, it lets in the imaginary and the fictitious.

Thus, there are docudramas, docufiction, “the noticeable boom of para- and mock-documentary strategies as a dismantling (from critical to satirical) of the basic prerequisites of documentation” (Marszałek, Mersch 2016: 20; translation mine) causing an unmistakable influx of the fictional that exposes appointed documentary practices as mainly – or merely – rhetorical and arbitrary.

One might of course argue that this extensive tendency to incorporate fiction, to balance on the line between authenticity and artifice or even push forward deep into the realm of the imaginary is the belated answer not to a current crisis of the real, but to a long-held suspicion regarding the cinematographic medium. Jean-Louis Comolli stated already in the late 1960s that documentary film images (for instance of the students and workers’ protests in 1968, and especially Jacques Willemont’s 16 mm short *La reprise du travail aux usines Wonder*) seem involuntarily charged with melodrama (Holl 2018: 118), since “the very fact of filming is of course already a productive intervention”, resulting in a “coefficient of ‘non-reality’” and “a kind of fictional aura [that] attaches itself to the filmed events and facts”. And, says Comolli, precisely when the absence of manipulation and staging is as great as possible, “the overspill into fiction may be total and irrevocable” (Comolli 1980: 226-227) – even if this is not necessarily a bad thing:

The movement which takes [*direct cinema*, amongst other documentary types] across the threshold where it begins to be affected by fiction provokes a contrast effect such that the film-document, even as it takes on an overlay of fiction and is thereby slightly denatured, immediately gains a new value on another level. It responds to the flight from reality with a new lease of meaning and coherence and emerges from the dialectic endowed with perhaps greater conviction, its truth reinforced by and because of this detour through the ‘fictitious’. [...] The [reading] gains in richness, coherence and conviction in proportion to the extent that the impression of reality produced is impeded and falsified by manipulation. (Ibid: 227; 229)

This paradoxical insight also seems to inform Gilles Deleuze’s anti-Platonic and post-Leibnizian belief in cinema’s *power of falsification*. For Deleuze, however, the false is not a path to ‘richer’ or ‘truer’ comprehension, but a mode that manages to evade altogether the exhausting/exhausted Platonic distinction between truth and representation, or model and reproduction, by leveling their hierarchy and internalizing both in the simulacrum (Deleuze 1990: 262). Also – in the specific context of (cinematic) narration – falseness does not refer to instances that are simply opposed to the true or possible; it rather denotes the concurrence of mutually exclusive or *impossible* terms. While Leibniz may posit that the co-existence of contradictory facts is only thinkable in two different worlds, Deleuze responds that nothing except our will to save the form of truth and expel contradiction prevents us from assuming that two *impossibilities* indeed belong to one and the same universe. Therefore, any

narration can readily and deliberately cease “to be truthful, that is, to claim to be true, and [become] fundamentally falsifying [...]. It is a power of the false which replaces and supersedes the form of the true, because it poses the simultaneity of impossible presents, or the coexistence of not-necessarily true pasts” (Deleuze 1989: 131).

(Only *one* way to accomplish this radical shift from Leibniz’s ‘form of truth’ to a euphoric creation of the false would be what Deleuze calls “story-telling”. Assigning to real characters fictitious speech-acts, infecting their factuality with the fictional, pushing the documentary towards fabulation undermines the authority of ‘realism’ [which is never objective, but inevitably tailored to specific concepts of governance] or ‘truth’ [“which is always that of the masters or colonizers”]. Such a story-telling function – when it becomes an utterance of the poor – “gives the false the power which makes it into a memory, a legend, a monster” (Ibid: 150). It can therefore not only be seen as a *philosophical* move against Platonic idealism, but also as a *political* move against hegemonic discourses. There remains the hopeful task to ascertain such political instances in Greek documentary cinema, images that falsify and fabulate in order to find a voice which belongs to a different modulation of reality – not necessarily to that one of Brussels or Berlin, but as distinct as the voices that Deleuze distinguishes, here and there, in Brazil or Senegal or Cairo or Quebec.)

All this suggests that one has to transcend the difference between ‘truthful’ and ‘fictional’ depictions to reach both a politically efficient model of the documentary and an adequate concept of ‘reality’. Indeed, the two issues (of representational modes and ontological spheres) are tightly entangled: for as long as one thinks in terms of new documentaries ‘adopting’ the means of fiction, one also holds on to the basic notion of a gap – bridgeable or not – between the world and its image. Regardless of whether this image might be seen as credible evidence or mere genre convention, regardless of whether its fictionalization is denounced as aggressive forgery or welcomed as liberating advent of the imaginary, one always proceeds from ‘reality’ to then conceive and compare methods that appear suitable, revealing, or provocative *with respect to* that reality. All such concepts and negotiations of the documentary thus keep revolving around the center of an essentially invariable *being*: the documentary constantly invents new movements; reality remains unmoved ...

3.

Meanwhile, falsifying and fabulizing not only propose novel inflections of representation beyond truth/fiction; they are rather very concrete methods of thinking, reacting to, and altering actuality itself. The world is transformed from a monolithic object into a substantially unsettled field of potentialities – including the realization of a post-colonial alternative justice through Deleuzian ‘story-telling’ as well as more recent and more expansive new-materialist, neo-ecological, post-humanist versions of the present. With this in mind, one might

wonder if the contemporary proliferation of documentary strategies (from collaborative practices to surveillance aesthetics, from sensory cinema to archaeological approaches, from cell-phone mosaics¹ to virtual environments) can not only be attributed to an increase in the possibilities of representation, but to a fundamental change of the *represented*? What if we are not dealing with variants of the documentary, but with revisions of what we call ‘reality’? A reality which no longer stands impassively before us, but responds to every intervention and gaze – a *reality 2.0*, or even *3.0* inasmuch as it forms communicating nodes and complexes of its own? A reality in which the documentary would not provide the position of an observer and instead become only *one* among countless interacting elements? And when William Uricchio, in the *wimmelpicture* of current documentary strategies, detects “a rare moment that is in equal parts creative and inchoate” (Uricchio n. d.), could we not also consider this an apt diagnosis of the evolvments of such a reality?

As it happens, one of the media applications on *Docubase*, Deniz Tortum, Çağrı Hakan Zaman and Nil Tuzcu’s *ΣΕΠΤΕΜΒΡΙΑΝΑ / September 1955*,² fittingly illustrates the altered position of a documentary that no longer reaches out to grasp actuality from the outside but belongs to, is located in, and programmed by a net of interacting entities.



Still from the trailer of *September 1955*, © Deniz Tortum 2016:

<https://deniztortum.com/september-1955>

¹ See, for instance, the film *L'eau argentée – autoportrait Syrie* (Ossama Mohammed & Simav Bedirxan, 2014), a montage of mostly anonymous videoclips shot with the non-specialized, non-individualized, banal and coincidental “para-cameras” of smart phones and then assembled to form an intensive mosaic of the life, combat action and destruction of the city of Homs (Ries 2018: 135-136).

² See the project description on *Docubase*: <https://docubase.mit.edu/project/september-1955/>, and also Tortum 2016b.

The virtual reality installation deals with the riots directed against primarily Greek minorities in Istanbul on the 6th and 7th of September 1955, when – as a result of the escalating tensions between Greece and Turkey during the Cyprus crisis, and triggered by false news about Kemal Atatürk’s house in Thessaloniki being bombed – a large crowd took to the streets and raided the shops of non-Muslim citizens. *September 1955* revisits the pogrom in the form of an eight-minute virtual documentary that employs *Kinect* motion capture technology, an *Unreal* game engine and *VIVE* headset for users to experience the threatening signs of impending rampage and looting while moving through the room-scale digital (re)construction of a besieged photo shop, “modelled after the actual studios of Maryam Sahinyan (1911-1996) and Osep Minasoglu (1929-2013), two Armenian photographers who lived in Istanbul during the events” (Boyacioglu 2017).

(One might of course argue that *September 1955* is not a documentary film at all. However, a – somewhat formalistic – response might put forward that it has been part of international film exhibitions such as the 2017 Istanbul Independent Film Festival *!f*. Another – formal – rationale could refer to the fixed playing time and pre-conceived order of sequences that make for an almost exemplary cinematic experience: Angela Andersen calls it a “curated visit” to a “series of visual and aural scapes” and “a visual meta-chronicle of frozen scenes”, first in a portrait studio, then in a small photography shop, then at a street corner [Andersen 2018: 6]. What is more, one could adduce Thomas Elsaesser’s understanding of cinema not as a particular medium, but as an internalized mode of perception – a “cinema effect” which may indeed be “most present where its apparatus and technologies are least perceptible”. Cinema is part of us and our media environments “even when we are not at the movies”, and this is “one of the many reasons why we cannot go on thinking of film history as the history of films” [Elsaesser 2016: 71-72]. After all, the debates about post-cinema or the closure of the cinematic age suggest that film has become fluid and that it migrates into the digital, into small screens, façade advertising, game cultures, virtual museum exhibits ...)

But in what way can the ‘cinematic’, real-time, virtual setup *September 1955* be seen as a documentary that answers to the metamorphoses of reality itself? How can the installation be understood as equivalent to a world which escapes objectification by forming ever-changing eco-corpo-techno-coalitions? First of all, it is not interested in the exact depiction of past events or in offering a precise replica of history: its virtual photo studio, for instance, may be modelled on actual historical spaces, but it merges them, transforms them into a synthetic mash-up, a “fictional environment” or architectural collage decorated with props from daily life and Turkish movies of the 1950s (illustrated magazines, a vintage radio set with lace doily on top, a sheet almanac, an advertising brochure of Istanbul’s Taksim night club [Tortum 2019]). This, however, does not so much create a consistent and self-sufficient illusion as a speculative sphere of possible

'memories'. The past presents itself as constructed, an assemblage of computed artefacts which do not add up to a gapless tableau. The result is neither objective fact nor subjective fiction, but a porous, brittle, intentionally half-finished display that both envelops the user and demands to be experienced, filled out and completed by her.

The *semi-, post- or meta-realistic* nature of the fully equipped, but also unperfected world of *September 1955* becomes especially apparent in its representation of human figures. The project, states Tortum, consciously dispenses with photorealistic imagery, instead using a *Kinect* device to capture the size and movements of people rather than their features and faces, producing rudimentary 3D-mannequins with a uniform grey-brownish coating. The motion controller deletes the finer details of every individual in favor of almost abstract shapes, thus turning human figures into ghostly virtual apparitions. On the one hand, this enhances the impression of the persons being gone, not real, merely faint memories, lost in time (Lacey 2017). On the other, it has the peculiar double effect of emphasizing the specific imaging technique and reminding the user of her mediated environment, and at the same time appealing to her imaginative faculties, thereby including her in the production of meaning: obviously, the spaces, people, and events of 1955 do not exist as past occurrences which can be documented; they come into being only by interacting with the present, the medium, its materiality and immateriality, the fictional, the perceiver, and her body ...



Stills from the trailer of *September 1955*, © Deniz Tortum 2016

Indeed, the malleability and interconnectedness of the various components of reality, including the user in its midst, manifest themselves in what Tortum calls “embodied retelling” – and with this, one also encounters another kind of gaze which testifies to that other texture of the factual. To characterize this extraordinary gaze and its very concrete ontological entanglement with the physical world, Tortum invokes the myth of Orpheus and Eurydice, of Orpheus descending to Hades to free his beloved dead wife and, on their way up from the underworld, looking back at her and thereby losing her forever. In the same manner, virtual reality does not know the abstract, detached and fundamentally inconsequential gaze of an objective observer. In contrast to the representational scheme of documentary cinema, a computational medium can track as well as respond to the user’s bodily input and change her surroundings according to the movements of head and body. It involves the subject and re-structures reality as a field of interacting forces. Here, watching actually causes something. The ancient myth of Orpheus thus exposes a central aspect of VR – namely that “looking signals moving, and moving equals involvement. To bear witness is no mere ocular event, but a physical and emotional act” (Ibid).³

In the end, both exploring the imaginary components of the past and letting the user participate in its reactive formations are not just signs of a critical stance towards ‘historical facts’ or their ‘faithful reproduction’ through documentary. Beyond that, the elimination of objective distance and peculiar merging of *de-realization* and *incorporation* – the dismissal of authoritative representation, while the medium places the human subject into an entirely new psycho-physical environment – seem to answer to the re-structuring of reality into a continually morphing, non-visual contact zone.

³ Tortum originally developed the concept of “embodied montage” and its merging of “action and perception” in his Master thesis *Embodied Montage* (Tortum 2016a). Here, the term not only refers to a broad mutual responsiveness between gaze, body and (virtual) environment, but to their intentional and experimental de- and recoupling. Instead of just mimicking a real world experience (turning the head lets the field of vision shift in the same direction; walking forward causes objects to draw closer) the computed image of a headset is able to connect any physical action with any desired perception (looking lets an object grow, walking causes it to retreat, or talk, or vanish like Eurydice ...) and thus “separate one eye from the other, separate height from the body, and separate the field of vision from sight” (p. 57). The result is not a temporal or spatial, but an embodied montage, “occurring within the physical perceptual system of the viewer, incomplete until viewed” (p. 56). Such a variation of the *agency relationship* between the user and the system generates new meanings by liberating her from habitual cognitive – and ontological – patterns. However, apart from only illustrating the ‘unnatural’ coupling of sight and somatic experience in “embodied montage”, the myth of Orpheus might also serve as an allegory for the general interconnection between the user’s head movement, body position, hand and arm gestures and the responsive output of the real-time 3D engine: in both cases, the user not only observes her environment but interferes actively with its composition; in both cases, “looking signals moving [of a subject in relation to the world *and vice versa*, revealing ‘the environment as a malleable space’ (p. 51)!], and moving equals involvement”.

4.

Therefore, and although Deniz Tortum describes Orpheus's gaze not only as "physical" but also as "emotional", *September 1955* is less about an individual body and its feelings (what could pro forma be labeled 'immersion')⁴ than about de-personalized corporeality and affection. The visuals and soundscape, the historical newscast on the radio, the mob banging on the storefront may certainly create a sense of entrapment and support the installation's overall emotional impact. Nevertheless, it proves much more crucial that the model 'subject observes object' is replaced by a more complex one in which all constituents – the user's body and cognition, persons from the past, technical appliances, archival sources, the installation space, contemporary events,⁵ inanimate objects, indices of (discursive as well as aesthetic) fabrication, the medium itself – send out lines of force and infinitely act upon each other. In such a milieu all things, physical matter, actual or virtual entities become 'agents': the world is no longer the stage for an acting subject, it acts for itself.

And along with the conversion of reality into a corporeal influencing-network, 'emotions' are transformed into 'affects': an experience does not induce personal sentiments but unfolds as interaction of impersonal, material as well as mental forces and repercussions – as affection. According to (the Deleuzian reading of) Spinoza, *affectio* is "a state of a body insofar as it is subject to the action of another body", an encounter between an affected and an affecting presence. Since Spinoza "does not believe in action at a distance, action always implies a contact, and is even a mixture of bodies. *Affectio* is a mixture of two bodies, one body which is said to act on another, and the other receives the trace of the first". Meanwhile, Spinoza's *affectus* designates the perpetual modulation or oscillation of a body's capacity to act according to the either positive ('joyful') or negative ('sad') influence of its encounters. The body thus passes from one stage to another: "our power of acting or force of existing is increased or diminished in a continuous manner, on a continuous line, and this is what we call *affectus*, it's what we call existing" (Deleuze 1978).

When Spinoza/Deleuze declare elsewhere that "everything is simply an encounter in the universe, a good or a bad encounter", when all bodies are no longer defined by their genus or species "but by the affects of which they are capable – in passion as well as in action", when every being is the result "of the relationships of which it is composed" (Deleuze, Parnet 2002: 45), one can easily

⁴ In contrast to Andersen's review of *September 1955*, this essay 'keeps in mind' but refrains from explicitly addressing the much-discussed ability of VR and gaming applications to breach the spectator's cognitive and emotional distance through *immersion* or its (potential) effects of *empathy*.

⁵ Angela Andersen points out that aside from generating a cultural memory, *September 1955* also "alludes to the current vulnerable situation of minorities living in Turkey. This resonates with the decades-long urban relocation of Kurds from conflict zones in Turkey's eastern provinces, and the recent situation of over two million Syrian refugees living in Turkey" (Andersen 2018: 6).

see how the principle of generalized affection creates a whole new world that must be experienced rather than documented. In light of this, VR becomes a veritable ‘Spinozistic machine’, a mediator that produces relations between bodies (of the user, of her physical and digital environment). VR, says Deniz Tortum, is a link between action and perception; *affectio*, says Spinoza, is the coincidence of action and passion; both in a virtual and affective reality, action is indistinguishable from reception since user and medium and all conceivable bodies equally act upon and receive from each other. In other words, VR seems to offer an adequate ‘documentary’ mode for a world of affects – not because it would best depict, mirror or expose that world, but because it is able to plug in and become a living part of its exchange circuits (only one of the myriad ways, envisioned by Ken Hillis, “in which virtual technologies [...] *will affect and be affected* by the real world into which they are now being inserted” [Hillis 1999: 200-201; italics mine]). Its specific technique would not consist in representation but in amplifying and taking part in constellations of interacting and interactive elements. ‘Documentary’ would mean to create a place that concentrates and engages in the manifold affections of the real.

We have thus come a long way – from reality as a collection of objects, facts or truths to a reality of agents and affects. This re-shaped reality obviously retroacts upon the possibilities of the documentary just as it informs contemporary philosophy or political and media theory.⁶

5.

The influx of fiction and falsification, the multiple contemporary re-formations of reality, the corporeal impact of virtual media environments, Spinoza’s model of affection: all this seems to amount to a somewhat extravagant and offbeat perspective on the documentary. However, the above considerations do not aim at determining its current state or suggest a general methodological approach. They are rather intended as an invitation – surely in accord with many of the ongoing developments in film theory – to welcome such interdisciplinary, interdiscursive, intermedia, interactive, and inter-affective aspects to the exploration of ‘cinematic’ documentaries. While Deniz Tortum is “trying to apply film history and film theory to virtual reality” (even though most theoreticians tend to think of digital media as “completely something else”, and even though VR, in contrast to cinema, does not yet have “a good way of capturing movement and the world in real time” [Lacey 2017]), the reverse operation of reading film *through the virtual* might prove just as fruitful. Revisiting the ‘old’ medium

⁶ See also Emele 1998: 264: “In the light of the ‘renewability’ of reality in audiovisual documentation, there is a fresh demand for theoreticians and makers to think about appropriate conceptual categories. Genre frontiers have become questionable. We must redefine the boundaries of terms such as ‘documentary’, ‘data’, ‘simulation’ and ‘information’. [...] We must reflect on the increasing virtualization of the world and the hegemonial demands of immaterial signs.”

through a 'new' one does not so much leave behind the established topics of (documentary) film studies or replace them with a brave new set of supposedly extrinsic concepts, as it reveals novel facets, areas or components *inside* the cinematic itself.

One can in fact discern several of these concepts throughout the present *Filmicon* issue: the question of a documentary quality of fiction (in the portrayal of Athenian urban space); the 'documentaristic' amalgamation of authenticating and consciously de/constructive strategies (in the depiction of sport exercises in recent Greek feature films); the spectator's affective involvement through 'aesthetic wit(h)nessing' (in a documentary essay about an Aegean island detention camp); the shift from a logic of photographic – as well as political – representation to a scheme of active participation and invention (in the work of a Greek independent film initiative); the correlation of cinema with other audio/visual arrangements (such as art and video installations); finally, an expansion of the research area by agitating, contaminating, and reflecting the notion of 'Greek' film in nationally unaffiliated views of the moving image. In this sense, any undogmatic foray – even if barely hinted at, or merely on a trial basis – into non-representational, de/constructive, post-human, virtual, environmental, art-based, networked, media-archaeological, oceanic, intersectional, new-materialist, cybernetic territory might in turn contribute to further outline past and present (Greek) film cultures or trace out a possible path in (Greek) film studies.

The current issue of *Filmicon* assembles 'moments' of the documentary that certainly do not maintain a rigorously experimental stance. At the same time, however, they set out to locate documentary traits in a number of rather unanticipated, peripheral aesthetic forms and environments. In the best case, they draw one or two lines of flight that deviate, or continue, from where we stand.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, Angela (2018), 'Empathy and the Creation of Virtual Space: Review of *ΣΕΠΤΕΜΒΡΙΑΝΑ* / *September 55*, Keller Gallery, Cambridge, MA, 2016; ! Istanbul Independent Film Festival, Istanbul, 2017', *Architectural History* [online], 6: 1, 01 October, pp. 4-6, Available at <https://journal.eahn.org/articles/10.5334/ah.334/>. Accessed 16 April 2020.
- Boyacioglu, Beyza (2017), 'Last Week at ODL: September 1955 by Deniz Tortum, Cagri Zaman and Nil Tuzcu', *MIT Open Documentary Lab*, <http://opendoclab.mit.edu/last-week-odl-september-1955-deniz-tortum-cagri-zaman/>. Accessed 16 April 2020.
- Comolli, Jean-Louis (1980), 'Detour Through the Direct', in Christopher Williams (ed.), *Realism and the Cinema*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 225-243.

- Deleuze, Gilles (1978), 'Sur Spinoza', *Cours Vincennes*, 24 January, Translated by Timothy S. Murphy, Available at <https://www.webdeleuze.com/textes/14>. Accessed 23 April 2020.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1989), *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta, Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1990), *The Logic of Sense*, Translated by Mark Lester, London: Athlone Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles; Parnet, Claire (2002), *Dialogues II*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam, London, New York: Continuum.
- Elsaesser, Thomas (2016), *Film History as Media Archaeology: Tracking Digital Cinema*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Emele, Martin (1998), 'The Assault of Computer-generated Worlds on the Rest of Time', in Thomas Elsaesser and Kay Hoffmann (eds), *Cinema Futures: Cain, Abel or Cable? The Screen Arts in the Digital Age*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 251-265.
- Gunning, Tom (2016), 'Early cinema as global cinema: the encyclopedic ambition', in Richard Abel, Giorgio Bertellini and Rob King (eds), *Early Cinema and the "National"*, New Barnet: John Libbey Publishing, pp. 11-16.
- Hillis, Ken (1999), *Digital Sensations: Space, Identity, and Embodiment in Virtual Reality*, Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Holl, Ute (2018), 'Mit ohne Ordnung: Kontingenzproduktion als Strategie des Dokumentarischen (zum Beispiel Abbas Kiarostami)', in Elisabeth Büttner, Vrääth Öhner and Lena Stölzl (eds), *Sichtbar machen. Politiken des Dokumentarfilms*, Berlin: Vorwerk 8, pp. 111-130.
- Lacey, Sharon (2017), 'VR through a long lens: Deniz Tortum lends historical perspective to a new medium', *Arts at MIT*, 13 March, Available at <https://arts.mit.edu/vr-long-lens-deniz-tortum-lends-historical-perspective-new-medium/>. Accessed 20 April 2020.
- Marszałek, Magdalena; Mersch, Dieter (2016), 'Seien wir realistisch: Einleitung', in Marszałek and Mersch (eds), *Seien wir realistisch. Neue Realismen und Dokumentarismen in Philosophie und Kunst*, Zurich, Berlin: Diaphanes, pp. 7-27.
- Ries, Marc (2018), 'Vorletzte Bilder', in Bernhard Groß, Vrääth Öhner and Drehli Robnik (eds), *Film und Gesellschaft denken mit Siegfried Kracauer*, Vienna: Turia + Kant, pp. 132-143.
- Tortum, Deniz (2016a), *Embodied Montage: Reconsidering Immediacy in Virtual Reality*, Master Thesis, MIT, September 2016, Available at <https://cmsw.mit.edu/deniz-tortum-embodied-montage-virtual-reality/>. Accessed 16 April 2020.
- Tortum, Deniz (2016b), 'September 1955', *Deniz Tortum personal website*, <https://deniztortum.com/september-1955>. Accessed 05 May 2020.

Tortum, Deniz (2019), 'A Virtual Reality Experience: September 1955' (Talk given at the Hafiza Merkezi research center), Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c-m-XlwknxA>. Accessed 19 April 2020.

Uricchio, William (n. d.), 'Mission - Selection Criteria - Why Docubase?', *Docubase* website, <https://docubase.mit.edu/about>. Accessed 16 April 2020.