

Moving Through the Documentary

Bodily Movement and Montage in Interactive Documentary

Cornelia Lund

Web-based interactive documentaries typically involve two types of performance or performativity: the performativity of software or platforms, and the performance of the user. In this context, physical movement or bodily interaction is usually limited to a certain set of actions related to direct interaction with the computer. At first sight, this article's title may thus elicit questions as to the importance of highlighting movement in relation to interactive documentary. This only starts to become more meaningful if interactive documentary is viewed from a wider perspective, one that leaves the strictly web-based setting and takes into account dispositifs that require more bodily interactive "exercise". This is not entirely new, as recent years have seen discussions and experimentations on performativity and the role of bodily presence in interactive documentaries from various perspectives (e. g. Aston 2017, Zimmerman & De Michiel 2018, Nelson 2022). Most of the time, however, these approaches are interested in direct exchanges and encounters between the artists or filmmakers as performers and the audience, their physical co-presence, and a collective experience, as opposed to the situation of isolation in front of a screen. Consequently, they mainly discuss live performance as taking place in a theatrical setting. Taking the open-ended definition of interactive documentary developed by Judith Aston, Sandra Gaudenzi, and Mandy Rose as a starting point (Aston, Gaudenzi, & Rose 2017, 1–2), this chapter proposes to shift the focus to an understudied aspect of how and where interactive documentary can take place, namely as part of installations. In order to connect and activate the different parts of a documentary, interaction in an installation setting involves movement: the movement performed by the viewer's body moving in and through the installation. As in web-based interactive documentary, this entails "modalities of perception, editing and temporality" (Parente & de Carvalho 2008, 50) that are very different from the "definite sequence" (ibid.) offered by traditional cinema. But, unfolding in a spatio-temporal arrangement unique to each installation and viewer (ibid.), the activating potential of the installation places the body of the viewer at the center as the privileged instrument for exploring the dispositif (Duguet 1988: 228). This leads to the question of whether or how the role

of the subject and subjectivation are affected by these characteristics, for example in comparison to the traditional cinema dispositif.

In order to ventilate this question and to explain how these installation settings can be discussed in relation to interactive documentary, this chapter will start by developing a methodological approach drawing on a critical discussion of the fields involved and relevant discourses. It will then focus on the analysis of works by Harun Farocki and Antje Ehmann, *Volumen Express*, and Rimini Protokoll, ranging from exhibition dispositifs to a set-design-like dispositif. The main focus here is on experiences that unfold in the physical world, but as virtual reality has become increasingly important in the field of interactive documentary (Nash 2018, 97), the chapter will conclude with some deliberations regarding VR.

Situating Documentary Installations

Documentary installations using moving images often combine and bridge various contexts of reference, depending on, for example, who produced them in which institutional context, or where they are presented. In consequence, they can be and have been discussed from a variety of perspectives, the most important ones for this article being art and cinema. With the so-called “documentary turn” in the arts around 1990, documentary moving images become part of a larger documentary field (Peleg 2010, 14) as one alongside many other artistic documentary practices. These have mainly unfolded within the context of art, which then also becomes their major framework of reference, and is where they have been widely discussed (e.g., Lind & Steyerl 2008; or consistently at the Berlin Documentary Festival from 2010 to 2014). If we shift our perspective to that of cinema, however, documentary installations using moving images can also be described, with Jihoon Kim, as part of “Documentary’s Expanded Fields” (2022), the expansion being one beyond the borders of the traditional cinema context and its dispositif. The following analysis of the three chosen examples is indebted to Kim’s discussion of the “multiscreen dispositif” as part of the paradigm of what he calls the “expanded dispositif” (Kim 2022, 114–123), in particular by further developing the idea of spatialized strategies of montage (*ibid.*: 114). Kim critically refers to a number of texts showing that this kind of spatial arrangement and the exhibition setting in an art context entail a series of implications. Erika Balsom stresses that the white cube of the gallery or exhibition room is not a “neutral container” (Balsom 2013, 39) but comes with a set of practices that are associated with it and a particular discursive and institutional framing. Referring to Francesco Cassetti and Jacques Rancière, Kim conceives the two main operations that are at work when the documentary leaves the cinema to take the form of an art installation as “relocation” and “redistribution”, arguing that “documentary installations inherit documentary cinema’s constitutive ele-

ments and its modes of practice while also endowing them with a new aesthetic experience" (Kim 2022, 109). The multiscreen dispositif thus functions against the backdrop of the traditional cinema dispositif, whose elements are dislocated from the movie theatre and migrate to the new context (relocation), while its formal, rhetorical, and perceptual elements as well as its reference to reality are rearranged and transformed (redistribution) (ibid.) In their seminal article on the subject, subjectivity, and subjectivation in this context – an angle of the multiscreen dispositif that Kim's approach is not particularly interested in – Parente and de Carvalho give a similar description of how these different types of dispositifs relate to each other (Parente & de Carvalho 2008, 51). It is precisely "because cinema subjectivity has been deeply interiorized" by the viewers that these installation dispositifs produce new models of subjectivation, "formed in the fissures of the dispositif", between "acknowledgement and displacement" (ibid.), they argue, with reference to Deleuze's concept of the dispositif.

At this point, I would like to open up a short parenthesis to critically reflect on the strong link to cinema that is being affirmed here. With regard to Kim's approach, it can be asked if the two operations of relocation and redistribution can fully account for all the implications of the changed framing. While some producers of documentary installations, such as Harun Farocki or Hito Steyerl, certainly have their roots in cinema and may use cinematic modes of production and practices, one might ask if this is always true for trained artists whose approach to working with moving images can be very different and does not necessarily refer to a cinematic framework, be it in terms of aesthetics or practices. Publications that address the positioning of documentary moving images in the context of art and cinema emphasize the importance of taking into consideration the different discursive frameworks. The failure to do so can lead to serious misunderstandings, for example if moving images originating in the field of the fine arts are analyzed as part of traditional history of film or cinema (Hohenberger & Mundt 2016, 18), particularly since the ethical frameworks (Ellis 2007, 59) and the reference to reality work differently (Lund 2019).

Similar concerns can be voiced regarding the concept of the dispositif. Caution might be in order when assuming a deeply interiorized familiarity with the traditional cinema dispositif and its effects, for example with respect to younger generations and their viewing habits. Furthermore, the theoretical approaches from the art context do not necessarily refer to traditional cinema in their definitions of moving images or video installations as dispositifs but define them in a wider net of modes of representation (e.g., Duguet 1988, 227).

With this in mind, we can proceed to provide a more precise definition of the approach taken in this chapter. Rather than adhering to a traditional methodology with a singular, conclusive research question, it can be characterized as an experiment that aims to foster new avenues of thought regarding interactive documentary. While Kim acknowledges in his book that documentary installations possess

interactive potential, they are not discussed within the chapter on interactive documentaries. I propose to shift the angle and analyze the installations precisely from the perspective of interactive documentary, or – as an extension of this perspective – in terms of the relationship between documentary and interactivity.¹ Even if these installations might not be perceived as very experimental exhibitions, they function as “experimentation fields” (Parente & de Carvalho 2008, 50) in which the viewer activates the dispositif through their unique experience. Seen from this perspective, these installation settings thus unfold an experimental character that can be used to further explore and expand the very notion of interactive documentary.

In this regard, I will examine how these settings experiment with and affect the defining parameters of interactive documentary. How does the interaction change in these settings? How are features such as collaboration and polyvocality orchestrated? And how is montage renegotiated when (bodily) movements define the selection and combination of images and sounds?

Before addressing these questions through the analysis of examples, there is one more instance to discuss, and that is how to refer to the person(s) engaging with these installations. Galleries or museums usually have visitors, films have viewers or spectators, depending on the context, interactive documentaries may also have users. Kim points to Dominique Païni’s use of the term “visitor-spectator” for film or video installations to describe the tension between their immobile attention to the moving images and their movements in and through the installation (Kim 2022, 112). For his own discussion of the “expanded dispositifs”, however, he opts for the more neutral term “viewer”. This article will mostly follow him in this choice – with one notable exception – by seeking to specify the role of “viewer” for each particular context in the analysis.

As already mentioned, the multiscreen dispositif does not aim at producing one generalized viewer experience; each viewer rather generates their own experience through their specific approach to the work. Furthermore, there are no standardized multiscreen dispositifs, but each work represents its own version of said dispositif – which is precisely why the title of Anne-Marie Duguet’s article on the topic is “Dispositifs” in the plural. They nevertheless share certain characteristics regarding the spatial and temporal organization and the role of the viewer’s body, as discussed above. The following examples show three different approaches to multiscreen dispositifs. Of course, they do not represent the entirety of possible approaches, but their differing fields of reference and degrees of complexity in the ways media are arranged and viewers activated provide an overview of the field.

1 The perspective of “documentary and interactivity” as an expanded approach to interactive documentary was proposed by Judith Aston during the conference on “Interactive Documentary: Laboratory and Experiment” (February 1–2, 2024, HSLU Lucerne) in which framework a first version of this paper was presented.

Example 1: *Eine Einstellung zur Arbeit (Labour in a Single Shot)*, Harun Farocki & Antje Ehmann, HKW Berlin, 2015

Eine Einstellung zur Arbeit (Labour in a Single Shot) is the title of a work by Harun Farocki and Antje Ehmann. It is also the title of the exhibition that presented that work from February 27 to April 6, 2015 in the main exhibition hall (now the Mrinalini Mukherjee Hall) of the HKW (House of World Cultures) in Berlin. The project is the result of three years of exploration of “work” in a contemporary global context and is well documented on a website that presents all relevant information on places, dates, curators, participants, and the concept of the project.² In brief, the project consisted of 15 workshops held in 15 cities; the task of the workshop participants was to produce videos of one to two minutes in length. Each video had to be taken in a single shot, cuts were not allowed, but the camera could be either static, panning, or travelling. The short clips had to show people leaving their workplace. These strict rules and the overall topic stem from the larger context of the project, Farocki’s investigation into the Lumière Brothers’ film *Workers Leaving the (Lumière) Factory* (1895), which started with his video *Arbeiter verlassen die Fabrik* in 1995 and took different forms over the years, including texts and installations.

The website also functions as an archive insofar as it presents the results of the workshops, the short clips. All the clips are brought together on one page, with each represented by an image of the same size. When a cursor hovers over the images, two lines of text appear, giving details of the author, the workplace filmed, and the city and year of the clip’s production. Clicking on an image activates the video. This mode of presentation references the exhibition (or vice versa), where the videos were shown on screens of the same size. But in contrast to the two-dimensional webpage, at the exhibition, the screens (and projectors) were hanging from the ceiling, facing in different directions, and thus forming a spatial arrangement that viewers had to navigate by moving their bodies. The hanging height of the screens, the short duration of the videos as well as the absence of seating furniture suggested that viewers should stand and move from screen to screen, watching the videos in no fixed order. By moving from one screen to the next, the viewer starts to combine the single videos into a series or ensemble of videos in what Kim calls a spatialized strategy of montage (2022, 114). The montage becomes interactive here as it unfolds through the viewer’s individual choice of where and when to move next.

It is usual for film or video installations in an exhibition to run in a loop and have no fixed beginning; it is also very often left to viewers to choose the order in which they engage with the parts of an installation – or not to engage at all, to do something

2 The website documenting the project *Eine Einstellung zur Arbeit/Labour in a Single Shot* is available in German and English at <https://www.labour-in-a-single-shot.net/en/project/concept/> (last accessed April 13, 2024).

different, answer a phone call, doze off, read a book, or eat an apple. But in addition to these usual elements, *Eine Einstellung zur Arbeit* (*Labour in a Single Shot*) offers a very open spatial arrangement. This allows sounds to mix, and not only the sounds in the videos, but also those of the visitors talking to each other. With the viewers standing next to each other and moving through the space, all kinds of sensory experiences become attached to and thus part of the viewing experience. Taking this into account, it seems to make sense to expand Kim's notion of montage and talk about a spatialized *and* bodily strategy of montage because the viewer takes in all kinds of sensory stimuli while moving their body through the spatial arrangement. The sensory experience is maybe even heightened in installations where the setting is more site specific and less abstract, as in the following example.

Example 2: *Facades of Crisis*, Volumen Express, Galerie Stadtgestalt c/o Serge von Arx, Berlin, 2010

Facades of Crisis by Volumen Express was shown in Berlin in November 2010, at the 24th Stuttgart Filmwinter – Festival for Expanded Media (January 2011), and at Club Cultural Matienzo, Buenos Aires (December 13 to 20, 2011). The work is based on research material produced in the context of the documentary theatre installation (IM)*POTENCIA* by Volumen Express, which addresses the loss of identity experienced by people in Buenos Aires following the 2001 economic crash in Argentina. Each work addresses the situation ten years after the crash using a different approach in terms of discursive framing and the respective media dispositif of the work: While (IM)*POTENCIA* is described as “documentary theatre installation” or “documentary theatre play” (Volumen Express), thus highlighting both its documentary character and the theatrical experience, its spin-off, *Facades of Crisis*, is characterized as a “multiple channel video/space installation” (Volumen Express). This shifts the emphasis to precisely the two parameters that define the montage and thus the documentary experience in this context.

Facades of Crisis combines various presentation formats to show a variety of documentary material: In the exhibition in Berlin, the viewer was first presented with larger-than-life projections of architectural security measures in Buenos Aires:³ shops protected by massive metal bars through which goods are passed to clients and social interaction happens, such as passing a lighter. In the same room, a table with a chair and a laptop offers additional material to explore. A trap door in the floor leads to the basement. Here, the viewer can choose between filmed interviews of ten inhabitants of Buenos Aires, from different social backgrounds, talking about the financial crisis and its effects. Projections are the exception here, most of the

3 For an impression of the installation, see: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-6m6uutas90> (last accessed April 13, 2024).

interviews are shown on a monitor and the audio is diffused via headphones. The basement is anything but a white cube, and the viewer is confronted with a somewhat untidy floor full of boxes and furniture of different types and sizes onto which the monitors are arranged and which can be used for sitting.

The sensory experience offered by this installation differs from the first example insofar as the institutional presence of the gallery is less strong and the senses have to deal with a much less rigid and more variable exhibition setting. First, it is site specific to the gallery venue; second, the two rooms offer different media environments with different viewing and sound situations; third, the viewer is confronted with different forms of visual, auditive, and haptic materiality; and fourth, the viewer has to execute a variety of movements and body positions, such as standing, walking, climbing stairs, or sitting, to find their way through the installation. The impression of becoming part of the life of the city and its problems that is created by being surrounded by the larger-than-life projections and sound in the first room is countered by the possibility of intimate concentration on the interviews in the basement. These different modes of experience contribute to a maybe even more immersive character than in the first example.

Both works show how the viewer has to negotiate the interplay of interactivity – through the spatialized and bodily montage – and immersion – in the concentrated act of perception – that is typical for this type of installation (Kim 2022, 115; Cowie 2009, 129). It is through the interplay of these two parameters that a certain polyvocality is orchestrated, another key element of interactive documentary (e.g., Aston 2017). In both examples, a number of contributions to the documentary argument are arranged and distributed among the screens – “argument” understood here, borrowing from the Cambridge Dictionary, as the subject matter and development of ideas in a work, both narrative and non-narrative. There is no linear “master narrative”; instead, each viewer creates their own documentary argument according to their choices and movements through the installation.

While the bodily movement through the installation is decisive to activate the documentary and create meaning, the participatory contribution of the viewer is nevertheless limited. Installations that happen only in the physical space of an art institution such as a gallery, museum, or project space are often not collaborative or even co-creative in the sense of giving the viewer the opportunity to contribute films or other material of their own making or become otherwise more active as a collaborative participant. If, however, the installation is conceived less as a multi-screen dispositif from the perspective of the art field, but from the point of view of theatre, the viewer’s role can change, as the third example shows.

Example 3: *Situation Rooms*, Rimini Protokoll, 2013

Rimini Protokoll is a “theatre label” founded by Helgard Haug, Stefan Kaegi, and Daniel Wetzel in 2000, working on expanding “the means of theatre to create new perspectives on reality” with each work, as they put it on their website. Their works are thus rooted in the context of theatre. They are often presented in this institutional framework, but the group chooses more often than not to leave behind the traditional theatre situation to break the fourth wall.

Situation Rooms is a “multiplayer video piece” characterized as a “simultaneous cinema” experience that unfolds on a “film set” (Rimini Protokoll). The reference to cinema, its mode of production and presentation is thus already given in the description of the piece, which is no surprise considering that Rimini Protokoll’s documentary theatre is often discussed as and in relation to documentary cinema (e. g. Rathmanner 2005, Cappeller 2018). The term “player”, however, points to yet another genre, namely games, and therefore to a more active, participatory role for the “audience members”.

But how exactly is the interplay of these elements arranged in *Situation Rooms*? What kind of documentary experience is proposed here and how does this relate to the approach to documentary and interactivity taken in this article?

Situation Rooms deals with war, presenting facets of this topic from 20 distinct perspectives: from war refugees, via a peace activist, to an arms dealer.⁴ Rimini Protokoll seldom work with professional actors, turning instead mainly to people with real-life expertise of a subject. In this case, the representatives of the 20 perspectives do not directly appear in the piece (in contrast to other pieces by the group). Instead, 13 players are sent into a set or installation consisting of 15 different rooms. In the starting situation, as everyone gathers around an oval table, the players are given an iPad with videos together with instructions on how to interact with the video material, the setting, and the other players. Different doors lead into the architectural structure, and depending on the starting position and the behavior of the players, the piece may unfold in different ways, planned and unplanned. Unplanned insofar as the players are still free to ignore the instructions, do nothing, sit down, start singing, or leave the piece prematurely, for instance.

Insofar as it has an organized, fixed beginning, a suggested path through the piece, and only allows players to remain in the installation for a limited duration, the organizational context of *Situation Rooms* resembles more that of a theatre piece than of an art installation. The montage through choice and movement remains, however,

4 The architecture of *Situation Rooms* remains the same regardless of where the piece is presented. In this case, therefore, no specific realization is discussed. For an overview, see: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-6iFd2EuS5Y> (last accessed April 13, 2024).

a decisive parameter, as the players are free to choose the order in which they look at the various elements in a room or where to move first, for example.

The media dispositif is more complex than in the two previous examples and consists of a combination of diverse media disposed within the set-like architecture and on the iPad. Moving images are only one element in this environment; there is also audio material, written texts, and objects such as furniture that serve to characterize the sometimes meticulously reconstructed spatial situations of the rooms representing the perspectives on war that are at the heart of the piece (e. g. an operating theater in a tent in Sierra Leone, a Mexican cemetery, or an arms fair in Abu Dhabi). This makes the experience more haptic, especially since the players are asked to interact with the environment: They are invited to touch certain objects, for example, or perform actions involving them. In some rooms, the haptic dimension is complemented and emphasized by other sensations such as smell (of food, for example). Movement is also highlighted by asking the players not only to move through the architectural structure but also to perform certain actions. Players therefore interact with the installation as in the previous examples, but are also invited to interact with other players: They not only see the relevant experts on the iPad according to which part of the architectural environment they are currently in, they also take on and re-enact the role of these experts to sometimes even interact with each other in this capacity.

Overall, *Situation Rooms* is characterized, on the one hand, by elements of immersive theatre or installations (players take on roles, interact etc.), but, on the other hand, it repeatedly creates distancing moments by means of the documentary material that can be accessed on the iPad or sometimes directly on site. This material, Miriam Dreyse argues, constantly interrupts the immersion, asks the players to step out of their assumed roles, and confronts them with the friction between the piece and reality – and ultimately the question of what it is they are actually participating in (Dreyse 2021, 171–175).

This self-reflective openness in the construction of the documentary argument is paired with and relies on the polyphonic approach based on strategies of spatial and bodily montage that allows for the construction of polyphonic realities. This is also reflected in the title, *Situation Rooms*, which indicates that, in global warfare and conflicts, there is no such thing as the one situation where all threads come together, become linked in space and time and thus coherent and legible, as implied by the unitary Situation Room of the US government (Hirsch 2013, 9).

Embodiment and Interactivity

If the interplay of immersion, reflection, and interaction is supported by a heightened sensory, bodily experience that engages all the senses, what does this mean for

the interactive documentary experience? How can we describe the impact it has on the way the documentary narrative or argument is perceived and processed by the viewer/player?

The concept of haptic visuality developed by Laura Marks as a mode of cinematic perception encouraging “an embodied relationship to the image that involves the non-audiovisual senses and calls on bodily memory” (Marks 2014, 272) seems useful in this context. If haptic visuality is already at work in traditional cinema situations, we can assume that its role becomes even more prominent in installations offering explicit haptic stimuli, such as those analyzed here. Combined with Judith Aston’s concept of live performance and interactive documentary as “emplaced interaction”, it helps to explain the mechanisms at work in these installations, as the notion of “emplacement” stresses the element of “bringing our bodies and minds into direct interplay with the wider environment” (Aston 2017, 233). The body and the senses, and, in Aston’s approach, spatial relationships, are central to these concepts, but movement is not a key element in them. It would thus seem likely that, to discuss the specific character of spatial and bodily strategies of montage, it would be fruitful to complement such approaches with ideas drawn from fields such as dance and performance studies, where the moving body is central. Concepts of bodily or embodied knowledge have been widely discussed in the humanities, particularly as a feminist approach and as a qualitative research method, and they have gained particular importance in dance and performance studies in discussions of the body as an archive of movements and with respect to the relationship of kinaesthetic and cognitive processes (e.g., Parviainen 2021). As it is characteristic of the installations we are discussing here that the aesthetic experience and the cognitive process are particularly shaped by bodily movements and sensations and thus become far more physical, it may be appropriate to speak about an *embodied interactive documentary experience*. Referring back to the concept of the *dispositif*, it is through the specific embodied interactive documentary experience that the viewer navigates and activates the *dispositif* and the mechanisms of subjectivation operate. In order to define the results of these operations more precisely, it would, however, be necessary to expand this article’s theoretical-analytical perspective and conduct empirical audience research.

Interestingly, the notion of embodiment also appears in the field of interactive documentary in relation to virtual reality. In his MA thesis, Halil Denis Tortum introduces the concept of “embodied montage” as an “expressive technique for creating meaning in virtual reality work” (Tortum 2016, 11–12). Similar to the discussed installations, where immersive and distancing moments are constantly negotiated, embodied montage aims to counter the immediacy of the “seamless comfortable experience” created by whole-body interaction mechanics (67) to make the medium apparent and “create new, unexpected meaning through juxtaposition and conflict” (77). The bodily movement in this case is, however, far less pronounced than in the

installations we have been considering, and the interplay between montage, movement, and other sensory influences is differently orchestrated due to the technical dispositif of the virtual reality experience. Furthermore, Tortum develops his concept of “embodied montage” for a particular type of virtual reality that he describes as the “non-fiction real-time 3D project”, which he contrasts to 360° videos (25) and exemplifies in his project *Hospital with one entrance and two exits* (2016). As the findings of research are not yet conclusive, the question remains as to whether embodiment in virtual reality functions in the same way as in the physical world. This excursion into the realm of virtual reality functions as a parenthesis on the way to my closing remarks and is intended simply to pave the way for further explorations. It would require another article as well as audience research to answer this question and others related to the element of montage via movement and choice in other types of virtual interactive documentaries, such as the *Subterranean Imprint Archive* (2021), a virtual reality experience for Oculus Quest by the South African duo François Knoetze and Amy Louise Wilson from Lo-Def Film Factory. The work traces the legacy of technopolitics in Central and Southern Africa, focusing on the question of what constitutes a “nuclear place”, taking the origins of the uranium used in the Manhattan project in a mine in the Democratic Republic of Congo as a starting point. The archive is navigated by moving one’s hands, but, as the voiceover description in the playthrough puts it, “You are both inside and outside of your body”.⁵ It still remains to be explored – by means of audience research, for example – how this kind of combined bodily experience works in terms of embodied knowledge production.

Towards an Open Ending

In line with this parenthesis full of open questions and in guise of a conclusion, I would like to steer this article towards an open ending by coming back to the idea of the experimental character that the type of documentary installations discussed here unfolds when analyzed from the perspective of interactive documentaries. These installations may or may not be considered experimental in the institutional contexts for which they were produced, be they galleries, museums, or theatres. However, the aim of this chapter has been to explore them, in a metaphorical way, as a sort of lab-like experimental setting for shifting perspectives and thus the re-combination and re-arrangement of concepts as a means of creating paths to expand the idea of interactive documentary. One such path lies in conducting audience research on the embodied interactive documentary experience with regard to multiscreen dispositifs. Another lies in the emphasis on bodily and sensory

5 For the playthrough, see: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hty7ulifaDw> (last accessed April 13, 2024).

experiences related to the concept of emplaced interaction and strategies of spatial and bodily montage. This perspective not only adds new possibilities of interactivity to the computer- and mouse click-based interactivity of the usual web-based interactive documentary. It also allows for a shift in focus from the audiovisual perception privileged in Western cultures to include modes of perception such as touch that play a primordial role in a global perspective (Marks 2014, 269). Paired with the propensity to postcolonial approaches that Kim ascribes to the fragmented polyvocality of the multiscreen dispositif (Kim 2022, 123–125), this potentially paves the way for the exploration of interactivity and documentary beyond the Western context in which the concept of interactive documentary was conceived.

Bibliography

- Aston, Judith (2017), “Interactive documentary and live performance: from embodied to emplaced interaction”, in Judith Aston, Sandra Gaudenzi, & Mandy Rose (eds.), *i-docs. The Evolving Practices of Interactive Documentary*. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 222–236.
- Aston, Judith, Sandra Gaudenzi, & Mandy Rose (2017), “Introduction”, in Judith Aston, Sandra Gaudenzi, & Mandy Rose (eds.), *i-docs. The Evolving Practices of Interactive Documentary*. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 1–3.
- Balsom, Erika (2013), *Exhibiting Cinema in Contemporary Art*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. <http://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/33914> (last accessed June 29, 2025)
- Cambridge University Press, “Argument”, *Cambridge Dictionary*. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/argument> (last accessed April 15, 2024)
- Cappeller, Ricarda (2018), “Städtische Alltagserfahrung und das politische Theatermachen. Die (politische) Arbeit von Rimini Protokoll”, *Deutscher Kulturrat, Politische Bildung*. <https://www.kulturrat.de/themen/politische-bildung/staedtische-alltagserfahrung-und-das-politische-theatermachen/> (last accessed: April 15, 2024)
- Cowie, Elisabeth (2009), “On Documentary Sounds and Images in the Gallery”, *Screen*, 50(1), Spring 2009, 124–134. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/screen/hjn076>
- Dreyse, Miriam (2021), “Situation Rooms de Rimini Protokoll, entre immersion et distance.” Translated from the German by Ève Vassière, *Études théâtrales* 2021/2 (No. 69–70), 167–175. DOI 10.3917/etth.069.0167
- Duguet, Anne-Marie (1988), “Dispositifs”, *Communications* 48, 221–242. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3406/comm.1988.1728>
- Ellis, John (2007), “Dancing to Different Tunes: Ethical Differences in Approaches to Factual Film-Making”, in Gail Pearce & Cahal McLaughlin (eds.), *Truth or Dare. Art and Documentary*. Bristol/Chicago: Intellect Books, 57–64.

- Hirsch, Nikolaus (2013), "Teatrum Belli", in Rimini Protokoll (ed.), *Rimini Protokoll (Haug/Ksaegi/Wetzel). Situation Rooms. A Multiplayer Video Piece*. Gelsenkirchen: Kultur Ruhr GmbH, 7–10.
- Hohenberger, Eva & Katrin Mundt (2016), "Orte des Dokumentarischen. Einführung in eine Fragestellung" in Eva Hohenberger & Katrin Mundt (eds.), *Ortsbestimmungen. Das Dokumentarische zwischen Kino und Kunst*. Series: Texte zum Dokumentarfilm 18. Berlin: Vorwerk 8, 8–28.
- Kim, Jihoon (2022), *Documentary's Expanded Fields. New Media and the Twenty-First-Century Documentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lind, Maria & Hito Steyerl (eds.) (2008), *The Greenroom. Reconsidering the Documentary and Contemporary Art #1*. Berlin/New York: Sternberg Press.
- Lund, Cornelia (2019), "Elastic realities – documentary practices between cinema and art", *Ars*, 17(35), Dossiê Membranas: intersecções entre arte, ciência e tecnologia, 167–182. DOI: 10.11606/issn.2178-0447.ars.2019.152831
- Marks, Laura (2014), "Haptic Aesthetics", in Michael Kelly (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 269–274.
- Nash, Kate (2018), "Virtually Real: Exploring VR Documentary", *Studies in Documentary Film*, 12(2), 97–100, DOI: 10.1080/17503280.2018.1484992
- Nelson, Kim (2022), "The historian is present. Live interactive documentary as collaborative history", *Rethinking History. The Journal of Theory and Practice*, 26(3), 289–318. DOI: 10.1080/13642529.2022.2103618
- Parente, André & Victa de Carvalho (2008), "Cinema as *dispositif*: Between Cinema and Contemporary Art", *Cinemas*, 19(1), 37–55. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/029498ar>
- Parviainen, Jaana (2021), "Bodily Knowledge: Revised Epistemological Reflections on Kinaesthesia, Movement, and Dance", in Rafael Jiménez Cataño (ed.), *Beauty and Life. Exploring the Anthropology behind the Fine Arts*. Rome: Edizioni Santa Croce, 171–198.
- Peleg, Hila (2010), "Documentary practices across disciplines", in Hila Peleg & Bert Rebhandl (eds.), *Berlin Documentary Forum 1*. Berlin: Haus der Kulturen der Welt, 4–5.
- Rathmanner, Petra (2005), "Filmlandschaft Mnemopark kommt ins Tanzquartier Wien. Ein Interview mit Stefan Kaegi", *Wiener Zeitung*, October 6, 2005. <https://www.rimini-protokoll.de/website/de/text/filmlandschaft> (last accessed April 15, 2024).
- Rimini Protokoll (ed.) (n.d.), "Situation Rooms – A multiplayer video piece by Haug/Kaegi/Wetzel", <https://www.rimini-protokoll.de/website/en/project/situation-rooms> (last accessed April 15, 2024)
- Tortum, Halil Deniz (2016), *Embodied Montage: Reconsidering Immediacy in Virtual Reality*, Master of Science (SM) thesis, Boston: MIT. Online: <https://cmsw.mit.edu/wp/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/326754928-Deniz-Tortum-Embodied->

Montage-Reconsidering-Immediacy-in-Virtual-Reality (last accessed April 15, 2024).

Volumen Express (ed.) (n.d.), “(Im)potencia”, <http://volumenexpress-projects.blogspot.com/2010/11/facades-of-crisis-videospace.html?m=1> (last accessed: April 15, 2024)

Volumen Express (ed.) (n.d.) “Facades of Crisis”, <http://volumenexpress-project.s.blogspot.com/2010/11/facades-of-crisis-d-nor-arg-2010-video.html> (last accessed: April 15, 2024)

Zimmermann, Patricia R., & Helen De Michiel (2018), *Open Space New Media Documentary. A Toolkit for Theory and Practice*. New York/Abingdon: Routledge.