Catarina Mourão

Se por um lado a distinção entre documentário e ficção continua a ser interessante do ponto de vista histórico, ético, e no seu modelo de produção, e exibição, a verdade é que o cinema mais interessante se encontra cada vez mais na fronteira entre ficção e não ficção. Do ponto de vista do realizador e do académico a distinção que talvez faça mais sentido é aquela que remete para formas diferentes de convocar o espectador: por um lado um cinema que utiliza uma construção dramática em que existe uma suspensão involuntária da descrença e um cinema que envolve uma narrativa mais épica, mais reflexiva e ensaística. Se identificamos a primeira categoria mais com a ficção e a segunda com o documentário, cada vez mais são os filmes que combinam os dois tipos de construção. E esta discussão não é puramente académica nem filosófica, ela tem consequências na produção de um filme, na sua mise-en-scène na escolha de actores profissionais ou não actores, na escolha dos decor. Neste sentido, hoje em dia, a distinção entre documentário e ficção pode até ser contraproducente para quem realiza e produz um cinema mais híbrido.

David LaRocca

The productive frisson between fiction and documentary has been explored with increasing regu-larity and sophistication in recent decades, whether from many works by Werner Herzog and the late Agnès Varda or experiments by the likes of Casey Affleck, Sarah Polley, Joshua Oppenheimer, and Rithy Panh. Though topically diverse, these directors show a penchant for Wellesian provocation—consider Orson Welles' F for Fake (1973) as a handy touchstone. In each case, we are given an opportunity to decode and delineate the seen from the unseen, the truth from the lie, the unrepeatable present (caught on film) from the staging or re-staging of an event that never was.

Essay films yield another genre that illuminates our epistemological (and dare I say, moral) predicament. Despite, or perhaps because of, a wonderful set of extended remarks on the essay film-recent volumes by Timothy Corrigan, Nora Alter, Laura Rascaroli, Elizabeth Papazian, and Caroline Eages come immediately to mind-we may recall that Phillip Lopate made an attempt at securing criteria for the essay film, now back some thirty years ago (after all he was in *search* of the centaur). While debating "What counts?" remains a useful exercise, the persistence of the question motivates much compelling reflection on the nature of medium and its various form/content assemblages. Returning us to our inherited sense of form and content-indeed, per Adorno, which is which? As theorized by Corrigan, et al., and the contributors to their volumes, the essay film involves a perpetual negotiation between what is "captured" and how it is presented. With Adorno surfacing earlier, we could turn profitably to his "The Essay as Form," its title announcing the essay's very shape as a candidate for "sedimented content." Thus "capture" and "edit" are necessarily forms of production.

Volker Pantenburg

Ouite obviously, this distinction is not absolute; it rather points to a

stvlistic convention which, like all conventions, can be quoted, appropriated, used in a different context. The Dardenne brothers' films (to a certain extent) look like documentaries, even if they are scripted. Frederick Wiseman spends months and months in the editing room to condense the material into scenes that, despite their purely documentary ingredients, have the narrative flavor that we are accustomed to encoun-(syntax, juxtaposition, montage): both elements are always present, as Dai Vaughan reminds us. If this is the case, trust is crucial. A "documentary contract" is established each time, and it involves various (human and non-human) actors: the people behind the camera, the camera (and microphone), those in front of it, the institutional context, and, not least, us as spectators. However, since this "contract" most of the times remains implicit, the conditions that it codifies are precarious and unstable.

Fernão Pessoa Ramos

Aqui não há mistérios, está tudo claro. Na medida em que um documentário pode encenar-se como ficção (e faz isso há décadas, desde sua origem), toma-se, às vezes, o pato pelo gato. Mas eles são diferentes basta olhar a forma, o corpo e a voz. A voz do documentário enuncia asserções por todos os lados: mais propositivas, em alguns casos; mais estéticas, em outros. O modo de encenação pode ser *construído* (a ação de distribuir cartas no interior de um vagão de trem em Night Mail), pode ser direto (Paul Brennan vendendo bíblias em Salesman) ou estético (o peixe que nos olha do lado de lá da câmera Go Pro, em Leviathan), mas há sempre um mega*enunciador*, com sua grande boca imagética e sua voz enunciativa, repetindo: "então é assim se distribuem cartas em caixa no vagão do correio noturno", "então é assim que se vendem bíblias em residências", "então é assim que peixes mortos nos olham no olho, do chão do convés de um barco no mar de New Bedford". Não se trata aqui de ficção, ficção é outra coisa. Isto é claro e límpido, como água cristalina.

Marie Voignier

C'est pourquoi je suis dans l'incapacité de tracer une ligne nette autour du cinéma documentaire. D'un côté il n'y a pas vraiment de distinction radicale suffisante avec le cinéma de fiction, on le dit depuis longtemps, et de l'autre côté, le glissement vers le cinéma de propagande et le reportage d'actualité est évident et ne doit pas être considéré comme une dégradation d'une forme de pureté d'intentions du documentaire. Je ne me satisfais pas d'une distinction entre un cinéma documentaire « du bon côté » contre un cinéma de reportage ou de télévision intellectuellement/esthétiquement pauvre ou alors fascisant. Le cynisme ou l'hypocrisie que peuvent prendre la position de cinéastes documentaires est selon moi souvent bien plus scandaleux que la littéralité ou partialité d'un mauvais reportage. Bien sûr, on peut distinguer des catégories de mode de production, de modes de diffusion, on peut distinguer différents dispositifs contractuels avec les protagonistes des films, différentes intentions. Mais le plus important ce sont sans doute des lignées (historiques, généalogiques) esthétiques et politiques dans lesquelles s'inscrivent ces films. Ces lignées politiques ou esthétiques sont transversales aux catégories (documentaire / fiction / reportage / film expérimental / etc...), et ne leur sont pas superposables. Elles ne sont ni aisées à identifier, ni étanches, car elles s'ancrent sur les projets de chaque film, sur des affinités politiques, et engagent une généalogie historique ouverte et pensante.

Ilana Feldman

Se grande parte da produção documentária mais interessante, expressiva e arriscada

Phillip Warnell

'History is a delightful fantasy' told Marcel Duchamp, as are its documents, texts, events, archives and recordings, which continually spawn a spectacle of a brightly coloured array. Colonial violence is a precondition of genre, a subspecies of modernity and its history. This noise afflicts the filmmaker, affirming trading pathways, shipping routes in-person, of missionary or cultural theft. Companies, shooters, cor-porations and end credits don't blink at the sight of real tears. See *from the pole to the equator* (Gianikian and Lucci, 1988) which repurposes how the western eye performs the mutilation of prodigious creatures and trophy hunters. The institutional rules of docu-grammar, cinematic threshold and structured learning emanate from these abeyances. Ethnography is them studied by us, uncompromised by an ethical filmmaker and release mechanisms. Cinephiles know that non-fiction is a program of both modernist and colonialist technique. Listen to the wilderness, as voiced by those without care. Chantal Akerman saw a truer falsehood, a cusp described in From the Other Side. 'It's a total fiction, but it could have been true' (on the film's final monologue). Certainty and belief sustain humanity in a world actually populated by ambiguity, lack of veracity, concern, contestation and precariousness. Afflicted by the temperature of 'collections' and 'investments', film oscillates in a wealthy bubble of feverish antics, where finitude is set alongside a cinematic reality comprised of an impossible search for missing persons. Unassailable, ungras

pable unknowns are cast in an algorithmic manner, where nothing can ever be fully identified.

Dario Cecchi

I agree with those who refuse to consider the distinction between fiction and

document rigidly. They are not opposed: they belong to the same dialectic of

narration, just as argues Ricoeur about the relationship of novel and history.

fiction. But she was aware that interpretation can be even stronger if one finds the meaning of actuality in documents. But the opposite could be also true:

Rithy Panh's documentary The Missing Picture reconstructs the life in the

camps under Pol Pot's regime in Cambodia with an original fiction device,

i.e. traditional theater puppets. However, he precisely wants to show that the

documents produced by the regime, which are the only documents available of

the period, are fiction because they represent a fake version of history, in which

workers-prisoners are happy to be engaged in the effort of creating an authen-tic rural and communist Cambodia. In this very case, the fiction in the movie

unveils the fiction of the regime's propaganda.

Shub's interpretation of the Russian history was as strong as if she realized a

que se realiza hoje lida, portanto, em sua própria forma fílmica e em sua metodologia com a fricção das fronteiras entre autenticidade e encenação, experiência e performance, vida e teatro, produzindo com isso efeitos estéticos e políticos desestabilizadores, é porque o documentário, longe de ser o regime da autenticida-de, da verdade, da fidedignidade e da pureza documental, como acreditam os mais ingênuos, dogmáticos ou puristas, tem sido, desde sua origem, um espelho partido do mundo, no sentido de que a imagem que ele revela é sempre distinta, rasurada, fissurada. O documentário seria assim, desde sempre, um teatro vazado pelo real. O próprio documentarista brasileiro Eduardo Coutinho reconhece, após a realização de seu original e desestabilizador *Jogo de cena* (2007), que "o teatro é o próprio lugar de tudo", o lugar em que todos os filmes estão e no qual a fala constitui um espaço de permanente encenação e auto-estilização. Sendo assim, se a verdade é então sempre construída (o que não significa dizer, evidentemente, que ela seja falsificada, manipulada ou deturpada) pela relação entre quem filma e quem é filmado, isto é, pelo encontro entre os modos de produção da imagem e os meios de construção da realidade, é porque, precisa-se ressaltar, o documentário é uma prática relacional profundamente ética, onde não há verdades prévias. Prática ética desprovida de uma ontologia enquanto gênero específico, o documentário, portanto, só existe na condição de uma fronteira instável que, para permanecer como fronteira, precisa ser sempre atravessada – e ele será tão mais potente quando sua construção der forma à fabulação, desejos e memória de uma coletividade quando sua construção der forma às forças sociais e subjetivas que o produz.

Raed Rafei

The distinction between documentary and fiction is merely a convenience. It stems from our modern obsession with classification and compartmentalization so as to rationalize the world around us. This distinction also allows for entire capitalistic industries and structures to exist and sustain themselves.

I have always attempted in my film work to trouble that distinction. In Salam (2017) for instance, I tried to give life to the words of an anonymous Syrian woman interviewed about her sexuality by asking an actor, Rawya El Chab, to say and perform her exact quotes. I think the mere gesture of another woman not only repeating the Syrian woman's words but also letting them inhabit her, exist and resonate inside her amplified the original testimony about bodies, desire, societal power trying to control them and resistance. I think the space between the original (or a fantasized idea of an original) and its performance is very generative for viewers because it reveals the gap between reality and its inevitable performance on camera.

Mohanad Yaqubi

FICTION/DOCUMENTARY DIVIDE Distinção Ficção/Documentário

José Bértolo

Cinema is hybrid, and there is no "pure documentary" nor "pure fiction" Only "impure cinema". This happens because, on one hand, with the exception of animated films, photography is at the root of all films. As a consequence of this, there is an apodictic character to cinema that makes its images testify to certain events that happened in a specific place and a specific time. A film always works as an audiovisual proof that something *real* happened. It is a document. But on the other hand, where there's human intervention, there's necessarily something along the lines of fiction. Photography is fiction. Science is fiction (remember Jean Painlevé). Religion is also fiction. Language is the touchstone of fiction (remember Jorge Luis Borges's *Tlön*). Film editing and framing are certainly related to the principle of fiction. With this in mind, we should stress that fiction is no less real than anything else. Like cinema, reality is made both of the actual and the virtual (see Deleuze). All documentary films are "realist documentaries made of unreal events" (Cocteau) because, in the end, all reality is symbolic and impregnated with the imaginary. In addition, every fiction film is a documentary about its own shooting. It is an essay film in the sense that it is a rhetoric construct and an object that thinks about itself.

Volker Pantenburg

A couple of thoughts and sentences to remember: Frieda Grafe, in a text with the great title "Found Fiction: Better Documentaries" speaks of the "fictional formations that run through reality like narrative threads." Dai Vaughan states: "Film is about something, whereas reality is not." Maybe it is best to think of documentary and fiction as two aggregate states of the moving image; two potentials that can be activated and pushed in one direction or the other. Who would deny that a Douglas Sirk melodrama, say: *Written on the Wind*, is also a documentary that shows a Universal studio lot in 1956 and tells us how Lauren Bacall and Rock Hudson looked like at this very moment before the camera. Yet this does not prevent the film from being a wonderful fiction.

Nicolas Pereda

The division between documentary and fiction is still as relevant as always. However, their difference has little or perhaps nothing to do with their relationship to reality. As I see it, the important differences between documentary and fiction have to do with formal approaches. A film is a documentary because it looks and sounds like one. Of course, there are fictions that look like docs and vice-versa, but that happens when a filmmaker specifically choses to draw from the formal toolbox of the other side. The difference between capturing a representation of reality, or reality itself (or something close to it), is a subject that concerns equally fiction and documentary filmmakers. When I film a person, I'm interested in their physical attributes, in how their body moves, in how they sound when they talk, etc. In a fiction film I choreograph this movement, rehearse it to the point that it becomes second nature to the actress, at which point her movements and sounds are triggered by muscle memory. In a documentary this muscle memory doesn't need to be generated, as it is part of the subject.

All movement is choreographed. Documentary aims to capture the movement that a subject has unconsciously learned throughout their life, while fiction aims to capture the movement that has been consciously learned and repeated over a short period of time. In both cases, a filmmaker aims to capture the essence of this choreography.

Christa Blümlinger

La forme essayiste a une longue tradition au cinéma, comme le rappellent les textes de Hans Richter ou d'Alexandre Astruc, d'André Bazin ou d'André S. Labarthe. Si la notion connaît actuellement une sorte de renaissance dans le domaine anglophone et ailleurs, elle risque de servir désormais comme passe-partout. Elle sert trop souvent pour classer non seulement toute hybri-dité ou forme expérimentale, mais aussi un certain type de discours critique, voire d'agentivité, attribué au cinéma. Si on trouve beaucoup de propositions philosophiques pour définir la fiction, les tentatives théoriques de définir le documentaire par rapport à la fiction sont souvent restées pragmatiques et liées aux pratiques de l'expérience des films. Une poétique du documentaire aurait peut-être plus de sens, car elle s'intéresserait davantage aux inventions des formes et à leur lien avec le quotidien et la vie. (Jacques Rancière parle d'une « poétique du savoir » quand il s'intéresse à la manière dont Fernand Braudel écrit de l'histoire.)

imposed on the medium, and seems to act as a compartmentalisation strategy in order to tame the medium. In many ways, this reflects the general capitalist attitude toward sciences and arts, with the dismissal of inherited knowledge or cultural significance through the process of opening markets, with a requirement for a clear division and hierarchy. If we look at categorisation as an industrial process, in order to label, package and distribute, then we can see how the medium (of film in this case) is open for exploitation. Any product is a result of the processing of resources, and includes extraction, manufacturing and distribution, like the chicken egg industry, or mobile phone industry, or simply the complex industries at work behind taking a vacation. Films too, are the result of a similar process, filmmaking is constituted of three main stages. First is writing, which includes the observation of subjects in order to extract stories. sketching the method in a timeline, followed by the manufacturing of this imaginative into the shape of breakdown excel sheet floor plans, lists of equipment; then production, capturing frames and sounds that represent, both metaphorically and directly. This capturing process can be of a group of actors on a stage delivering a dialogue, or an image of sleepy passengers on a night train, or even just a scene of a quiet morning in a forest. These images are recorded and unified into a format unrelated to the actual physics and realities of these frames, and so they receive a new form, a new time, a resurrection, ready for distribution. And from that sense, thinking of fiction or documentary that are captured with the same camera as different categories means sub-

terms of images) is an essential exercise for filmmakers, to distinguish between the captured and manufactured images, simply by taking into consideration the concept of cropping. Imagine the restaurant scene in *Pulp Fiction*, with a boom mic revealed in the upper left half of the frame. This mental image suddenly brings different realities and content to the image, it becomes a documentary; if Quentin Tarantino didn't crop the frame, he would end up with a different film of course, Pulp Doc. The fact is, editing frames produces the

public financial system of France for example, or other EU countries, which overpowers any other voice or gesture either from the south, or the diaspora. These voices, i.e. films, end up in the "creative documentaries" category, where "creative" refers to the challenging of the Eurocentric narrative(s) and daily realities.

Marie Voignier

Il y a donc toujours avec le cinéma de fiction ou documentaire une instrumentalisation des images qui en soi n'est ni positive ni négative, c'est un outil, qui a cette puissance perverse de pouvoir activer notre croyance en lui et parfois à notre insu provoquer notre adhésion, notre projection. La puissance de cette réinvention/recomposition de la réalité peut servir plusieurs objectifs : contester la réalité effective plutôt que la reproduire, fabriquer des contre-récits pour émanciper, discriminer, dénoncer, divertir ou faire histoire : si l'on prend pour exemple les films complotistes actuels, les pires/meilleurs films de propagande qu'ils soient fascistes ou révolutionnaires, ce sont des productions filmiques qui visent à « changer le monde », ou à « réveiller les consciences », et qui utilisent cette puissance d'invention et d'agencement des faits réels ou inventés pour créer un sens nouveau, « révéler » quelque chose du monde qui ne s'y trouve peut-être pas. Je suis très méfiante avec cet objectif-là du cinéma (souvent du côté de ce que l'on nomme cinéma documentaire) : faire un film pour « rendre visible ». C'est la plus mauvaise raison de faire un film. Tout le cinéma se construit sur un jeu de cache-cache, sur une ombre plutôt que sur une visibilisation.

The fact that the medium of film has a reality of itself, like any other medium, that is able to produce a context, and therefore a consciousness, that reproduces and influences other realities, with a tremendous power of change. This contradicts the categorizations which are

mitting to the will of the market and its conditions of demand and supply; a force that shapes the artists' consciousness, and imposes a divide on the medium limiting the exploration of the after and the beyond. At the same time, this contrast between fictional and real (in meaning. And therefore, determines what is the genre. This is the game of the filmmaker, the craft of hiding and showing within a me-dium that is based on this spectrum between the light and its shadows; and the more complicated it is, the more interesting it becomes.

It calls on the audience to participate, raising the same question of what is reality-the reality of the moment of the filming, the reality of the filmmaker, the reality of watching. It brings what Deleuze describes as the mirror-image into action, with the possibility of multiplied readings, empowering both the image and its recipients. The question that is raised here, in a more active way, is how to keep this division within the artistic process and fight the tendencies of

imposing these categories through the market trends. It's also a question of whose eyes are looking at this. If it's the eyes of the industry, the artists/ filmmakers have to compromise artistic integrity in order to be fished out of the sea of talents. Dismantling these capitalist tendencies from within the film industry is necessary to reclaim it (the industry) as the space(s) of creative and progressive exchange between filmmakers themselves, and filmmakers and the rest of the world. In documentary film markets, there are slots/ categories for public presentations, the so-called pitch sessions. These slots would usually be categorized as history, politics, current affairs, science, and would see presentations by either established or promising emerging filmmakers. And of course, producers are well embedded in the