

Hypermodern
Documentary
Discourse in Cinema

Hypermodern Documentary Discourse in Cinema

By

Jarmo Valkola

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Hypermodern Documentary Discourse in Cinema

By Jarmo Valkola

This book first published 2022

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2022 by Jarmo Valkola

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-8688-X

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-8688-8

This book is dedicated to our grandchildren:
Alvar, Verner, Oliver, Anton, Unia, Elmer,
Tomas, Valoria, and Mimosa

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Hypermodern Perspective | |
| Domains of Audiovisual Orchestration..... | 12 |
| Chapter 1 | 18 |
| The Documentary Approach: Staging the Hypermodern Stance | |
| Operative Processes of Documentary | 18 |
| The Exclamatory Nature of Hypermodern Frame..... | 22 |
| Utopia of Hypermodern Frame | 29 |
| Gilles Lipovetsky’s Scientific Legacy | 34 |
| A Hypermodern Enunciation: Nanfu Wang’s <i>In the Same Breath</i> (2021) | 38 |
| Observational Methods | 46 |
| Intermodal Perspectives | 55 |
| Hypermodern Sense of Documentary | 61 |
| Recognizing Documentary..... | 73 |
| Creating Documentary Presence | 76 |
| The Aesthetic Route of Hypermodern | 78 |
| Cinematic Metaphysics..... | 80 |
| Documentary Wisdoms and Hindsight | 83 |
| Memory Images of City Culture | 89 |
| Architectonics of the City | 93 |
| Chapter 2 | 99 |
| Towards Epistemological and Schematic Activation | |
| Cognitive and Phenomenological Challenges..... | 99 |
| Chris Marker’s Hypermodern Setting of <i>Sans soleil</i> (1982)..... | 106 |
| Metaphors of the Real..... | 109 |
| The Forms of Hypermodern Journey | 117 |
| Recollecting Nostalgia..... | 124 |
| Swinging in Liverpool | 127 |
| Physiognomy of Mutable Appearances | 130 |
| Forebode Reflections | 132 |
| Intermittent Attachments | 138 |
| Claims of Objectivity | 142 |

| | |
|---|---------|
| Chris Marker's <i>l'esprit de corps</i> | 144 |
| Reticent Intervention..... | 149 |
| Historical Constellations | 152 |
| Hypermodern Demeanours | 159 |
| Presence of Historical Conundrums..... | 164 |
| Metaphors of a Re-enactment | 166 |
| Hermeneutic Affectations | 172 |
| The Promotion of Theoretical Foresights | 175 |
| Chapter 3 | 185 |
| The Search for Meanings in Hypermodern Times | |
| Vitalism of Memory..... | 185 |
| Subjectivity and Psychic Documentation..... | 193 |
| Epitomes of Contingency..... | 208 |
| The Trace of Documentation | 218 |
| The Hypermodern Rhetoric of Time and Space..... | 224 |
| Heightened Audiovisuality | 231 |
| Historical Echoes | 242 |
| Schiffer's Audiovisual Style | 247 |
| Intuitively Embodied Figurations | 249 |
| Poetics of Transfiguration and the Fragility of Memory: | |
| The Cinematographic Eloquence of <i>The 3 Rooms</i> | |
| of <i>Melancholia</i> (2004)..... | 257 |
| The Modal Qualities of Expression | 272 |
| <i>The Thin Blue Line</i> : A Hypermodern Display of Documentary | |
| Forms | 283 |
| Observational Traces of Ambiguity..... | 297 |
| Inside the Japanese society | 303 |
| Photographical Traces..... | 311 |
| Ontology of Hypermodern..... | 313 |
| Memory Traces and Instances: <i>First Cousin Once Removed</i> (2013) .. | 324 |
| Performing Manners | 332 |
| Audiovisuality and Redolent Thinking | 337 |
| Virtual Reality Challenges..... | 341 |
| The Universal Characteristics of Hypermodern Cycle..... | 343 |
| Conclusions | 350 |
| Postscript | 360 |
| Notes..... | 362 |
| Bibliography | 385 |

INTRODUCTION

HYPERMODERN PERSPECTIVE

Documentary film's inextricable entanglement with historical and cultural appropriations and articulations possesses a crucial dimension of its accent of social contexture. Documentary discourse is generally categorised with these underscores and evaluated from these premises more than as an object of aesthetic contemplation and reverie. This kind of view of documentary is more like a simplification of matters than anything else. What we should really think of is to see documentaries as a rich source of aspirations, full of potential selections and prisms that come up with sudden and ambitious attachment, conjunctions, and substantiated aesthetic experiences. The placing of efforts should emphasise individual experimentation, creativity, and innovation. The rhetoric of documentary discourse is bound to develop around these premises more than others.

The interface between cinema, media and arts offers a possibility for an evolved, reciprocal dialogism to promote inventive aesthetics for the audience. One of the alleged repercussions of this mixture consists of a dialectic that resonates on the levels of experimentation and composition, giving space for new constructional and epistemic methods. The artist's preference for creative ideas is present in modern documentary where the reciprocal interaction of imaginatively open aspects of narrative prescription are re-emphasised in a more intricate manner that has an embodied sense-impression of vivid connection. The documentary discourse is allowed to establish dialogical expectations that ostensibly support the precarious placing of the strain of theory in relation to new documentary.

By analysing representations of documentary discourse, the following chapters examine a set of documented and advancing cinematic outcomes that are perceived in contemporary media as emanating palette of affections, which gradually influence their audience. In focusing on conscientiously selected examples of documentary, the films and texts analysed here seem to re-emphasise the argumentation of modern and especially that of hypermodern documentary discourse which is extremely substantial to

theory and practice of current documentary film.¹ I firmly advocate a conscientious and detailed account, as well as literary invocation and audiovisual analysis of these perceived entities, accentuating a highly complex mode of understanding concerning the dialogic interaction of the constituents of theory and practice. Instead of merely confirming or simply and straightforwardly describing the conceptions and theories about documentary discourse, this endeavour engages in a metamorphosis of cognitive and phenomenological analysis of these forms and contents. The science of contemporary literary and audiovisual culture is expounded through these findings, which cut across the fields of media studies generally, combining sociohistorical and developmental perspectives, and applying other representational practices. Close readings of filmic examples explicate that hypermodern documentary discourse is bound up and laced with a comprehension of narrative rhetoric forms and structures that function as concrete foundations and actual preconditions for new and more flexible theoretical approaches and epistemological assumptions.²

Phenomenological re-examination of documentary illustration is concerned with the camera as an aesthetic medium. This concerns also mannered artistic photography that sometimes reaches avant-garde forms of art, especially when understood as an advanced standard of pure design. The documentary spirit relates to an unequivocal degree of narrative and pictorial innovation that guarantees a level of intuitive and perceptive legitimacy of this phenomenon. To understand the problematic aphorism of hypermodern documentary discourse it is consequential to see things in full perspective. The different styles of documentary have developed over time and substituted their form at the same time as the concept of documentary itself has gained unfamiliar dimensions by scrutinizing itself. We can ask where did these forms come from, and how did, in fact, the ideas and intentions of realistic representation and documentation evolve? We can answer that the discursive diversity of documentary representation relates to the differing forms of both new aesthetic departure and qualifications of technological edification and advancement. This continuing tension between the upcoming forms of aesthetics and technology is concerned with motifs that relate to historical and cultural appropriations and modifications in modern societies. Abstract and figurative modes of confidential display have their long tradition in the history of nations and cultures, which have been revealed through time and history. The present day nurtures these cultural traits and sees their inter-relative and fundamental relationships as parts of the whole picture.

Hypermodern Documentary Discourse in Cinema is a theoretical, philosophical, and partly practical introduction into the documentary theory related to art and its comprehension. Documentary theory is an interdisciplinary way of scientific thinking, which has its unsuspected but also subtle implications to aesthetic theories. Documentary theory has its links with philosophy and deals seriously with purist aesthetical questions primarily because of the importance of mental processes and the documentary approach in visual panoramic perception. Perception itself is a phenomenological procession of enunciated possibilities, since to see is to perform operations on visual materials. Observation is significant since it forms the basis of our spectatorship concerning both analysis and synthesis. I am arguing that observers think, perceive, feel, interpret, and apply knowledge of the world when viewing and making sense of the works of art.³

Hypermodern Documentary Discourse in Cinema integrates aesthetic and phenomenological approaches and concepts to understand the complex processes of filmic art and its interpretation. Documentary film's perspective towards narration helps to transport the viewer through a proceeding which opens dimensions for a camera-based film experience of illuminating propulsions. Through different cinematic examples it is possible to study artistic originality, and they are documentary film's interesting examples of audiovisual orchestration and intonation of images and sounds in a creative way. Through individual cinematic analyses, the author wants to disclose, investigate, and reappropriate the underlying documentary film's structures of narration and articulate as well as emphasise the enduring importance of hypermodern understanding of cinematic display.

What is at stake is the documentary film's concern for new contents and formations: seeking, aspiring, and constructing activations and providing fresh ideas for the future. In this regard, articulation refers to the way the surfaces of a certain form come together to define its shape and volume. An articulated form clearly defines and reveals more about the precise nature of its parts and their integral relationships to each other and to the whole.⁴ The documentary's shape of hypermodern formations obviously varies within the very existence of things, whether real or fictive, as do the shapes that can be depicted. Also, in question is the phenomenological reality of ever-present audiovisual presentations, how images and narratives are dramatically enhancing, stylised experiences amid all these alternations and embodied variations, and, for example, what is the role of emotions in these processes?

These premises indicate that the notion of the image has diverse viewpoints especially in the time of the Internet and other electronic and digital systems. The resolutions of digital technology are structurally embedded in the scores of the camera's operational tactics towards filmic movement and photographic stillness. Digital post-production provides further possibilities for a filmmaker to facilitate, add and subtract frames and create slow dissolves in the narrative. In studying the importance of the image in our world we may point out that there is a need for a meta-theoretical perspective that would integrate and possibly co-ordinate the various approaches in this field. The idea is that there is a perceptual and cognitive basis for understanding the approximate operations connected with the image experience. Through this we can allow intellectual and cultural appropriations, currents, and transcendent abstractions to be interconnected to our understanding. Contemporary art dispenses us with hypermodern modulations and various transdisciplinary assessments. It also gives us generic and other frames of mind of how we as spectators can partake to this contingent reverie by enlarging and multiplying our phenomenological comprehension of narrative functioning. In this regard, the pictorial comprehension of aesthetics sets into play a field of filmic deployments that might be causally, or some other way related and can create and convey modalities typical for the hypermodern understanding of narrative possibilities.

There are three larger enveloping strands of formation that explain the narration and ostensive stylisation of documentary film. They all go through my research agenda. These are, first, the fragility of memory, second, heightened audiovisuality, and third, poetics and aesthetics of narration. These modes are concerned with all the films analysed in this research.

The hypermodern dimension of audiovisual culture demands observation in this respect. A cognitive mapping of audiovisual (optical-acoustical) traits of the philosophy of hypermodern may be helpful in recognizing few persistent ideas and intentions on audiovisual culture that are expressive for it. Deferentially and aside from contextualising the hypermodern image itself, the critical dialogue here aims at a deepened account of the introductory perspective of hypermodern alchemy and, even more accurately, strives to identify some ideas of phenomenological content to illustrate and increase our conceptualization of hypermodern documentary formulae. I am willing to envisage some problem explorations of methodology in this manner and try to find answers to them. It is necessary to clarify the title of this research, since at the beginning of writing this literary text, the philosophical context of both cognitivism and phenomenology was more or

less evident. A renewed interest in issues of human thinking and immersive experiences has created semiotic interrelations between different topics in philosophy and other areas of aesthetic and narrative theory. In terms of the strategy of spatial negotiation and argument, VR-technology has brought forth new ideas on spatial structuring, and the epistemological and philosophical frameworks of this research are tightly reassessing the fragmentation of hypermodern documentary perspective to address significant interrelation in the interdisciplinary field of immersive technological advances and reflective philosophical notions of existence, experience, perception, and subjectivity. The methodological parallels concerned in this study relate to the premises of these frames that express the metaphysically phenomenal appearance of human thinking in tight connection and attachment of systems, patterns, and the conveyance of meaning-making processes. The hypermodern direction of documentary narration forms a clear and principal focus of research with a specific interest in creating impending interactions and possible interdependence between the various systems of thought, and rational explication of open-minded and consciously bracketed formations in our contemporary approach toward reasserted apprehension and functional discussion. There can be overly complex and implied interactions, prone to an exchange of a few inciting influences as characteristic to the phenomenon, which is not always easy to assimilate or define. The documentary heritage opens here with an understanding of the operative proceedings and observant insights that are consciously acquired and consistently formed entities, alliances, and approaches to these questions. The media-critical formation of the theoretical doctrine connotes that the immersive technologies in concert with 3-D image reality experience increase the educed empathy of the viewers and reflect presence of plain human agency of phenomenological comprehension toward the depicted destinies accordingly described in hypermodern documentaries. This semiotic process draws on the persistence of these point of views in contemporary audiovisual and electronic media culture. As a more detailed account, the proposed elicit of empathy refers to the affective and sensory aspects of hypermodern intonations of images and sounds in this narrative context.

In some instances, human perception is also referred to as the performance of some composite phenomenal sentience; an operation that affects mental contents, and an activity in which information processing is used to transfer information from the world into the brain and mind, where it is further processed and related to other information. In perception, a variety of mental procedures come into attendant and collateral consideration, and perception is based on many different systems that function as partly

independent modular designations and phases of these perceptual acts occurring in that system of temporally extended cognition.

Many of the perceptual theories and conceptions are framed exclusively in terms of audiovisual processing and compaction. This is understandable in the sense that the recognition of various patterns is one of the main functions of the visual system. Through this pattern following we can identify objects in our environment. Perceptual and motor processors deal with the inputs and outputs of cognitive activities. Many other modular systems exist like the memory system, motoric control system, and the system and act of writing which are in constant collaboration with each other and quite hard to separate. For example, in comparatively direct perception the spectator is active and can experience a kinetic depth effect. The mind is an information processor which represents and transforms information. Many operations depend on our existence, and the human mind must incorporate some form of mental representation and proceedings that act on and manipulate this information.⁵

In a broad and theoretically neutral sense, a mental representation is supposed to be a mental structure (concept, thought, image) with semantic properties (content, truth conditions, reference), or a state or process involving such a structure. Usually, a mental representation is not considered to be an object of cognition or awareness, but rather that by which one cognizes or is aware of something in the world.

Evan Thompson (2010: 23)

In this context, my point of view relates to a larger understanding of documentary film and conferred phenomenological connotations in the language of cinema, by pointing out the comprehension of the importance of documentary theory and aesthetics as a driving explanatory force and theoretical angle in figural mode of reading and interpreting the whole cinematic process. This perspective is resolutely focused more on cinema as an art form than cinema as entertainment. So, to understand what documentary theory and aesthetics in our times means, we must interpret and transcribe the operational and aesthetic qualities that surround it. Generally, documentary theoretical axiom is attributed exclusively to the actual filmmaking process; aesthetically, its intrinsic cognition to the language of cinema is dialectical, concerning its use as an epistemological and aesthetic concept or idea. It is also much more noticeable that we cannot take these outlooks for granted, since the usage of any angle is not obvious or even clear all the time. It means that the angle at which we observe things may feel inconsistent. The same goes with hypermodern hallmarks of display. Different theoretical (and partly practical) viewpoints

refer to the concept and iconography of hypermodern documentary theory and aesthetics in different ways and for different purposes. Therefore, it is useful to clarify what these features of epistemology and aesthetics comprise from different theoretical and practical standpoints. The chapters of this text intend to provide an assessment of the problem- and context-oriented approach to the kernel of the theory and aesthetics of hypermodern documentaries. The idea or nature of this perspective and its appropriations seems by comparison to depend on what different theoreticians have said and thought about it. No clear consensus exists in this area because of the variety of definitions. A good understanding of these familiar conundrums demands sufficient knowledge and a widening of the spectre around the phenomenon.

In order to develop and evolve a hypermodern theorem and its prepositions, I have arranged my approach and my case studies so that I will begin first with historical and epistemological standpoints of documentary's evolution. Thus, the first part of this book deals with the historical conventions in science and art, and their gradual influences on documentary representations, and aspirations on film and media studies. The focus is on the modularity of the mind, the sensual immediacy of panoramic perception and on the essentiality of mental processes.

The films analysed in these sections combine various styles, but the aim is to track down cognitivist and phenomenological influences through a large phraseology of matters. Part One, *The Documentary Approach: Staging Hypermodern Stance*, sets the background for contemporary debate about hypermodern envisioning. Before assuming that hypermodern perspective is a predominant approach to interpret cinematic endeavours, more historical reflection is needed on what it means and how it has developed during the past decades. The chapter ostensibly introduces some of the major theoretical approaches to this stand covered later from a phenomenological viewpoint in the second part. More significantly, though these designations we are indicating the thematic and stylistic extent to which attitudes, as expressed earlier, still frame the current discussion about the state and complex essence of hypermodern mediation.

Part Two, *Towards Epistemological and Schematic Activation*, lays out key ideas through which cognitive and phenomenological approach towards cinema has been conceptualised in our hypermodern state of affairs. This can be understood as an iconoclastic form concerning the various markers of development constructed around these questions. Documentary and emotion are connected to this debate, as well as art history and aesthetics.

Moreover, the practices of aesthetics pay close attention to details, elaborating historical, cultural, and contextual issues and variety and sub-variety of analysis techniques and scientific research approaches to these dimensions. I am arguing that, for instance, phenomenology is philosophically rooted, focusing on the conscious and unconscious perception and experience of filmic images and sounds, while also providing needed insights for a research attitude and approach.

Part Three, *The Search for Meanings of Memory in Hypermodern Times*, introduces some of the recent notions about hypermodern documentary approach in today's audiovisual environment. The values of cognitive and aesthetic modes of signification become particularly prominent. The imminent diversity of readings in this field is covered partly, as well as the impact of philosophical and scientific frames of research. A key feature of audiovisual culture studies has been the innovative analysis of it as historical, cultural, and aesthetic entity. The announced aim is to identify different forms of confidential and sublime audiovisuality, and the hypermodern construction of far-sighted and enticingly evoked characteristics of various approaches.

In the final frame of reference, my approach is a way to understand the main ideas, subjects and markers of hypermodern theoretical formula and the conjecture of aesthetics in documentary, to explore the main ingredients of this phenomenon and to focus on narratives that can be approached through these perspectives. All this is helped with a selection process of filmic examples that illuminate this circle of affairs. The approach to the study of cinematic images and sounds proposed by this literary text is interdisciplinary, concerned with the notion of hypermodern in all its theoretical, critical, and practical contexts, uses and history.

Hypermodern Documentary Discourse in Cinema examines and accommodates the various types of objects of study that different frames and disciplines make of images and sounds of cinema. The approach is wide in the French philosopher Gilles Lipovetsky's precise sense of the word, covering and ranging from psychology and phenomenology to neuroscience, and art, media, and cultural studies. The creation of a single interdisciplinary map for these connections would, therefore, be inappropriate. The text aims to encourage readers to pursue imaginative and intentional combinations of disciplines, theories, and debates in the hypermodern vocabulary of mediation. In expounding the philosophical, historical, and cultural trajectories, *Hypermodern Documentary Discourse in Cinema* provides a

philosophical and epistemological tool and guide to some of the crucial differences and similarities between these transdisciplinary aspirations.

The sphere of literary text is a response to the idea that images and sounds appear to be a distinctively prominent feature of our lives today. They seem to inhabit every integral part of our existence, and our eyes and ears are bombarded by audiovisuality. The urban environment is replete with the audiovisual displays of décor and layout. In documentary theory, the possibility of interpreting and reading all this technologically and other ways produced data, art and design has led to different notions, observations, and research activities on this agenda. The reproductive mediasphere of hypermodern contingency consists of different viewpoints such as science, technology, and cultural politics. Thoughts of knowledge around this intention are as broad as the culture of life and, at the same time, pertinent to various specialised activities. Hypermodern perspectives constitute a problematic field for academic, intellectual endeavour. There is no single definition of hypermodern, and its several standpoints may have semantic overlaps. The family tree of hypermodern signification consists of various approaches constituting a complex and discursive network of associations. Rather than striving to emulate and render an absolute clarity of it, our aim is to guide and develop cues, and especially pitch contours around it. Hypermodern angle relies, however, on the integral relationship in depth between theory and practice of embodied emanation, and the necessity to expand our cognizance of aesthetics and technology. In documentary discourse this means to emphasise the idea of observation in the age of virtual and other new strands of cinema. Hypermodern, nowadays ever-present mode poses questions about the general function of significant form of documentary knowledge and its applications. The aspect of knowledge has its expanded array of amendments in the digital era, concerning distinctly the stance of truthfulness.

This collection of ideas and frames of reference also represents the implied philosophical connection of historical claims and sources around hypermodern. It is also a discourse, a phraseology and a theoretical map of matters that are to figure out the family resemblances and epistemological dimensions of hypermodern approach. Through an understanding of the lasting significance of the term, and its alleged potential, will probably raise a consequential and particularly accented appreciation of these matters in a larger perspective. Aphoristically, the relation between the proliferation of hypermodern position and the hermeneutic close reading of audiovisual imagery is crucial and necessary to any undogmatic and scientific attempt in this field. The hermeneutic approach can appear as a normative code of

conduct and a signpost of enigmas appearing in the narrative rhetoric. Documentary theory and aesthetics of audiovisual accessories requires an acknowledgement of the phenomenological signs in line with their multiple academic assumptions and other contexts. Each of the various domains deserves research and study, but principally the interdisciplinary viewpoint addresses also other impositions concerning the historical, cultural, and philosophical texture. What is the state and justification of hypermodern attitude today? How has the documentary's discursive viewpoint developed and changed during the last decades? What are the figural modes of documentary storytelling, and its structural relationship to other matters in this field? The research around hypermodern standpoint entails both historical mode and current situation.

Another motivation for organising this volume relates to the discursive and figural mode of representation of the hypermodern frame. The text aims to define and extend the contours of documentary discourse and create contemporary debate around these matters. The domains of art, cinema, science, theory, and historicist analysis are present in this intellectual rigor, which combines literary invocations and audiovisual analysis for the purpose of a close reading of narrative and theoretical forms. The films analysed in the text seem to appropriate and anticipate epistemological arguments central to recent hypermodern theory by Gilles Lipovetsky and his associates.⁶ The specified idea relates to the present broad faculties of interest and critique around the phenomenon of hypermodern. As a result, the interdisciplinary approach gives voice to a variety of entries in unfolding and exploring various methodologies and contexts. By and large, we can study academically these matters through various disciplines in disclosing the processes of knowledge acquisition and the subsequent effects on the labyrinthine structures of our understanding.

Nowadays, also neuroscientific, and other research approaches are present, and the capacity of manifested postulations to deal with perspectives of all sorts have been perpetually enhanced by directly addressing a far greater complexity of artistically mannered cognition, production, and performance, using a combination of epistemological canons of much evidence and inference to suggest and answer the questions posed. This has caused a situation of philosophical reasoning and historical argumentation in a mode of discourse considering, for instance, the possibilities of distinct and verified sociological and psychological understanding among art and cinema studies. The interdisciplinary area of audiovisual and visual studies has widened, as well as the interest in computer screens connected with

cognitive theory to tangibly demonstrate the underlined and condensed ‘visions of intelligence’.

Consequently, our hypermodern stance also focuses on two basic intentions of documentary cinema. The first one allegedly corresponds with the spatial and temporal malleability of cinematic images and the paramount implementation of experimental possibilities of ‘acousmatic sound’ to adjust extra pitch contours through the artistic manipulation of rhythm and duration, light, and shade, and tended to use other filmic implements in order to stress the controlling elements of narration.⁷ I will refer to the formal and exploratory aspects and qualities of cinematic narration in the informed context of cognitive and phenomenological frames of mind, which denote the different ontological claims that have subtly defined filmic discourse.

The reason we overlook these aspects is that we customarily focus on either the general features of spectator psychology, such as the cognitive aspects of how the narrative logic of story time is understood, or the formal aspects of the ways in which symbolic meaning is achieved.

Malin Wahlberg (2008: 16)

Aside from documentary discourse and filmic attempts to frame the unfolding of an event, this idea underlines the phenomenological aspects of sensory and affectionate qualities of cinematic images and sounds, and their immediate addressing and interpolating of the human mind.⁸ Another intention deals with the implied theoretical and philosophical mode of memory in cinema, meaning the evocative quality and endowment of images and sounds that add to the historical and cultural significance of cinema as spatial and temporal medium. The memory aspect of cinema is a crucial and insistent theme and stance in cognitivist and phenomenological perspectives. Such a pivotal standard pertains to the ontology of film as a hypermodern, photographic, and pictorial discourse, but also the testimonial, documented, enriching appropriation, and function of cinematic values of evidence concerning the ventures of memory and imagination.

Additionally, my objective is to concede the coexistence of various media technologies in contemporary film production. I will account and refer to examples that transgress the borders of different memory contexts, such as the work by Alan Berliner (USA), Patrizio Guzmán (Chile), Pirjo Honkasalo (Finland), Terence Davies (Great Britain), Guy Maddin (Canada), Péter Forgács (Hungary), Chris Marker (France), Errol Morris (USA), Kazuhiro Soda (Japan), and Nanfu Wang (China/USA)). The arguments expounded here relate these ideas as philosophical discourses and open them to further

discussions in the informed context of filmic history, recognizing the creative stage of narrative analysis as a force to deal more in depth with the attending of audiovisual culture and memory.

Furthermore, I would argue that hypermodern documentary discourse has a specific critical function in expressing the actual state of documentary narrations in the midst of our historical and cultural landscape. Its transformative vision are essential ingredients of current documentary envisioning. They are both generative and progressive in their handling of the issues of content. Their contributions are philosophical, theoretical, psychological and sociological as ramifications including contemporary challenges related to documentary language and aesthetics. These are implied and culturally distinctive impulses, including their hypermodern components. In the works of current documentary filmmakers, it is possible to identify larger positions and practices that explore and portray consequences of fact and fiction, blurring the generic and other boundaries in their search for metaphysical and other contradictions applied in these contexts. The absolute humanism of these endeavours appears as a recognition of previously targeted aims.

Domains of Audiovisual Orchestration

Nowadays we live in an audiovisual culture, and contemporary culture is vehemently immersed in constantly changing cultural and technological forms and edifications. The important question raised is how far new media and communication techniques determine the culture in which they exist. It is tangibly phenomenal that the specific significance of the images in today's world is greater than ever. Therefore, images must be studied in a variety of ways using a wide range of methods and approaches. Images are everywhere around us and in front of them we must make choices between the surface of the image and the virtual world it refers to. Further research is necessary to elucidate this curious fact of psychology and to establish idiosyncratic brand of options between the surface and contingency of the image and the virtual world it refers to. Additionally, and assuming a specific position, we can state out that the perception of the images is not just the processing of the information but also a complex psychic experience of illuminating specified moments and not directly comparative with the information contained in the pictorial image.

The constitutive role of the image has gone through modifications: the 21st century has witnessed many significant and wide alternations in the role of images on technological, aesthetic, political and social levels. Digital

production, the proliferation of television formats, YouTube, and other dimensions of web-based footage have caused rethinking inside culture and image circles. At present, different notions of viewing and spectatorship are current both within and between all the various audiovisual disciplines. The value, for example, of a digital image is derived in part from its role as information, and its capacity to be easily and frictionlessly accessed, manipulated, and stored in a computer or on a web site. So, the digital and virtual image gains prevalence and value from its accessibility, malleability, and information status. The increased versatility of digital and virtual images immediately raises many questions concerned with the cultural concept of photographic truth. As digital electronic media make everything so apparent, absolute fidelity lies in the mind of the beholder as much as it lies in the innate apprehension between a camera and what is in front of it. Especially the atmosphere in particular attachments can be created by the mind of the beholder. It cannot be guaranteed that what we see is exactly what we would have seen if we had stood beside the camera. Postmodern film utilises the unique, specific capacities and capabilities of the media to create multilevel meanings, thereby raising sizeable questions about the evidence and the nature of knowledge. Digital media accelerate our many-faceted experience of temporal relations and substitute our concept of duration. Still, there is a willingness to reflect and search for historical truths.

The context of audiovisual culture is hard to define exactly, since it covers a wide range of approaches and considers the transdisciplinary nature of the whole phenomenon. Admittedly studies on audiovisual culture have been increasing steadily during the last decades, for example, through a transnational approach, as well as through certain interpretative tactics emphasising the “visual subject and diverse interactions of visual phenomena” (Mirzoeff 1999). In this regard, the spaces of experiences and the horizons of expectations have reached conceivable dimensions. Thus, the range of reproduced and multiple and intermittent images and sounds in contemporary audiovisual culture means that the concepts of authenticity, originality, and space gain unaccustomed nuances and connotations. The art of the past has been transformed into this new “image and sound world”. Even more articulately, the context of the rhythms and intonations of images and sounds is wide and open to new forms of comprehension and interpretation. Nowadays images and sounds are more prone to circulation, exchanged contexts and remaking, regarding production and exhibition of images and sounds, and an audience projection of them. These are the main aspects of contemporary media and audiovisual culture. In today’s world, the protracted proliferation of images cannot cohere into one single picture for the contemplation of academics. In this sense, audiovisual culture is

connected to the information and visual and aural overload of everyday life. It means looking for new ways to deal with virtual and 3D image reality in which, for example, seeing is not believing but interpreting. As we shall see and encounter, a difference between passive reception and the active perceiving of images and sounds is contained in elementary audiovisual experience. We are not conscious of an image of an object but have an imaginative and animated consciousness of the object. The perception of an image is a cognitive process, which means that to see is to perform operations on visual materials. The cognitive functioning of thinking is not the privilege of mental factors above and beyond perception but the essential, fundamental ingredients of perception itself. It is a question of active exploration, selection, the grasping of essentials, simplification, abstraction, analysis and synthesis, completion, correction, comparison, and problem-solving. These are the ways in which the mind treats cognitive tools at different levels. Each of these approximate operations is a component of intelligence and panoramic perception. Overall, film activates two different mental processes: the associative, in which one phenomenon is linked to another by some likeness; and the sequential, in which one phenomenon follows another. In our thinking, the mental flow moves from perception to enaction, thereby creating a narration that is performed through the sequencing of events and relations between motives, cognitions and acts (Grodal 1997: 279). Virtual reality activates new spatial and temporal relations through the existence of new media technologies as emanating and captivating for the sake of impact to the audience.

Generally, documentaries are about “something specific and factual, because they concern public matters more than private ones” (Ellis & McLane, 2006, 2). At least, this was the case with the older tradition of documentary. Nowadays there are many documentaries in which private psychic issues are at stake, and the subjective look of the documentary filmmaker has caused an effect and impulse where the camera focuses on very personal matters. We can think that the exact qualities of documentary are related to a non-fiction film using actual footage, which can be characterised as live recording of events and other relevant research materials. Usually, it is informed by a particular point-of-view and seeks to address social issues, which can come across and mediate the responses of the audience. Documentary filmmakers try to increase our understanding of their subjects of associated consideration and contemplation and engage us more directly with emotions. As this implies, our presuppositions can be undefined, but one of documentary’s main features is to tell us something about the implications, insinuations, and workings of the socio-historical world, the sights, sounds and events which work as audio-visualisations of

occurrences. At any incisive moment, we are dealing with outlooks towards the socio-historical world of different times. The visionary assertions can be cerebral, critical, and persuasive, but they are also modes and re-visions of the phenomena they depict. In contemporary times, documentaries are also engaged in the overall development of cinematic narration. The last decades have consistently seen a re-emergence and cultural re-appropriation of the documentary film from its valued background in narrative controversy and movement towards its proper recognition as a constitutive cinematic mode. This includes a practice that can provoke and persuade, educate, and entertain and, first, affect audiences emotionally demanding ways. In addition to a number of narrative patterns, documentary may be in a state of crisis since documentary filmmakers are searching for new challenges and it may turn their analytical faculties toward the discipline itself. Tracing the survival and re-definition of documentary is an integral part of the whole idea, which concerns the new modes and fundamental aspirations of documentary narration.

In the early days of cinema, it was often presupposed that those documentaries were telling the truth and recording the actuality, which meant that the raw footage of real events was behind the approach to depict matters as they happen: focusing on real people as they speak and conveying the shifting aspects of life's cursorily and unmediated existence. Through experience the cinema audience works toward an intuitive solution that is highly appropriate, and the impetus of this process leads to interpretation of a documentary. The approach is more a specific perception and a matter of gaining the necessary information than an actual feature of the documentary itself. We all could comprehend the resources that a documentary film requires. It must be edited, ordered, and placed into the proximity of the final sequential form. Even during the shooting of the material, each set of options needs to be concurred phenomenally and examined cinematically as images and sounds and their common outcomes moved back and forth through the contingency of historical evolution and ardently augmented different postures of it. These are matters of specification and forms of experience that may suggest narrative challenges to pinpoint and address the study of them. They are to be envisaged and thought conscientiously, so that the expected audiovisual projection endows its redemptive pledge.

In our framework, cinema and cultural studies unfold in conjoint with distinctly and independently operated psychological and epistemological doctrines offering elucidation of a wider painterly frame of literary and audiovisual analysis with a historical and cultural history of media and science. I will therefore outline how to conceive of the interdiscursive web

among literary, theoretical, and other texts. The interdisciplinary study of cognitivism, constituted in concert with the research of images and sounds opens a broad set of visions and foresights based on phenomenological comprehension and ethos of matters, through which we can examine the full spectrum of ideas present here. Some initial explanation is required for the search of audiovisually conferred intimations, according to an exploration of the condition of alternative tables of contents for cognitivism and phenomenology. It is worthwhile to try to unite philosophical questions and hypotheses with wearing close conundrums of neuroscientific measuring of physiologically elaborate performances and brain activity to cognitivism that in art and film studies can design, plan, and carry out ground-breaking analysis and experimentation. The primary *modus operandi* of our approach is still reasoning and judging about specified instances, notifying structural similarities and influential differences, and drawing conclusions. In this regard, the intention is to summarise fundamental issues facing the philosophy, psychology as well as the modularity of the mind, and the wide variety of mental factors, in investigating the semantic and cognitive networks of memory, and other domains of perceptual information of knowledge.

Psychological understatements are consequential. The distinct psychological perception of cinematic images is increasingly concerned with ramifications made in this area of research. For instance, Michael Tarr asserted that a perceptual organisation will happen in the early stages of visual processing, and it is needed for the development of more complex representations (1994: 503- 12). This activity partly relates to general mapping of intentions, in the sense that cinema can establish a common perception which unites the filmmaker's perception and the spectatorial interpretational ability to box all this in. Generally, in cinema this sort of mapping works through three formalized strategies. The first is linked to the way that overall perception happens in the diegetic world. The second relates to the idea of how camera motion is made particularly evident and how it exclusively controls the space of the narrative. The third relates to how characters, social actors in documentaries, survey the space through their movements, for the most part by means of walking and perceiving the milieu. The different perceptual laws describe more thoroughly the organisation of these matters and their function although all the possible information concerned with the view in question is not available. Anne Treisman affirmed that the essential and valid grouping of features will happen during the slower, focused-attention stage of processing. This stage selects and integrates features into certain positions. The focused-attention stage of processing is also needed to form a temporary object representation, and it will be fulfilled constantly, for

example, when the object changes through movement (1993: 5-35). This insight deals with the spectator's role as an active and creative one and raises the all-important frame of concatenation of the individual and collective perceptions and attention. The alternations of meaning indicate the way the panoramic perception happens. Through pattern recognition, documentary images and sounds are matched to our internal, mental representation, emerging from a context that encompasses ideas of visual and parallel search across the items of display.⁹ The filmmaker produces images to understand the intersubjectivity of observation. The whole display deals with memoryscapes and mindscapes in which personal experiences are susceptible to the images of media. Our perspective is to understand how contemporary art and electronic media are composed with an aesthetic development that deals with historical notions and compelling articulations uniting narrative linearity. It also connects singular performances.

Specifically, the aesthetic procedures of cognitive formations need to be unfolded phenomenally and explored cinematically as images and sounds and their integrated outcomes move through history and contemporary times. In so doing, contemporary artistic and filmmaking practices are not only questioning the past—what has historically happened before—but also insinuating their own historical and contemporary situations and the spaces of this approach—conditions and mediations in the larger enveloping sphere of filmic noosphere and its procedures.

In our investigation, aesthetics suspends the linearity of cinematic movements of narrative, and the movement of performance and moving bodies of characters in the middle of it. This also deals with the continuity of the narrative rhetoric to examine the audiovisual tendencies and engrossing articulations constituting the whole of narration as a surface of diverse processes. The objective of the text is to conceptualise these matters in consonant with other precisions, since that will help us to demarcate and analyse more intensively what cognition in direct connection with audiovisuality truly means, and how we can understand the nature of these phenomena, as well as how we can paraphrase them. It will also help us to situate cognitive, phenomenological, and audiovisual aspects of hypermodern thinking in a specified and assumed resonance, and in a general context that has a relation to other similar phenomena in media history. Our trans-, interdisciplinary, and comparative approach exists in a variety of theoretical and other debates around these issues, contextually in relation to other similar phenomena in media history. Our interdisciplinary and comparative approach exists in a variety of theoretical and other debates around these issues.

CHAPTER 1

THE DOCUMENTARY APPROACH: STAGING HYPERMODERN STANCE

Operative Processes of Documentary

Documentaries are decisive attempts to interpret and transcribe history and memory of our existence. There might be a tension between the realist poetics of transfiguration, as it has been codified in the 20th century, and the historical impact of theories about documentary, especially appearing in the second half of the century. The lasting significance and canonical practice of documentary theory has been powerful enough to allow for a surreptitious appropriation of theoretical, concise discussion about the underlining of these standpoints. It could be predicted that documentary doctrine would yield rich assets for the extended research on these matters, and indeed it has happened but in quite small and restricted circles of audiovisual thinking. These premises should be enlarged to other realms of research as well, for example to cognitive studies, phenomenology, and neuroscience. And partly it also has been done, but only partly. In the representation of philosophical possibilities and social and aesthetic pretensions, we can undertake complex research-based premises of this research, and successfully record the smallest details. Our quest is based on accurate documentation and planned circulation of affairs. Simultaneously, our research should point towards important links between the scientific research and present-day debate about documentary theory and another, seemingly more remote discursively connoted sphere that invokes these figures and conceptualizations. We will perceive matters and work concurrently to the epistemological stances of documentary theory, defining the contours of documentary film, and foregrounding the rhetoricity of the theory, as well as the diverging concepts around it. I will also focus on the scientific legitimacy of the debate around these matters, as well as on the way documentary discourse and its constitutive realm of research has developed.¹⁰

Documentary discourse has its social dimensions that are visible, corporal, and real. The task of hypermodern view is to represent it as an unremitting construction and invocation of earlier traditions of representation. These enterprises consist of social organisms with their material and spiritual substrates apprehended as a whole and sensed through immediate psychic and sensory perception. There lies an inner quality of experience and existence, an epistemology of systems that provokes thinking, and allegedly corresponds to the cognition of tangible signals of a distinct entity and phraseology like the hypermodern existence of documentation and its traits and abilities. Hypermodern documentary discourse consists of distinguishable and resilient standards, forms, operations, and a style that unites them.

As we already know, the term *documentary* refers to all these processes by which the filmic input is transformed, reduced, elaborated, stored, recovered, and used. It is concerned with these proceedings even when they operate in the absence of relevant stimulation as in images and sounds that create filmic environments; it is apparent that documentary is involved in a constant reflection upon the intricacies and complexities of representation and their contexts of origination and critical examination. As one might expect, these other dialects and speculations of documentary discourse, and by and large a hypermodern manifestation of these interweaving and blended forms of impressive appearances, are a specifically targeted phenomenon that appropriates and deciphers many insights and aspects of forms and uses of our contemporary affections. Through the employment of these closely and subtly integrated and merged framings, other dimensions and more extensive accounts are ubiquitously connected and revisited in this context.

Research of documentary has described and explicitly classified the idea of documentary film and its relation to various processes. These underlines have been widely conceded and discussed among documentary doctrine, principally when seeking to account for all the intellectual and other activities related to documentary perspective. Generally, the epistemology of documentary forms a transdisciplinary research cluster, related to the fields of philosophy, psychology, anthropology, and aesthetics. Each field consists of a unique and notable set of implements and views. Documentary approach unfolds different theoretical standpoints and is, in this sense, a settled position, a stance, and a scope for intellectual and emotional register of tentative attitudes rooted in several disciplines. Documentary approach is often historical, an inquiry that designates the very operations of historical knowing. In another connection speaking of historiography,

Paul Ricoeur has spoken of 'documentary phase', which starts with the reception of the witnesses' statements and ends with the production of archives that serve to establish documentary proof. And further on with the hypothetical explanation and understanding phase where the historian illustrates the reasons and repercussions of things that have happened, and then, the representative phase in which the actual expounding of the past occurs. These are the methodological momentums interwoven and interspersed with one another, as Ricoeur explains.¹¹ This is a methodological layout that has its attachments with documentary discourse as it appears in Patricio Guzmán's film *Nostalgia for the Light* (*Nostalgia de la luz*, 2010). Guzmán's film is an instructive and commendable study of heaven and earth, situated in Atacama desert in Chile, a place for stargazing and a place for searching the bones of people who were buried in the desert sand during the Pinochet dictatorship. Guzmán's filmic methods are sketched to resemble Ricoeur's list; the documentary, explanation, understanding, and representative phases are all present in Guzmán's approach. He has designated his film as an interdisciplinary historical research and filmic approach within the aesthetic domain of film language. He concentrates on these phases to infiltrate and reorganise practices around the articulation and vocalization of temporality. The historical roots of expounding things, comprehending, and representing them, are all relevantly present. It is the audience's duty to resolve these puzzles once the question of historicity has been raised, as well as the question of extraterrestrial phenomena. Indeed, the fundamental motivation for Guzmán is to raise these questions, to see what the constitutive relationship between past, present and future will be. In the encountering phase of Guzmán's narrative, a conceivable and declarative memory is born out of these circumstances and is turned into an allegedly genuine, authentic proof of matters in question. Guzmán films testimonies of witnesses, and they are evaluated so that a documentary truth is supposed to appear as entangled in the forms and conventions of testimonial language. Crucial here is Guzmán's affirmation that the witnesses' declarative memories are the initiating instants of historical knowledge and possible aspects of truth. This arrangement of design gives the work an even structure, not always so common in cinematic circles and using a variety of mediatic surprises to produce a fluctuated style coming across the images and sounds. The processual quality of historical dimensions opens up new visions for research.¹²

In the film, Guzmán interviews, for instance, Luis Henriquez who is one of the survivors of Pinochet's death camps, chastened by the past, and he recounts how inmates studied astronomy until it was forbidden later. Another survivor, Miguel Lawner was an incredibly talented craftsman,

able to produce compelling drawings of the concentration camp by explicitly memorising how many feet he covered as he paced its grounds. The narrative undertakes a seemingly complex, partly intimate, partly ceremonial debate about the anxiety and exasperation of Chilean tragic past. In another, crucial passage of the film, Guzmán's interviews with the Atacama astronomers attempt to link their inquisitive probing of the cosmos with the equally daunting task of making a nation recall its days of victimisation. The study of the heavens seems to be offered as a form of consolation against the painful void, as a scientist tells us that the stars contain the same calcium as our bones, including the bones of the disappeared persons lying near the telescopes. The points in time show how essential is Ricoeur's affirmation that the witnesses' testimonies are the initiating appearances of historical knowledge. The witnesses want to reassure us; they want us to believe what they are saying. At the same time, it is our responsibility to evaluate the credibility of their testimonies. This forms a key operation in the establishment of the authenticity of the documentary, concerning the claim that the events happened.

The type of questions raised in Guzmán's film are crucial for historical research, since they consequently concern documentary facts that are dealing with not just the remembered events but their actual, painful occurrence. In this way, the described event becomes the referent of testimonies. We can think that Ricoeur's conceptual description of the historical traces of documentary discloses and gives form of something very meaningful, showing a great concern of the silenced voices of the people who have lost something and, at the same time, lived through something and experienced a paradox of being a human whose humanity has been utterly jeopardised.¹³

Nostalgia for the Light represents an artistic practice that invites the cinema audience to think about the excruciating pain of the past, and to make multiple connections between characters and objects in sequences that describe these episodes. This is also a sensitive memory work in progress that concentrates not only on specific historical resonances, but also on historical representation of them. In Guzmán's film, the amenable method of investigation controls the narrative rhetoric, representing and citing exact dimensions and a view of largely ignored, forgotten history. The filming in Atacama-desert performs a way of retelling, a way of how a contemporary activity of a filmmaker, in a way can open the wounds but also, at the same time, shed a new light on the traumatic events. The conscious intention pertains to remembering and forgetting and produces a meta-historical account in mobilising the accomplished effect about the lamented past,

adding culturally and sensitively invoked connotations and embodied interpretations to it. As Malin Wahlberg has demonstrated: “The trace is a trace of something, and therefore it stands out as an intentional object whose mode of being is equivalent to its function as inscription of the past within the present.”¹⁴ In hypermodern features, the tracing or cognitively mapping out the reflections of the past and present is a question of opening the burdens between them and triggering associations that run through them in order to develop continuities and discontinuities between them and assess evocation encoded resonantly within them.¹⁵

A film, for whatever mood and purpose, can invoke an act of reminiscence that is permeated by personal memory, symbolising something more. This is in line with the dominating influence of existential phenomenology and phenomenology of time experience concerning historical ideas and their philosophical outcomes. Nostalgia in *Nostalgia for the Light* unfolds a hypermodern form of reawakening of memory as a productive force and sentience. Guzmán’s film pursues to corroborate possibilities that are still valid in the present and, in this sense, Guzmán’s nostalgia subsumes an almost utopian presence of the future, an apparent desire for a state and phraseology of matters that could be better than the current one. Following this logic, one can think that nostalgia contains a critical element, since it is usually a symptom of (subjective) longing for something else, a modification, or hope for another reality.

The Exclamatory Nature of Hypermodern

In his book *The Subject of Documentary*, Michael Renov accounts: “There is a great respect in the scientific community for ‘basic research.’ Only consider the homage paid to the category of defence appropriations: all hail the repose of laboratory conditions – the place of detached musings and speculation – that gives birth to new strategic defence systems” (2004: 108). Current research on documentary, concerning the meaning, interpretation, and kudos of it, is based on a complex history of intentions. Many of the earlier arguments have formed the basis and an alliance for a great deal of research on documentary perspectives down to the present time. Therefore, it is crucial to know the heritage of this tradition, and to understand what kind of issues are at stake in talking about documentaries. When talking about the historical value of documentary film, several epistemological schemes and game plans have been adopted and constituted in discussion of ontological differences and similarities between them. As Vivian C. and Thomas Sobchack have illuminatively emphasised: “Documentary filmmakers