

TD 01 Mandy Rose

John Burgan

I'm going to let Mandy Rose more or less introduce herself, Mandy however is a regular visitor to us in Newport. Her work, as some of you are aware of, particularly in the field of i-Docs, is really ground-breaking and so if I ever want to understand what's going there, I speak to people like Mandy

Mandy Rose

Thanks John and thanks for the invitation to be here thanks Heidi, thanks John and it's in an honour to speak to you this morning and to see a number of people who I've worked with and known over the years here and I look forward to meeting other people later in the day.

So I have come to research media after a long career in programme making as a documentary maker, as an interactive media producer, the last 20 years or so at the BBC, where I ran among other things a couple of major participatory media projects - the best known of which was called *Video Nation* which I co-founded and ran for 6 years for BBC2.

Around 2007 I started thinking what was going to happen as documentary met these new of what we're calling Web 2.0 and I developed a research proposal and pitched it and happily got that got a fellowship and since then I've been in the field of research, thinking about these questions about documentary.

I'm now working as the director of the Digital Cultures Research Centre at the University of the West of England in Bristol just 50 miles east of here - and I'm also in a group called i-Docs. i-Docs is a biannual symposium, a website and a lively thousand plus people Facebook community of practitioners and scholars who are thinking about interactive documentary. So i-Docs being short for Interactive Documentary. And Judith Aston one of my co-directors is here or will be here so catch up with us if you're interested in i-Docs.

My talk title - and I do apologise to Raymond Carver for this title - you know asked us to think again about what we mean by documentary if going to think about what we teach in the coming period. I'm going to think about the disruption and also the opportunities that Digital has bought documentary, point to some of the forms that are emerging that will require new teams and new skills, think about how the markets changing and also how the audience is being reconfigured in this new environment.

And I'm going to suggest that if we want to know what to teach now we need to be thinking beyond production, to the lives that documentaries have in this new ecosystem.

Back in 2001 - which in this kind of world this kind of field seems like a very long time ago - Lev Manovich published an important book called "The Language In New Media", and in that book he was thinking about what the impact of computerisation was going to be on art, in the 21st-century.

He saw cinema as the dominant form of the 20th century and was saying if cinema has had all these implications, what are going to be the implications of computerisation and one of his points, which has turned out to be more and more kind of accurate, is this issue of the tendency for computerisation to lead to an opening up.

If you think about the music industry and the way that was disrupted by file sharing perhaps that was the first big huge impact of that kind of opening up and we're seeing it now in documentary in all sorts of ways.

In the language of new media, happily for us, Lev Manovich took a documentary as his key example of 20th century cinema; Vertov's luminous work from '29, and he kind of refers to it throughout the book and talks about how he thinks computerisation is going to give us an opportunity to see the world and the human being anew in ways that were not available to the *Man With a Movie Camera*.

I think that's a rather beautiful articulation of what documentary is about - and on that front I'd say a lot of my references are going to be to interactive documentaries to documentaries made by computers, documentary that you find online. And my interest in that is not for its techie innovation: My interest in that is because I think that the new forms we're seeing emerging in the space advance the project of documentary in really interesting ways. There's important work going on that takes forward that project which, I think, more or less is a project of looking at that world that we share, asking questions about that world and asking if the world that we have now is the world we want, or if there are alternatives.

So I'm going to start with one example, something that I saw fairly recently - A project need for this piece of open technology, the *Oculus Rift*.

Many of us will be aware that virtual reality is something that started 30 or 40 years ago first heard the term virtual reality for these kind of headsets through which you were supposed to experience aspects of the world in a very present form. And just in the last couple of years, a kind of version of Virtual Reality was created by somebody in his garage in California was a version that was supposed to be cheap and easily accessible and various people have started looking at the creative possibilities of that technology. One of them, Oscar Raby, a Chilean documentarist who lives in Australia now - and I'm going to show you a clip from a piece of work that he's made.

I should have prefaced this by saying this is really kind of just the tease for something because you can't ... you need to be wearing the headset to properly experience it, but I think what I should say before you see the clip, this brief clip, is that what this piece of work does is to reflect an experience Oscar's father had as a young military officer in Chile in 1973 soon after the coup against the Allende regime, when he was stationed up in the Atacama desert and was called with his fellow officers to witness events on the nearby hillside.

[plays extract from *Assent*]

So, as you see: Scratchy, 2-D animation, you know, poor quality - and yet somehow, one of the most moving pieces of work I've seen in a long time. It's something like an eight-minute experience: You put this headset on and in a sense, you are transported into the shoes of Oscar's father. And into this dialogue between father and son Oscar explained that his father had taken him aside when he was 16, sat him down and started to tell him something and Oscar was expecting, you know, what we'd call in England, the birds and the bees and actually what his father told him, was that he had been called to witness an execution by a death squad and that, in a way it was a brutal induction into the new regime and you know that this thing that had kind of marked his life, that required his complicity in death - in murder. And Oscar had held - you know - carried this memory around, for 20 years and been seeking, in a sense, a platform, or a place - a way of expressing this story and found it in this VR technology.

There's nothing about realism in this story, but there's something very interesting about the kind of presence you felt - I felt - with this headset on - and other people who have seen this piece have said the same thing. And we can expect, I think, many more powerful factual experiences made on this platform.

An Australian psychologist I came across the other day, Jeremy Bailenson - who's been working on virtual reality - describing his anxiety about trying to step off a cliff - supposedly with the headset

on what felt like a cliff - compared it to this apocryphal moment, when the train pulled in the station, in the Lumière brothers' 1895 film. And I just think that's a very interesting comparison for us - that actually, his brain was confused between the virtual and real in this experience and I think perhaps that there's something about this presence that is going to do that for us and it's something you know that documentarists need to think about.

So *Assent* conforms to definitions of documentary: Its about the real world, it's about things that actually happened, it speaks directly about that world - it's not an allegory as fiction is - and it also suggests just how radically the contours of documentary are changing now.

And alongside *Assent*, oh so much more work I'd love to show you now, but I can't today - but we're seeing work, which you know, is personalised rather than universal - work which speaks to you directly to a viewer and will change viewer to viewer - were seeing, all the work that's online is 24/7 as we know, rather than scheduled. We're finding increasingly pieces of work that are experiences rather than representation and work, many pieces of work now, that are generative - that grow and change over time that are not fixed and stable. Of course the history of documentary has been more about adaptation and change – it's been a constant story, as producers, directors, have taken advantage of new technologies and the affordances of those new technologies - the things those technologies allow, indeed perhaps encourage, but which are always mediated by human decision-making.

So we can think about, tend to think about, that moment around 1960, when on this side of the Atlantic and Rouch and Morin and across the Atlantic Leacock and Drew and others picked up those hand-held cameras for the first time. So its so interesting that on this side of the channel - of the Atlantic - what came out of that was cinéma vérité, an intensely reflective practice and on the other side, you know, Direct Cinema, something which was much more interested in the, kind of, notions of unmediated reality. So, you know, the technology mediated by the kind of philosophical and interest of the filmmakers at all times. It didn't dictate the outcomes.

So as well as the technology constantly, you know, in a dance with documentary, as William Urrichio the media historian says, the business of documentary is been one of change. So for example, the big story perhaps in the early 21st century has been that story of the rise of theatrical documentary and in terms of form, documentary, linear documentary, has also been getting increasingly diverse, you know, we've seen that mainstreaming of first person work the incorporation of animation and the rise of reality TV.

But I would suggest that Digital has amplified those processes, ushering in transformation on multiple fronts so that tools, form, technique, platforms, economic models and relationships to audience are all in the process of change. So how do we think about this kind of dizzying set of possibilities as teachers?

Thinking about this talk, I looked at Bill Nichols, whose kind of lucid thinking about documentary is always so grounding. And I think, looking at his 2001 "Introduction to Documentary", I looked at those frameworks he came up with: He kind of said you can't define documentary by just thinking about what's in it, you have to think about other context. And he came up with these 4 frameworks which he thought it could deal with that dynamic quality of documentary, which he said both uphold what documentary is at a given time and place and promote the continual transformation of documentary over time. So I'm borrowing his frameworks now for this talk as a way of throwing light on what's happening now and that changing world of documentarians.

So first: His first framework: An Institutional Framework.

And in a way this is about saying, well where are these things labelled documentaries appearing now? Who's making them and why? Who is making them, who is funding them and why?

So were looking at the context now - this context of network culture where media is everywhere where we live a media life - where there's media in the bus stop, you know, on our phones, projected onto buildings, everywhere we turn. And everyone it seems is interested in story now and factual stories seem to be of great interest. So we're seeing new players enter the documentary fields from lots of different aspects - *Project Wild Thing* - I do apologise actually about that many of my references are from England or North America so there are many other places where this work is emerging, some of these are ones that are fairly close to me, that I'm familiar with, so *Project Wild Thing*: A feature documentary that came out about 18 months ago? 2 years ago? About childhood and trying to reconnect kids with nature.

Multiple partners: National Trust, various charities, so, hugely supported by non-governmental organisations. And that's been a trend in a way, since *An Inconvenient Truth*, where perhaps that documentary was really important in turning the attention of charities and NGOs to documentaries - to the power of documentaries to tell the story.

Kony 2012: When I checked YouTube this week, 10 million views at this point. Supported by a charity - I won't go there it's another conversation. And actually I was quite ambivalent this week,

when I saw that Lewisham Council, a London Labour Council, strapped for cash, had decided to invest in a documentary to engage young people with the potential future, the decisions they might make in their young lives and the potential implications of them.

As an enthusiast, I'm still nervous about this - about this kind of assumption about what the impacts of a documentary might be. And there are lots of people now working on that, working on that question of impact, because as all these new players come in they want to know if I'm going to invest this money - is it going to actually have the effect I'm hoping it's going to have? So that's a kind of interesting development.

But if you want to know who the biggest commissioner of interactive documentaries is in the UK, you might be thinking, BBC, Channel 4 - but actually it's The Guardian. The Guardian newspaper, who as we all know have been really kind of agile and experimental and interested in where digital might take them, and in the last couple of years has invested in a series of interactive - I call them interactive documentaries - Francesca Panetta, who's the producer, tends to call them "Interactives" - without the word documentary on, but then Francesca turns up at documentary conferences and talks about them in that context plenty, so I feel it's fine to kind of harness them to the documentary project.

So *Firestorm* looked behind a photograph that went kind of viral when there were these bushfires in Tasmania 18 months or so ago and looked at that. *In Flight* took the hundredth anniversary of flying and treated it with lots of kind of live data. *The Shirt On Our Backs* went behind the fire in the garment factory in Dhaka. And tried to in a sense bring it home - you can see there, rather small on-screen, "You have been on this interactive for 0.7 minutes. In this time Mahmud has earned X amount of money." So it tries to sort of reconnect or connect the audience in a slightly different way than a text article might, with a story behind that fire.

This isn't only in the UK: French newspapers have been investing in this kind of work. A big piece for the New York Times that made a real splash perhaps a year or so ago: *Snowstorm* took an interactive perspective or applied an interactive perspective to a story about some young people caught in an avalanche.

But this interest in newspapers is not only about interactive: The New York Times have now got a Ob-Doc section and regularly commission short documentaries... sorry I'm struggling a bit with technology today.

And one of the projects - one of the - I think one of the very interesting documentary offshoots of a newspaper or magazine in this case is Time Magazine's "Red Border Films" which they launched last summer. And what they've done is to think about photography and actually commission, once a month, one of their photographers to make a short documentary based on an image that they've already shot - so I'll show you a little bit of one of those. No I won't, because that's what I was going to do live.

In the breakout session I'll show you because they are really lovely and this one was about this guy, Bobby - can't remember his surname - but he had been seriously burnt as a soldier in the Iraq war and is now doing stand-up comedy and it's a piece with him - and with somebody who's so injured that it's hard to kind of look at them - but he's a great character and it's a really... it's a good piece of work.

In one respect we've got this new institutional interest in documentary, in journalism. Perhaps more kind of radically is the rise of crowd funding as a funding source for documentary. Which I think we can think of as a kind of democratised commissioning - it's certainly not kind of watering down what happens in crowd-funding: You see niche topics, very political subjects sometimes - themes that wouldn't find their way onto a broadcast platform, are often supported through crowdfunding and it's something we need to take seriously - I know Charlie Phillips is going to talk about it tomorrow - but you know the numbers that are around the amount of money changing hands are significant: In 2012, Kickstarter distributed more money in the United States than the National Endowment for the Arts. And it's rare that somebody just says - I want to fund the documentary and get the whole funding: People often work in stages, do a number short campaigns and it's a lot of work and commitment and time, but people like Jeannie Finlay British documentary-maker and Franny Armstrong, who in a way pioneered crowdfunding work in the UK, have found that you get a lot more out of it than just the money - that actually it's really significant in terms of building a community around a film, who after all then are going to go on to be your audience and the ambassadors for your project.

So there's one - just this week: *Blast Theory*, really interesting, experimental, digital media group in Brighton, attained their aim of £15,000 for a project which will be a documentary: *Karen App* - it's an app which will psychologically profile you as you engage with it, as a way of interrogating and making a commentary on data and our data and what happens to it, often without our awareness. So you know interesting work coming out this way.

So, Bill Nichols' second framework: A Community of Practitioners. The idea within the community of practitioners is, what he was saying was, if you think about the people who make documentaries: They hold certain assumptions, they go to the same conferences, maybe write for the same journals, they meet, they talk, they speak a common language. They have shared jargon and a sense of purpose.

So I thought it would be interesting to think about, well what are the - what is the shared language, what are the common purposes among people making this new generation of interactive documentary work. So, and a place I thought was worth, to look, to think about this, which I think is a really interesting reference point for you beyond today if you want to look further into this work, is MIT, Open DocLab's *Docubase* - So this is a collection of 172 - a growing collection of interactive projects - of kind of landmark interactive projects, because there are many, many more than that now and they're also the playlists: 10 or 12 curators have made playlists of projects they've chosen and written a commentary about each one, and I'm one of those curators. So it's a worthwhile reference point

So there are two names that crop up in this *Docubase*, and crop up in those playlists more than the others - and I just wanted to tell you something about the two of them, because I think their two stories are offer some insight into this space.

First is Katharina Cizek: Katharina Cizek, a Canadian social justice documentarian - is how she describes herself. She studied journalism and in a way stumbled into a video-making when she was covering a protest around Native American rights and made her name on a 2002 documentary which she codirected with the late Peter Wintonick: *Seeing Is Believing: Handicams, Human Rights and the News* - which was about the impact of camcorders and digital media on citizen media and grassroots democracy.

After making the film, she was invited by Tom Perlmutter, from the National Film Board of Canada, to come to the board and work with them, to reinvent their project from the 1960s: *The Challenge for Change Project*. So, explicitly invited to reinterpret that project, which was a foundational project of community media within the context of digital - and she embedded herself in an inner-city hospital in Toronto - if you haven't heard of it before, check it out: It started with Fogo Islanders films.

So Katharina Cizek embedded herself in an inner-city hospital in Toronto and undertook a number of projects over 3 or 4 years, I think, as filmmaker in residence. And in those projects she was

experimenting with digital media, she kind of learnt how to work as an online filmmaker who was distributing her work on the web, thinking about interactivity and she was also crucially thinking about the relationships between her and the participants, her subjects as participants, because she was thinking about that community medium model and how it might be developed.

She then moved on to make *Highrise*, which has been a multi award-winning project - you can see up there all the kind of plaudits that its won – it's multi in many aspects, Its a multi-year project with multiple manifestations and it's made with partners at its heart, both academics – it's about the, what the academics call "global suburbanisms": Life in high-rise blocks around the world, those high-rises that lurk not in the city centre but sort of on the peripheries often, and are often the places where immigrant people live, often kind of rundown blocks that have seen better days - looking at the lives that happen there.

And so she's worked with these academic partners and also, at the heart of the project, with a group of tenants of Toronto high-rises who the project team are in constant dialogue with.

HighRise has gone through a number of different iterations which I'd urge you to check out and recently won an award for a New York Times commission: *Short History of the Highrise: Four Short Films in Poetry, Four Short Films in Rhyme* - about the history of the high-rise, using lots of lovely animation and interactivity.

So I think, Katharina Cizek reflects one strand within this digital interactive media which is the strand of participation and I just think its really interesting that this work, this space which we think is all about tech and about virtual and about being online, actually has proved to be a space which has not least inspired a generation of filmmakers to rethink that kind of community media project and a lot of the work that happens around some of these online projects is actually face-to-face work in communities, embedded, on-going and serious.

So example number two: Jonathan Harris: So a Princeton computer science graduate, but also somebody who was painting from his teenage years. So a kind of artist and a geek / computer science guy. So while still at college in around 2000, he started thinking about what he kind of described as the kind of traces of self-expression that people were beginning to leave in social media spaces and started thinking about how he work with those with his algorithms with that kind of - those voices - and made a number of projects and then kind of burst into our consciousness in 2005 with a project called *We Feel Fine* with a collaborator called Sep Kamvar.

It's hard to describe in a way what an impact *We Feel Fine* had and it's still live and I think it's still kind of amazing but in 2005 / 2006 I'm sorry I can't remember which it was...

[cut]

... random stuff happening too. So a kind of playful exploration of the ways we talk about ourselves and I would urge you to check it out.

But I think that for those of us who came across it then and perhaps still now, it just kind of opened our eyes to the idea that there would be a kind of web-native native documentary, that there would be something which has moved on from the kind of linear cut-cut-cut into something that lived and breathed online.

So since then Jonathan Harris has been tearing through projects: He's made lots of work and in a way, his work seems to move between these works that almost seem like the machine is in control - the kind of algorithms are in control - and then other pieces where is much more human handcrafted so for example this is *Cowbird* - a platform that he created, launched, three years ago, probably two three years ago and these are two minute, highly authored, personal pieces. In a way his contribution is as much about organising those, offering ways of accessing those and bringing together these kind of interesting juxtapositions between different pieces.

His latest piece, *I Love Your Work* is... I'll find his description it's best to let him describe... how does he put it: It's about lesbian porn actresses and as he put it, about the realities of those who make fantasies". And in this one, he basically did an observational filmmaking approach, but with a machine-like sort of intervention, so he basically followed about 6 or 7 women across a week, filming 10 second clips taken at five minute intervals. Just like that, over 10 consecutive days.

And then, cheekily, makes us pay to watch it - its \$10 you have to book a slot. So then you have this experience of this vast array of these tiny little images and then you click on one feeling like a real kind of pervy person and it pops up and you get to watch it and just when you get interested, it kind of cuts to the next one. So you know it's like a fascinating kind of playful engagement with all sorts of issues around the web, with the kind of attention economy as people call it, the business that everything is just free to access. So it plays with that whole business, stopping the access, stopping you accessing it and playing with your voyeurism - a very instant piece of work.

So you know Harris's story tells us something about some of the skills you could do with if you going to flourish in this environment - so he's a computer scientist and you don't necessarily need to be a computer scientist and artist all rolled into one: You can put together a team. And often now were seeing teams of storytellers, lets say you know, documentary storytellers and you'll need a designer and a developer - so a different kind of set of skills, where certainly there's some computer science - but perhaps somewhere, I mean there's also some platforms you can use off the shelf, but you know, often teams have a kind of mix.

But it's going to be challenging to put together those cross-disciplinary teams. And one of the ways that people are getting around that is by setting up what people call hacks or labs - and here is just an example of one because it happens to be coming up this weekend in New York: POV's *Hackathon*. POV is an American investigative journalist TV series public broadcasting series - they've been running these hackathons lots of people have been doing it it's just one example but actually there's been some really interesting creative work coming out of those hackathons and their one approach to dealing with that problem of the cross disciplinary team.

So, OK. Number 3: [A Corpus of Texts]. There are four of these frameworks this is three. So, Nicholls says well how do you know what documentary is - well we can look at a group of pieces of work can say that's what documentary is, all these pieces that came out last year, so what's it looking like.

So and I think it's interesting thinking about this idea of a corpus of text in relation to the interactivity because it problematises that notion of the corpus and that notion of the text.

So to take an example *Bear 71*. You may have heard of this project that came out in 2012 from the National Film board of Canada. I wish I got time to show a clip - So it's a project about man and wilderness. About surveillance, about technology, about animals. It's about bear 71 - who is a she bear, who like many she bears in the Banff national forest, is trapped from birth to death; and this interactive project proceeds through a number of audio pieces in the voice of the she bear, bear 71 and it's a brilliant script and it's a really wonderfully written piece of work.

And what you see is this strange kind of map they call the grid it's kind of a bit like a map of the national forest but it kind of isn't really and on it you'll find these little things that say bobcat or merganser - and you click on them and you see little clips of all these images of animals and nature that have been captured on his trail cams and at some point a little thing pops up saying

can I access your webcam and if you say yes, at some point when you're clicking around and you click on human, you'll find that what pops up is human what pops up is you.

And that was me in 2012 - anyway so... and actually, very, very interesting uncanny, moment but also a kind of brilliant moment because it reflects that surveillance theme so there I was, looking at myself and looking at other people me around me, which I haven't actually managed to capture on this, and thinking: "Oh god I can see them - can they see me, I don't know" and I would kind of wave a bit or whatever and you know you didn't know whether you were being recorded for later or whatever.

Very nice, simple, brilliant expression of that surveillance theme. But actually not everyone who watches *Bear 71* sees that. Not everyone will have said yes to the access in their webcam, so there isn't "a" *Bear 71* there's not "an" experience of *Bear 71* - I got a different one from everybody else and I think that really kind of already start shaking that notion of the corpus how do we talk about *Bear 71* we don't even know what we're talking about.

And there are other examples as well of this business of the problematics of the shifting nature of these documentaries. So, a lovely project I would urge you to look at by an artist called Perry Bard is *Man With a Movie Camera: The Global Remake* and Perry Bard created a website where she cut up *Man with a Movie Camera* into all its constituent clips and invited Vertov fans around the world to refilm a clip, and this documentary has been running now for nearly 10 years growing and changing every single day and there are - November the 3rd, somebody in Hong Kong has posted a new clip, somebody in Greece. So again, a piece of work that never changes.

And another big theme that we see in this space that I think we have to look at, is this theme of remix. This theme of content that's open and that's deliberately made available through Creative Commons Rights frameworks for reuse - so again, Tiffany Shlain, a filmmaker who absolutely makes work about remix - calls people around the world to offer her clips, cuts them, makes them, offers them back for people to use in their own ways.

So again I think this notion of the corpus starts to kind of creak and strain quite a bit. And is a challenge of studying documentary and a challenge for teaching it

So right - three and half minutes to go I'm going to do my biggest...

So Nicol's last category was "A Constituency of Viewers" and in a way this does show perhaps the most radical shift of all. We've come a long way from that image of "the" media in "the" box in the corner. We all know that in one house everyone can be accessing diverse forms of media: My 12 year old on YouTube, *Minecraft*, Sims, Instagram as well as as *Hollyoaks* on TV etc. and viewers become actors in this landscape.

The people, as Jay Rosen described them in 2006 "formerly known as the audience" so you know they're capturing, uploading, favouriting, bookmarking, sharing: They're actors and there's lots of analytics now, data that can tell you kind of what they're doing, but actually we're in very early days in terms of understanding what all that data means: The data is there, but the interpretation is much more mysterious.

And among the roles for viewers now, is the role as the producer. You know, now, every minute there's 100 hours of material uploaded to YouTube. I don't think most of that's documentary but you know, but actually all those people who are uploading that, many of whom are recording that, are also potential co-creators of documentary and I think if you think of documentary as I have suggested about being about our shared world, what can be more powerful than to be able to work with the subjects who, the people previously known as the subjects of documentary, in creating documentaries together, is a very powerful and important opportunity.

A couple of examples of this - I mean I will say, I'm not very excited by the *Life in a Day* version of this, the Ridley Scott version, which is probably the better known one yet, not very interested in that at all because actually seemed like it's kind of an extractive process. They shout "give us your material" and sit in the editing room and make the film they wanted, but there's lots of much more collaborative dialogic approaches to this kind of thing.

18 Days in Egypt was a project would ask people who had tweeted or blogged about those 11 days back in January 2011, that process, to come back and build out from that those brief bits of content they'd made then to tell that story in more depth.

Question Bridge is a project which interrogates Black-American identity - the identity of that, in fact, very diverse group of people, but people who are all too often reflected in the kind of prison system and in the poverty and disenfranchisement in the States. It doesn't ask is meant to make content more interestingly in a way it asks them to ask the questions and it's a project which is manifested online as a gallery installation and has been touring schools, museums, prisons around the States

and has engaged hundreds of thousands of men in important conversations about their lives and futures.

I'm going to say my conclusion now.

So: huge pace of change - and I've rattled through a lot of stuff and I think, no doubt we going to see documentary moving into areas that we haven't even thought of yet, before too long.

So with documentary taking so many forms on so many platforms, with works that morph and grow, that respond to actions taken on the part of the user, we can no longer take for granted that we know what we mean when we say documentary. We need to ask not just what a documentary will represent, but what will a documentary do? What kind of experience will it offer, what kind of life cycle will the project have? What kind of skills are needed to create that work and support that life? What kind of partners will be involved - on what terms?

These are some of the things we need to talk about, when we talk about documentary today and think about teaching documentary for the next 10 years.

[presentation ends]