




Presenting the Testimonial in Multimedia Documentaries

Kenneth Feinstein^(✉) 

Sunway University, No. 5, Jalan Universiti, 47500 Bandar Sunway, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia

kenf@sunway.edu.my

Abstract. This paper looks at two multi-media documentary projects one in Portugal and the other a developing work in Malaysia. It will look at relationship of the documentary to the bearing witness of the subject. From there we will look at the ethical underpinnings of this. From there we will look at how this ethical relationship between the subject bearing witness and the audience changes into a new form within the installation. We will see how the new form of installation documentary is based on an idea of presence and how that leads to the work bringing forward a relationship of the viewer to the witness as a one ethical responsibility to the other. From there we will look at two examples of installation documentaries one completed in Lisbon in 2022 and the other in Sarawak, Malaysia is an ongoing project to see how these considerations are used to design new works.

In looking at these two projects we will see concepts of direct testimonial found in documentary come into direct conflict with the interviewees sense of governmental repercussions. We will ask if it is possible to create a documentary work that has a greater sense of presence while having to face the need of anonymity by interviewees. From this we will draw some conclusions and look forward to how this experience can help in future works.

Keywords: documentary · installation · media art · interface · testimony · performativity · otherness

1 Introduction

This paper is looking into how we can use installation design as a way of creating a new form of documentary. We will look at what are the distinguishing factors regarding a documentary work, how they have been defined in the cinematic tradition and how installation design allows for a different form of documentary to exist. From this we will look at a specific example of such a work and then a speculative design for a future project. Within the analysis of these two works we see how interface design can be used not only for a more experiential interaction, but how it can be fundamental in the conception and design of the work itself. We will address issues regarding how to ethically present the voice of the subject in differing political and free speech environments and see how interface design must take center stage to address these issues.

2 The Documentary as a Form

As a form of non-fiction narrative, the documentary is unique. History is based on the linear text. It defines our understanding of events in a cause and effect relationship [1]. The narrative voice is found in the historian author. While documents and testimonials of participants may find a place in the work, they are always supplemental to the authorial narrative. With a written text the voice of the participant or subject of history is always at a remove. At best it is a transcript of them talking, but their visage and voice must be by definition missing. Even if the historian is claiming to be a witness to events, they are still subject to the literary form. It is only with the technical image that a sense of presence can be brought to bear on historical events. Beginning with Roger Fenton's images of the Crimean War in 1856, we can see what the aftermath of a battles looks like and begin to feel as if we are experiencing the events as they are. As journalistic photography and cinema were invented, the historical gave way to the documentary. The role of the witness changed. We as viewers were given access to the direct testimony of the witness as well as being able to witness events as they unfolded for ourselves. Where history is a linear narrative derived from the distilling of documentation, the documentary centers on the presentation of the documentation directly to us. It is designed to bring the real to us as a way of presenting us the truth. This truth is found in the unfolding of events as they occur. This is why they tend to present us events in some form of linear time. Most documentaries use linear time as the main structure of the narrative form. We see this more strongly in direct cinema but find it in other forms such as the expository or voice of God film.

2.1 Various Modes of Documentary

In *Representing Reality*, Bill Nichols defines the various types of documentary as four different modes namely, "expository, observational, interactive, and reflexive" [2]. Later this was amended by Stella Bruzzi so that interactive became participatory and a performative mode was added [3]. Each mode has a different approach to how we are presented with reality in the film, but all are based on some sort of presentation of documentation. In the expository mode which is driven by the "objective" voice of the (male) narrator, we still will have images that verify the narration. The images in John Huston's *Report from the Aleutians* reinforce the narration. Eyewitness testimonials are also used to reinforce the overall narrative by they are still supplemental to the narration [4]. More recently we find this mode used in the multipart documentaries of Ken Burns. In a series like *The Civil War*, Burns uses voice actors to read testimonial documentation, letters and diaries, from eyewitnesses to events that predate cinema. [5]. Yet these testimonials are supplemental to the narrative voice. This expository mode is the most problematic in terms of presenting the testimonial as the core of the documentary. In form it is the closest to written history as the film is developed around the written text.

As the technology allowed for handheld cameras which enabled synchronous sound and images to be filmed, the observational mode became predominate. This mode is possibly best known by films such as *The War Room* [6] or *Salesman* [7] where the filmmakers follow their subjects recording them in their daily lives. In this form the filmmaker tries to eliminate their presence from the film leaving the viewer to experience

events as if they were there. The camera eye becomes the surrogate for the viewer's eye. Where the expository depends on the narrator and interviewees to be the witness form which we arrive at the truth, the observational mode places us in the action making us the witness. This form eschews an externally imposed narration as much as possible and just allows events to unfold. It gives us access to events as they happen, but this doesn't mean that the underlying motivations for various people's actions are available to us. We do not get to know how the actor's perceive events and how this modifies their actions. This form is based on the idea that seeing is believing and that truth is always found in the outside actions before the camera. The observational film tends to center on a specific (time limited) event. This gives the film its narrative structure. It allows the film's narrative to resemble a fiction narrative by reinventing the documentary as a three-act play. For example, in *The War Room* the event is the 1992 presidential election. We have a structure that builds from the first primary in New Hampshire through to the climax of election night. Here we have a form that on first sight appears to give us a raw view of reality as it unfolds. What happened and said is unscripted, yet there is a great deal of editorial control by the filmmakers both in the placement of camera and especially in structuring a narrative. The filmmaker is not physically present in the film, but it is their views that shape and define what we take as real and true. Testimony is presented to us, the camera is unflinching in what it sees, yet that doesn't mean that it doesn't have a point of view. It is the director and editor who have the last say in how we experience this reality. Because we do not always perceive events that we live through in the same way, an issue for observational documentarians is the possibility of the subjects feeling betrayed by how they are presented in final work. Since the film can only show us the physicality of events as they unfold the perspectives of the participants are not communicated, the whys of their actions, and subjects can feel that without that understanding their actions are not fairly presented. It is this last issue that helped lead to the last mode of documentary that needs to be discussed here, the performative mode.

A major problem with the objective mode of documentary film is that subjects can feel betrayed by how they are portrayed in edited film. They feel that their actions are not given context and may appear very different from how they saw the situation. Even in a performative film like *The Fog of War*, the subject can feel manipulated by the editing. Those are choices and risks these filmmakers have made. Both styles also tend to thematize the subject, making them part of an argument made by the filmmaker.

What distinguishes the performative mode is that the presence of the documentarian is acknowledged. This can be in the form of them being visible actors in the work, such as Michael Moore in *Roger & Me* [8] or more of an off-camera presence like Errol Morris in *The Fog of War* [9]. Within this structure we see that the testimony presented is a performative act. Where the observational film pretends that the presence of the camera doesn't affect the events depicted, in the performative mode how the camera defines what we see and hear is central to the form. The voice of the subject is given to us as the main form of documentation. The filmmaker's job is to tease out the thoughts of the subject giving us a chance to understand why they act the way that they do. *The Fog of War* is a good example of this mode of documentary. The film is based on extended on camera interviews with Robert McNamara. While other images are used as illustration of the voiceover, it is McNamara's testimony that is the core of the film. McNamara gets

to present his testimonial; it is his voice that we mainly hear. Morris, who remains off camera, questions what McNamara says. He will try to get more introspective reactions from his subject, but at the end of the day we are left with the voice of the subject of the film as our primary voice. We as viewers get to determine if he is an unreliable narrator, but it is still his voice that we are presented with. This direct interview style that Morris uses is framed by the director, he chooses what to intercut and how to edit the conversation. As a style it is trying to overcome what was perceived as the weakness of the observational mode, the inability to get into the thoughts of the subjects. Even with the more hybrid style that Michael Moore uses where he becomes the subject of the observational mode and the interlocker for the performative mode, it is in the direct interviewing of each sections subjects that Moore tries to bring out the reasoning of the interviewee. The voicing of the subject, their knowing performance before the camera allows us into a different idea of what the truth is compared to the observational mode of documentary. In Morris' work the subject is in direct conversation with the documentarian, they are very aware of their role as both witness and performer as they are placed in an unnatural situation. They are seated in front of a camera, and this allows them and us to understand the performative aspect of their role. In this style of filmmaking, we are confronted with the face of the subject. We see them as they reason out what they understood to be the forces behind their actions. We enter into a direct relationship with them through this concentration on their face and voice. Reacting to them as real people first and deciding what we think of their statements second. As such we enter into an ethical relationship with them as other. This relationship demands that we bear the burden of being witness to their testimony.

2.2 The Ethics of Presenting the Voice of the Other

In the different modes of documentary, we have looked at there are a few central tenants across all forms. First is that we are learning something about reality. What we see before us is real or in the case or re-enactments based on the real. Second is the idea of testimony. What is unique about the recorded sound and image is that it allows us to experience events as they unfold, and it allows us to see and hear the testimony of those involved in the events. This means that we enter into a direct relationship with the witness as a *being-with* them. One where we are taking up a responsibility to them by bearing witness to their testimony. Emmanuel Lévinas writes about how the other precedes us and defines us, and that this means that we have an ethical responsibility to the other. To be able to be responsible to the other we first have to experience them as real. By this I mean we must see them as another in all its reality before we can turn their testimony into meaningful language. Lévinas says that we first must experience the other as being nonthematizable and it only after that twhen we can turn what we have seen into signifiers of meaning [10].

If we look at the documentary *Shoah* [11], in one section we follow Simon Srebrnik a survivor of the first phase of the Chelmno Extermination camp. Claude Lanzmann, the director, brings him back to the village of Chelmno where he meets members of the local community. They all gather around in front of a Catholic church where a service is just getting out. They all speak fondly of Srebrnik and seem to be happy to see him. When suddenly a woman starts telling a story in which she claims that a rabbi speaking to his

fellow Jews who have been rounded up by the Nazi's claims that their fate is justified as they as a people are responsible for killing Jesus. This is all shot in one take, we see Srebrnik amongst them as this tale of pure antisemitism is said before him. What we see is his face, his expression and his inability to respond to her racism in that situation. In this moment we are witnessing him in his otherness. We are seeing him and his reaction as testimony. Our reaction comes from our being in relation to him in his humanity first. Whatever understanding of how this scene relates to history and racism comes after the initial reaction. Our first reaction is one of feeling the pain that we see as the camera zooms in on his face. In that moment we know what he feels and that language will not be sufficient to express it. This is what Lévinas means about our facing the other and our responsibility to it.

In the different modes of documentary, the directors are trying to find ways of presenting evidence so that we can make judgements on what we are seeing. In all these forms there is the belief that the real can be presented and that we must witness it. This core tenant is the enactment of our responsibility to the other. This is core to the idea of testimony. Within each particular mode there are different approaches to this idea, but it is the underlying factor in all documentaries. In making a documentary film any of these modes as well as the reflective and participatory modes are free to be used, but all these forms were created for the cinematic experience. They assume that we are seeing the film on a screen that we are seated before. They are built around the expectation of a linear viewing of the work either in a cinema or on a television. With this expectation certain ways of constructing a narrative are assumed. Arguments are built in a linear fashion and are strictly defined by the editing of the work. This is what we expect from film. Even as it is presenting us with the testimony of the subjects or directly showing us events as they unfold, the film is structured by its editing to become an understandable narrative. As we move away from the cinematic form and begin to make documentaries for experiential spaces or to be interactive how we structure the work changes. How we tell stories change and so does the relationship of the audience to the work. The importance of the testimony, our being-with the other as an experience becomes more front and centre. The space becomes a part of the experience of the work, we move away from a framed image on a wall into the creation of an entire work as a unified whole. With this the design of the space as an interface becomes important. We will now look at two works, one completed and the other still being designed as examples of how experiential design is used as an ethical tool to safely present the voice of the other. We will see how design becomes part of the creation process in order to put the viewer into relation with the other.

3 The Lisbon Project

In the summer of 2022, I was awarded an artist-in-residency from Carpentarias de São Lázaro a non-profit art centre in the Martim Muniz/Mouraria area of Lisbon Portugal. The brief of this residency was to create a work that related to the neighbourhood where the art centre was located. This area has a large immigrant community. It is made up of people from all over the world. Where most cities have specific ethnic enclaves, this area is home to a very mixed group of people. As you walk through the streets a Senegalese hair salon will be next door to a Nepalese restaurant and a Bangladeshi travel agent.

The nature of the work and its subject was determined after observing the area and talking to both members of the art centre and people in the community. From observing the physical area, I saw that there were many Roman Catholic religious tiles embedded into the facades of buildings. Seeing these objects as signifiers of an older Lisbon, one that was no longer relevant to the current situation, it raised the question of how does one assimilate into the culture this long-established culture? The first response was to make montages where the Catholic iconography was replaced with images and reliefs from South and Southeast Asia. From there the following research questions were established. How assimilated do immigrants and second-generation people feel in Lisbon? What is their relationship to their new culture and how much of the old culture do they feel they can retain? What are the daily examples of negative or positive reactions they get moving through the culture? Language was another important issue explored. All of this was aimed at seeing if migrants, rich or poor, felt that Lisbon was home for them. In order to accomplish the project, it had to be designed according to several principles. It was important that the work centre on people living and working in the area. That it be focused on their testimonials, centring on their life experiences. In order to do this a series of interviews with a variety of people were organised. The art centre and I reached out to a variety of people and organisations, including community groups, international student organisations and friends of friends. From this we were able to find fourteen people to interview. A series of questions were developed. These questions were determined from conversations with immigrants from former colonies and other countries. They also reflected personal experiences as foreigners living in a country that is not always comfortable with immigration. These questions were further refined through suggestions of the interviewees and after observing certain topics that recurred in conversation.

A series of interviews were arranged at the studio space in the art centre or in a few cases online. Our first interviewee spoke only Portuguese, and this changed the dynamic of the interview as I was not able to conduct it. It was still based on the set of questions established, but as the documentarian my input into the interview was limited. Beyond this I did not budget for a translator to transcribe the text for subtitles. One of the members of the art centre was kind enough to do this for me, but it did mean that we limited all our future interviews to English speakers. This constraint was less of a problem as most people were comfortable speaking in English and a few were more comfortable in English than Portuguese.

The questioning was done to try to find as wide a variety of experiences as possible. It was not planned with a specific outcome in mind. I tried to ask questions that could elicit responses of inclusion or exclusion, but I let the conversations take their own course. Subjects felt free to recount their experiences negative and positive. They did not have a problem with appearing on camera. Interviews were about fifteen to forty-five minutes in length. They were then cut up into clips ranging from half a minute to three minutes long. Approximately ten clips were used per interviewee.

The work was designed to be a multi-screen installation. The desire was to move away from the traditional documentary and make the encounter with the project and its testimonials express the idea of being in the presence of the other. In order to emphasise this, it was decided that the images needed to be presented as a series of clips randomly displayed on the three screens. The randomisation of the clips was to remove the editorial

control of the documentarian and allow the voices of the subjects interact with each other in a free fashion. Meaning was created by how various clips interact with each other, how they reinforced or contradicted each other. The interview clips were projected on a larger middle screen while clips of the area and the montages were shown on the side screens. Again, these images were randomly displayed. The screens were at varying heights and distances from the viewer (see Fig. 1). Images from each of the screens were creating and recreating context through this randomisation process. The visual hierarchy of traditional cinema was removed as much as possible. Viewers could walk around the space or just sit on benches provided. The sound was primarily from the interviews, but the sound of the other clips also played at a lower volume to help create a sense of ambience.



Fig. 1. View of installation at Carpentarias de São Lázaro

A major problem with the objective mode of documentary film is that subjects can feel betrayed by how they are portrayed in edited film. They feel that their actions are not given context and may appear very different from how they saw the situation. Even in a performative film like *The Fog of War*, the subject can feel manipulated by the editing. Those are choices and risks those filmmakers have made, but those forms also tend to thematize the subject, making them part of an argument made by the filmmaker. As stated earlier that was part of what I was trying to avoid in this project. The randomization of the clips allowed for the removal of a heavy-handed editorial voice and allowed the images and sound to stand on its own.

The final work was titled, *My Head is My only House Unless It Rains* and was show in August of 2022. The title came from a song by Captain Beefheart. In observing the audience and having conversations with viewers, I determined that the design of the work did communicate a feeling of presence with the subjects. The audience tended to stay with the work for about twenty to thirty minutes at a time. The reactions were positive in that they expressed having a feeling of intimacy with the work. Interestingly, subjects who saw the work felt that they were fairly represented by it. As a work that was designed to place the testimonial at its core the reactions of the audience and subjects indicated that it was successful.

Coming from this the next question was if this approach both in focus and design could be developed in future work. What elements in the work are adaptable and what parts of the format need to be changed as new works are developed. The work can be seen as the prototype for a method of installation-based documentary as well as a way of presenting works focused on bearing witness and the presence of the witness to an audience. As a methodological prototype we can look at the work in its form and structure. In the latter view we are seeing how installation-based non-fiction work can continue the traditions of the documentary and apply them to a new form. The work was an attempt to fuse the two issues together in a single work. As much as this piece was able to address these issues in a coherent work, the next step is to develop new projects along these theoretical and design standards. The subject matter of the new works does not have to be the same as the Lisbon project, nor do they have to be different. What does have to be taken into consideration is the relationship of the installation design to the subject matter, the audience's experience and how does it allow for the testimony of the subjects to be central to the work. Moving forward a new as of yet unnamed project has been proposed to develop these issues in relation to the situation of indigenous people migrating into urban areas in the state of Sarawak, Malaysia.

4 Sarawak Project

In 2023 the work *My Head is My only House Unless It Rains* was show at the University of Technology, Sarawak's (UTS) SBE Gallery. Here the physical form of the installation had to be adapted to the physical space and the technical considerations of the gallery. The side images were presented on large television monitors and the central images were on a single projection a pull-down screen. This allowed me to see certain degree of flexibility in installation and how much it changes the experience. A smaller space allowed for a more intimate relationship between the viewer and the work. With the images being closer to eye level. There was an excitement to seeing such a different way of presenting a documentary work. As part of this interest the research office of UTS asked me if I would be willing to collaborate with members of their faculty on a version of the work that spoke to issues found in Sarawak. This version of the work is intended to adapt the same general subject, that of assimilation, to the East Malaysian context.

Sarawak, located on the northern part of the island of Borneo is a state in Malaysia, but its ethnic make-up is distinct from the rest of the country, referred to as peninsula Malaysia. Where the peninsula has a Malay ethnic majority, East Malaysia, the states of Sarawak and Sabah, are made up of a variety of indigenous peoples such as the Dayak

and Iban. They have different customs and religious traditions. Peninsula Malaysia is religiously Muslim and culturally and historically tied to Indonesia, the Middle East and the Subcontinent. As a state Sarawak is separate from yet dominated by policies determined in Peninsula Malaysia. There is a tendency to try to bring a Malay ideology to life in East Malaysia. As indigenous people move from the countryside into urban areas, they are challenged with a need to assimilate. They find themselves living in situation that is different from traditional village structures, for example moving from more communal long houses into smaller single family-oriented apartments. They find that they have to speak Malay or English instead of their own languages. In these aspects their experience of integrating into urban Malaysian culture is one of assimilation. Even though they are citizens of the country their integration into the Greater Malaysian culture bears very similar hallmarks found with the immigrant.

We agreed that the project would be a collaboration between myself and Annie Jaid Parker, the program head for the BA in Interior Architecture at UTS. First, an overall design for the project had to be conceptualized. In Portugal the main issue regarding the movement of people is around immigrants coming into the country. Issues of diversity of populations and integration revolve around this. In Sarawak there is an issue of assimilating indigenous people into the larger Malay culture. Here the questions that arise from the movement of people into urban spaces are focused on how native people can or should be allowed to maintain their traditional culture while still being part of a developing Malaysia. Much like in Portugal there is a need to adapt to a new language as well as new social structures, but unlike the migrant in Portugal these people are still living in their native land.

In the Lisbon project almost, everyone was fluent in English well enough to be interviewed in it. Many of the South and Southeast Asian subjects were more comfortable in English than in Portuguese. In Malaysia although English is ubiquitous it is still not spoken by many indigenous people, or they are uncomfortable speaking in it. Because of this the planned interviews will have to be conducted in their languages. The research team includes native speakers of Dayak, Iban and other languages. In the final work we still want to hear the voices of the subjects in their native tongues as it communicates much of their testimony. In order for there to be a common language for the project all interviews will be translated into English and presented with English subtitles. English was chosen because it is a more neutral language choice. Given the politics of integration in Malaysia, Malay would be seen as a language representing the abandoning of the native culture. English also allows for the project to be exhibited internationally.

The images in the Lisbon work included random images of the neighborhood and montages shot by the artist/documentarian. These were created to be shown alongside the images of the interviewees. Because the number of language groups is larger, we are expecting to have more screens than the previous installation, the number of images required are greater than needed in the Lisbon version. In order to have more contextual images we will be asking the subjects to provide videos of their lives and situations. Of course, these images will have to be edited so as to provide anonymity to those involved. Images can be completely randomized, or they can be grouped by ethnic groups so that Iban images are only seen of the Iban screen and the same for the Dayak and other groups. This is a good example of how the choices of interface design help enhance the

narrative structure of the work while still putting the testimony of the subjects in the fore.

As in the Lisbon project, the images and testimonies will be displayed randomly on the various screens. This will allow the viewer to experience the work without feeling that there is an editorial control over the work. It will allow the viewer to feel a more direct relationship with the images and sound. The testimonials and the images will relate to each other in a tangential way. This means that meaning is found in the unfolding montage. As both the audio testimonials and the images are randomised each viewer will have a unique experience with the work. Installation will be designed to make the testimonials the main focus of the work while still allowing the images to have a strong effect on the narrative.

For the Lisbon project, the narrative was simpler in that I didn't divide the subjects into subgroups as this didn't seem necessary in the Portuguese context. People didn't feel that their speech could have negative effects on their situations. Therefore, it was easier to have the central screen show the subjects. The situation in Malaysia is different the government has been known to use the sedition act as a way to stop or silence critics, international or local. In 2020 AL Jazeera English broadcast an episode of the series *101 East* called *Locked Up in Malaysia's Lockdown*. The filmmakers were questioned by the police and threatened with the prosecution under the sedition act [12]. The filmmakers were eventually sent out of the country and cannot return. Again in 2021 the Freedom Film Festival showed and then posted an animated documentary online about a police beating of underage suspects. The festival directors and the filmmaker were brought in for questioning and again threatened with the sedition act [13]. As the subjects are all citizens of Malaysia there is no anticipated threat to them foreseen. Therefore, we are assuming that that subjects will be willing to appear on screen. If any foreign workers are interviewed, we will have to review how to design the work with off camera interview subjects.

In the Sarawak project a similar structure to the Lisbon work is planned, but since language issues are different in relation to the indigenous populations, we are planning to have different screens reserved for different language groups including a screen for Malay and English. Multiple screens with multiple speakers will change the focus of the work opening it up to a multi-tiered narrative. This will allow the work the various voices to appear more in conversation with each other as their faces will be on different screens at the same time. Depending on the space of the exhibited work is designed these faces could be next to each other or facing each other. It will change how the audience will experience the work as their focus will shift as the various screens change and new faces or images appear. The space can be designed so that the viewers have to physically move through it to encounter the different testimonies and images. This will bring forward conversational nature to the work. The testimonies and images will be randomized so as to emphasize the ideas of presence and our relationship with Otherness found within it. But for a more complex design like this will incorporate Isaac Julian's idea of the multiscreen montage [14] as a way to understand how the shifting attention of multiscreen installations can relate to a narrative structure. In his work the spatialization of a narrative is accomplished through this shifting of attention from screen to screen in order to create a single narrative. By contrast the work proposed here is focused on the relationship between the person

bearing witness and the person who this witnessing is addressed to. While it will still have an opened ended structure based on the principles described above in order to make a work that is understandable it is important to understand the lessons learned from Julian's approach.

An important aspect of this new design issue revolves around the presentation of the audio and as well as the subtitling. How is the sound played, does the work allow for multiple tracks to play? Do we allow the voices to play over each other or does only one sound file dominate? If there are multiple subtitles visible which one has its sound played? At the moment there are three solutions proposed. One is that each screen has its own ultra-directional speaker aimed at the area in front of the screen. This will allow multiple sound files to play, and the viewer will only hear the one that they are in range of. This will require the viewers to move through the space and interact with it physically. The drawback with this is that there will be no overall sound for the work. As people walk into the gallery it will appear to be a silent work until the viewer moves through the space. The other option is to program the sound files so that only one plays at a time. This would mean that only one subtitle file would appear in the installation at any given time, but as in the directional speaker option, all screens would still play random images. Thirdly the directional speakers could be used for the testimonies, but a general speaker could play the ambient sounds of the videos at a low volume to create a sense of ambience. How the sound will be presented and programmed will be determined in consultation with our sound designer after experimenting with the various options.

5 Conclusion

It was with the filmic documentary that direct experience and testimony was brought into non-fiction storytelling. With this form, viewers were put more directly in relation with events and the voice of the witness. Yet it still was tied to traditional narrative forms. We see this not only in the expository, but also in the objective and participatory modes of documentary. As new forms of documentary developed, we saw the presence of the witness take a stronger role in and some cases the director even becoming the witness. The relationship between subject and viewer found in the bearing of witness is an important part of the filmic documentary, but it remains supplemental to the voice of the director. The idea of presence is implied, but it is not a major aspect of the documentary film. As documentary moves into the installation space, the possibility of new ways of creating non-fiction works open up with the new medium. Within this medium the sense of presence found in the work comes more to the fore and with this bearing witness of a subject to the audience becomes more central.

In both works above, the attempt has been to create this feeling of presence between the subject giving testimony and the viewers of the work. They are designed to create a space where a relationship between the viewer and the other is brought to the fore and that our ethical relationship to the other is manifest. It is hoped that this type of work will bring understanding to the viewer in a way not possible through traditional documentaries.

References

1. Flusser, V.: *Towards a philosophy of photography*. Reaktion, London (2000)
2. Nichols, B.: *Representing reality: issues and concepts in documentary*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington (1991)
3. Bruzzi, S.: *New documentary*, 2nd edn. Routledge, London, New York (2006)
4. Huston, J.: Dastar Corp., Marathon Music & Video (Firm), Copyright Collection (Library of Congress). *Eyewitness to war. Color documentaries of WWII disc 3*. Distributed by Entertainment Distributing, Eugene, OR (2003)
5. Burns, K., Burn, R., Ward, G.C., McCullough, D.G., Plimpton, G., Robards, J., et al.: *The Civil War*. PBS Home Video; Distributed by Paramount Home Entertainment, Hollywood, Calif. (2011)
6. Hegedus, C., Pennebaker, D.A.: *The war room*. Criterion collection 602. The Criterion Collection, United States (2012)
7. Maysles, D., Maysles, A., Zwerin, C., Brennan, P., McDevitt, P., Baker, J., et al.: *Salesman*. Criterion collection 122. RSDL dual-layer ed.: Home Vision Entertainment, Chicago, Ill. (2001)
8. Moore, M., Beaver, C., Prusak, J., Rafferty, K., Schermer, B., Stanzler, W., et al.: *Roger & me*. Warner Home Video, Burbank, CA (2003)
9. Morris, E., Williams, M., Ahlberg, J.B., McNamara, R.S., Glass P., @Radical.media (Firm), et al.: *The fog of war eleven lessons from the life of Robert S. McNamara*. Columbia TriStar Home Entertainment, Culver City, Calif. (2004)
10. Lévinas, E.: *Entre nous : on thinking-of-the-other. European perspectives*. Columbia University Press, New York (1998)
11. Lanzmann, C., Chapius, D., Glasberg, J., Lubchansky, W., Postec, Z., Ruiz, A., et al. *Shoah*. Hollywood, CA: New Yorker Video 2003
12. Latiff, R.S., Joseph: *Al Jazeera staff grilled in Malaysia over report on migrant arrests*. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-malaysia-media-idUSKBN24B0BC> (2020). Accessed 25 Dec 2022 (2022)
13. Thomas, J.: *Cops raid Freedom Film Network's office, cartoonist's home*. <https://www.freemalaysiatoday.com/category/nation/2021/07/02/cops-raid-freedom-film-networks-office-cartoonists-home/> (2021). Accessed 25 Dec 2022
14. Julien, I.: *Theatrical Fields: Special Brunch and Screening with Isaac Julien and Mark Nash*, NTU CCA Singapore Digital Archive, Singapore (2014)