

REPRESENTATION, NEW DOCUMENTARY MOVEMENT:
“A BITE OF CHINA SEASON I”

by

Zhuofei Cheng

Copyright © Zhuofei Cheng 2016

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF EAST ASIAN STUDIES

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2016

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

The thesis titled *Representation, New Documentary Movement: "A Bite of China: Season I"* prepared by *Zhuofei Cheng* has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for a master's degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that an accurate acknowledgement of the source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Zhuofei Cheng

APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

Dr. Hai Ren
Associate Professor of East Asian Studies

Apr 20, 2016

Acknowledgement

The process of writing a M.A thesis always feels like an endless journey. Here, I owe large debts of gratitude to my major advisor, my parent and my dear friends. Dr. Ren has provided generous professional advices for writing and revising this thesis. My parents encouraged me to finish revision. My dear friends wished me the best.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	3
A List of Figures	5
Introduction	7
Chapter One: Theoretical Analyses --- A Theory of Representation and Affect	15
1.1 A Theory of Reality.....	15
1.2 A Theory of Representation.....	18
1.3 Brain Massumi's Idea.....	22
1.4 Baruch Spinoza's Idea.....	26
1.5 Conclusion.....	30
Chapter Two: The New Documentary Movement	32
2.1 Western Documentary Film History.....	32
2.2 Chinese Television Documentary History.....	34
2.3 The New Documentary Movement --- Background.....	39
2.4 Interview with Wu Wenguang (吴文光).....	42
2.5 Interview with Chen Xiaoqing (陈晓卿).....	46
2.6 Interview with Wang Zijun (王子军).....	48
2.7 Conclusion.....	50
Chapter Three: "A Bite of China" --- A Case Study	52
3.1 A Gift to Food.....	52
3.2 Episode Three --- "Transferred Inspiration" (转化的灵感).....	62
3.3 Conclusion.....	64
Conclusion	66
Endnotes	68
Bibliography	76

A List of Figures

Figure 1: The Statistic Data of The First Question.....54

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts to explore within what historical context and with what documented content, *A Bite of China: Season I*, a Chinese documentary television series that explores the history of food, eating and cooking garners widespread popularity. By theoretical analyses, Chapter 1 concludes the relationship between documentary and the “reality” is built upon representation and there is “something beyond reality” in documentary. Moreover, in documentary representation, affect helps the “reality” to transform into “documentary reality,” and affect is the key to understand “something beyond reality.” In order to analyze documentary in historical context, Chapter 2 reviews and analyzes western documentary film history, Chinese television documentary history and The New Documentary Movement in China. As conclusion shows, this movement changes Chinese documentary history and provides historical context for *A Bite of China*. In particular, it makes common Chinese people’ lives and general Chinese society become main documented content, which constitutes a non-governmental power discourse. Chapter 3 turn the case study of *A Bite of China*. As it concludes, historical context is the integration between governmental discourse and non-governmental discourse. As for documented content, the intertwined representation between the representation of Chinese gourmet food and affective resonance among director, documented people and spectators makes *A Bite of China* popular. This thesis advances “affect” as an approach to further understand “documentary reality” and provides a new viewpoint on how *A Bite of China* becomes a popular Chinese television documentary.

Introduction

The initial purpose of this thesis is to acquire more understanding of the nature of and motivation behind Chinese television documentary, in particular, *A Bite of China: Season I* (Shejian shang de Zhongguo: Diyiji 舌尖上的中国：第一季), by examining the connection between the documented content and historical context. My methods of research will be theoretical analysis and case study. I will begin with an overview of the relationship between documentary and “reality,” including an outline of theories of reality in documentary, and a call to explore the nature and source of “documentary reality.” Next I will recognize that the key distinguishing factor between “reality” and “documentary reality” is representation, and investigate whether this claim is fully justified. To understand the underlying motivations surrounding this complex subject, a thorough literature review of the debate surrounding “reality” and “documentary reality,” an introduction to “affect,” and an examination of the evidence traditionally used in support of “affect as a possible approach to understand ‘something beyond reality’ in the documentary form” is required. Specifically, I will focus my attention towards documented content e.g. representation, affect, and historical context e.g. the New Documentary Movement in China.

During the past two years, I have reviewed literature about how documentaries are developed. An extensive review of diverse literature led to the conclusion there are interesting differences in documentary form within different cultural settings. For example, the evolution of documentary in China is different from the evolution of documentary in the West. More specifically, the US and Europe, documentary was originally developed as film, mostly shown in theater. However, the documentary as a form was imported into China in 1958 and modified to be shown mostly on television. The first television documentary is “Heroic Xin Yang People” (Yingxiong de Xinyang renmin 英雄的信阳人民). It mainly shows Xin Yang people’s battle against drought in He Nan province.¹ These cultural differences are quite remarkable, and will be analyzed in more detail within this thesis. In particular, an analysis of the research literature revealed one intriguing theme.

There are very interesting discussions in the literature related to the reality shown in the documentary compared to the actual reality of what was documented. There don't seem to be cultural differences between Chinese and western perspectives related to documentary reality compared to actual reality. In fact, in both China and West, the documentary form represents a sampling of a complex real world, sometimes more completely sampled than others.

A number of researchers have explored the “reality” of documentary films and their earlier work led to the first focus of this thesis – do documentaries represent “reality” or do the very process and content of a documentary create a new reality that is one beyond the actual reality of the real world events being filmed. However, as the focus of this thesis evolved, previous “documentary critique” scholarship, for example, Zryd Michael, led to a more careful examination of the possibilities that documentaries could, in fact, be less real than the actual events portrayed. More specifically, Zryd spoke to this issue by noting that analyses of documentaries and their portrayed reality “seemed constantly to run aground on the critique of documentary as representation. As representation, documentary always falls short: it is neither comprehensive enough to be adequate to reality nor does it exist without ‘bias.’”ⁱⁱ Consequently, the research of this thesis examined the range of realities that any documentary might portray. In particular, several areas seemed promising routes of inquiry: (1) what bias does the documentarian introduce into the filming and interpretative framing of the documentary; (2) if viewers create their own interpretation of the documentary, then what is a viewer's sense of the reality of that portrayed; and (3) what might the interactions be among the actual real event filmed, the documentarian's creation or portrayal of those events, and a viewer's interpretation of the documentary.

A Bite of China is a Chinese documentary television series on the history of food, eating and cooking in China. The series was directed by Chen Xiaoqing (陈晓卿), narrated by Li Lihong (李立宏) and with original music composed by Roc Chen (阿鲲).ⁱⁱⁱ The theme is Chinese people's pursuit of gourmet food and a good life. Within seven episodes, it introduces Chinese

culture by telling behind the scenes stories of local cuisines in over 60 locations within mainland China, Hong Kong and Taiwan. After it was first aired on China Central Television (CCTV), it garnered widespread popularity. The first episode which was aired on May 14, 2012 gained audience rating as 0.012.^{iv} Afterwards, it increased to the highest point as 0.55.^v On *Douban.com* (Douban 豆瓣)^{vi}, it was rated as 9.3 of 1 to 10 point scale,^{vii} which was of the first rank.

Meanwhile, “A Bite of X” became a popular syntactical structure. It developed various versions, e.g. “A Bite of USA,” “A Bite of Germany,” and “A Bite of South Korea.”^{viii} These data encouraged me to explore why this Chinese television documentary was popular.

Here, I quote a short comment published on May 15, 2012, by a spectator “Bernina”, on *Douban.com* (Douban 豆瓣):

Though they only aired the first episode, I so recommend this documentary. When I saw the first episode, I knew it would be my top recommendation for Chinese documentary. It has the compassionate care. With a pristine spirit, those documented people cherish the nature wholeheartedly. They respect labor, nature, and tradition this kind of warmth is what majority of Chinese documentary, which are well known of presenting data, tricking words, and superfluous presentation of history, are simply lack. (Quanli tuijian zheyibu, suiran muqian zhi fangchu diyiji, keshi kanle diyiji wo jiu zhidao, yihou zai wo de zhongwenjilupian tuijian mingdan shang ta yiding zhanju shouwei. You renwen de guanhuai, yizhong zhipu de zhenxi taidu guanchuan qizhong , zunzhong laodong , zunzhong ziran, zunzhong chuantong Zhezhong wenqing shi jue daduoshu lieju shuju, bannong wenzi, xuanyao lishi de zhongguojilupian suo quefa de 全力推荐这一部，虽然目前只放出第一集，可是看了第一集我就知道，以后在我的中文纪录片推荐名单上它一定占据首位。有人文的关怀，一种质朴的珍惜态度贯穿其中，尊重劳动，尊重自然，尊重传统.....这种温情是绝大多数列举数据、搬弄文字、炫耀历史的中国纪录片所缺乏的。)

As this quotation reveals, even though Bernina only watched the first episode, he fell deeply in love with it. After perusing his comment, I became interested in one phrase he mentioned, “humanistic care” (renwen guanhuai 人文关怀). This concept originates from “Humanism” which emphasizes the value of human beings and humanity. ^{ix}In President Hu Jintao’s (胡锦涛) report to the Seventeenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China (CPC) on Oct. 15, 2007, he said: “We will strengthen and improve our ideological and political work, paying attention to compassionate care and psychological counseling and correctly handling interpersonal relations.” ^xThis statement signifies that CPC advocates and emphasizes the “compassionate care” of the Chinese people. In other words, Chinese people should find support to find personal value in everyday life.

Then, how do individuals find such value in everyday life? *A Bite of China* provides an answer. However, before I discuss this answer, I want to pose why does Bernina have such conviction to recommend this documentary? If we look again at Bernina’s comment, we note his use of: compassionate care, the pristine spirit the documented people have as the cherish nature, the respect these people have for labor, but also for nature and tradition. Consequently, Bernina was emotionally engaged with the people and so with the documentary. In other words, the people documented have affection for nature, and they express this affection by their daily cooking and having meals. But how did their affection influence Bernina?

In “Affect: What is it good for?” William Mazzarella noted: “From the standpoint of affect, society is inscribed on our nervous system and in our flesh before it appears in our consciousness.” ^{xi}Therefore, people who live in a society are an affective body. “The affective body is by no means a *tabula rasa*; it preserves the traces of past actions and encounters and brings them into the present as potentials.” ^{xii} So Bernina and the documented people are the affective body and they somehow share similar past life experiences through everyday life activities. For example, as a human being, eating is instinctive. Bernina is no exception. In Bernina’s past life, he might not cook, but he

definitely did eat. It is possible he watched his mother cooking. So Bernina had the past life experience of “food, eating and cooking in everyday life.” As an affective body, he preserved such memories, and thus Bernina brought his past life experience to present. When he saw the documented people farming, harvesting, cooking, and eating, he was affected. So, when Bernina watched the first episode, he could sense documented people’s relationship to nature as an affective body, and he was touched.

Based on the brief analysis, “affect” exists in both the spectator and documented people’s view point. Does it exist in director’s point of view? In an interview, Chen Xiaoqing claimed that despite former “gourmet food” documentaries, which mostly concentrate on “eating” with associated ritual, culture, and cooking technique, he and his team sought to make this documentary with respectfulness and affection to food.^{xiii} Evidently, affection to food raises Chen Xiaoqing’s desire to make a “gourmet food” documentary not only documenting activities of “eating, cooking, and food in everyday life,” but also displaying people’s psychological relationships toward “eating, cooking, and food in everyday life.” But how is Chen Xiaoqing’s affection with food embodied in this documentary? In brief, I will discuss this issue more completely in this thesis, the director, spectator, and documented people, “affect” is embodied through their involvement with a documentary.

Coincidentally, when I looked into western “documentary critique” scholarship, I realized that even though most scholars agreed that a documentary typically includes “something beyond reality,” and they argued possible causes, such as structure, genre, photograph techniques, point of view, and forms of narration, they did not mention “affect.” Therefore, “affect” is my focus for an original research point. In this thesis, not only am I going to argue that documentary is an artistic combination of “reality” and “something beyond reality,” but I also plan to uncover the process in which “affect” transfers “reality” into “something beyond reality.”

Besides, when I looked for reasons for *A Bite of China* being a successful new Chinese television documentary, The New Documentary Movement in China appeared to be an inevitable historical event. In the Preface of *Documenting China: The New Documentary Movement in Contemporary China* (Jilu Zhongguo: Dangdai Zhongguo Xinjilu Yundong 记录中国：当代中国新记录运动)^{xiv}, Professor Lü concluded:

The significance of The New Documentary Movement in contemporary China was in current Chinese social, political and economic framework, it conducted a down to top perspective, which manifested people's survival pursuits and ways of showing affection (toward people or objects) along with different stratum. Meanwhile, it replenished and regulated mainstream ideology, which made history be able to "open up wide" and "be roomy and bright."

Furthermore, it promised possibility for everyone being involved in history, which created history and showed social democracy. Beginning from 1980s and 1990s, Chinese society and people's transition made The New Documentary Movement and this event also resulted in further transition. On this point, The New Documentary Movement was unrepeatable and rare. (Xinjilu yundong duiyu dangjin Zhongguo de yiyi zaiyu: Ta jianli le yizhong zixiaershang de toushi guandao, zai dangjin Zhongguo shehui zhengzhi jingji geju xia, toushi chu butong jieceng renmen de shengcun suqiu jiqi qinggan fangshi; Ta shi dui zhuliu yishixingtai de buchong he jiaozheng, shi shi lishi deyi "changkai" he "huoliang", shi yunnuo meigeren douyou jinru lishi de kenengxing, shi chuangzao lishi, shi yige shehuiminzhu de tixian; Cong bashi niandai dao jiushi niandai yilai Zhongguo shehui de zhuanbian he ren de zhuanbian, xin jilupian yundong shi ta de tixian, yeshi ta de chanwu, zai zhege yiyi shang shuo ta shi bukechongfu, yeshi bukeduode de 新记录运动对于当今中国的意义在于：它建立了一种自下而上的透视管道，在当今中国社会政治经济格局下，透视出不同阶层人们的生存诉求及其情感方式；它是对主流意识形态的补充和校正，是使历史得以“敞开”和“豁亮”，是允诺每个人都有进入历史的可能性，是创造历史，是一个社会民主的

体现；从 80 年代到 90 年代以来中国社会的转变和人的转变，新纪录片运动是它的体现，也是它的产物，在这个意义上说它是不可重复的，也是不可多得的。)

As her conclusion indicates, The New Documentary Movement has threefold meanings. First, it allows people from different stratum to express their pursuits and affection. Second, it provides various perspectives to achieve a comprehensive historical context. Third, key word of this movement is transition. This movement changed what, why and how Chinese television documentary documents.

In summary, the following is the one research question that this thesis will address: Within what historical context and with what documented content, *A Bite of China* garnered widespread popularity?

The thesis has been organized into five parts. The rest of the introduction provides how I generate research question along with a brief analysis of one Chinese television documentary *A Bite of China* as the case study. Before the introduction closes with specific research question, I shall introduce the general argument structure of this thesis. In Chapter 1, the thesis focuses on four parts: (1) western documentary film history; (2) Chinese television documentary history; (3) a theory of representation within documentary as a form in general; and (4) the theories of affect. Chapter 2 examines the New Documentary Movement in China. I will focus on individual interviews with three directors, Wu Wenguang (吴文光), Chen Xiaoqing (陈晓卿), and Wang Zijun (王子军) to better analyze how new Chinese documentaries portray representation of the “reality” with affect and how this movement provides historical context for *A Bite of China*. Within chapter 3, I shall use *A Bite of China* as the case study to more completely analyze the theoretical analysis and historical context discussed in Chapter 1 and 2. The conclusion provides a discussion of (1) theoretical analysis: affect as a possible approach to understand “something beyond reality” in the documentary form; (2) historical context: New Documentary Movement as a historical

context for *A Bite of China*; and (3) case study: *A Bite of China* as a successful new documentary in China.

Chapter One: Theoretical Analyses --- A Theory of Representation and Affect

Chapter 1 examines the relationship between documentary and “reality” through representation. My approach is to review and analyze theories of documentary and of representation. In addition, Chapter 1 examines affect as a possible approach to understand “something beyond reality” in the documentary form. Moreover, I review and analyze two noted scholars’ ideas of affect, Brian Massumi and Baruch Spinoza to demonstrate the relation between affect and “something beyond reality” through representation. Finally, I produce the synthesis of these theoretical analyses.

1.1 A Theory of Reality

At the beginning, I probe more deeply into the theoretical frameworks of the documentary form. John Corner states that “ ‘Documentary’ is the loose and often highly contested label given, internationally, to certain kinds of film and television (and sometimes radio programmes) which reflect and report on the ‘the real’ through the use of the recorded images and sounds of actuality.”^{xv} So, since documentary film and television have an inherent obligation to reality and Corner puts quotation mark on ‘the real,’ my first research question examines the “reality” of documentaries.

Christopher Williams’s argument structure, in his book *Realism and the Cinema* (1980), informs my thinking about portraying reality. His first point is that documentaries provide an “account of things outside itself.”^{xvi} From Grierson to Alan Rosenthal, “such films normally obey rules of structure, of tempo and sometimes of dramatic form; their aim is almost invariably presented as being to tell ‘the truth,’ but it would, in fact, be more appropriate to say that they tell their truths within the framework of the particular set of languages available to them.”^{xvii} In other words, though such films try to present the things the way they are in the real world, they still show those

things through a biased “lens.” As long as such films are filmed, the process of filming, and the perspectives and intent of the director impose obstacles.

Williams’s second point concerns “the area of narrative.”^{xxviii} “Narrative itself is a story-telling tradition borrowed or adapted on some aspects by films from at least Homer.”^{xxix} Particularly in a documentary film, “there is a referent outside the film itself.”^{xxx} Furthermore, this referent is a combination of “the real world”, the director’s vision of how to record a real world object or event, and viewer’s ideas of the real world.^{xxxi} Therefore, “the articulation of the narrative, has to be based on a sense that they are only partially and variably mimetic, and that before being mimetic they are self-referential, which is to say that they refer back to themselves, or to their likes.”^{xxxii} In this sense, spectator’s understanding of a film is built on the film “making reference to the real world or to an idea of the real world.”^{xxxiii} In other words, as for documentary, reference to^{xxxiv} the real world is not only essential to documentary itself, but it is also equally important to viewer.

William’s third point focuses on “image.” “Naïve realists tend to demand that the ‘image’ should be adjusted so as to give a ‘correct’ picture of the conditions of life itself, transcending or escaping in one way or another the processes of the medium itself.”^{xxxv} However, the process of transcending or escaping is critically difficult because Williams argues: “the processes of the medium cannot be transcended.”^{xxxvi} Hence, films can never render “the real world.”

Moreover, Williams outlines a philosophical point on “reality.” “Reality” itself has two levels, “mere appearances” and “true reality.” “ ‘Mere appearances’ means the reality of things as we perceive them in daily life and experience, and ‘true reality’ means an essential truth, one which we cannot normally see or perceive, but which, in Hegel’s phrase, is ‘born of the mind’ .”^{xxxvii} So, documentary can only collect documents from “mere appearances.” In this sense, documentary is not able to document “reality.” Therefore, as for documentary, it is “only indirectly linked to the realities it is supposed to document.”^{xxxviii} Then, how does documentary indirectly link to the realities it is supposed to document? I argue the “representation” is the key.

In Richard Harvey Brown's paper "Realism and Power in Aesthetic Representation" (1995), he cites: "Representations are regarded as realistic when their socially orthodox practices of writing and reading or painting and viewing have become so familiar that they operate transparently."^{xxix} Therefore, in documentary, as spectator, when I see one image on screen, the image may cause me to think that image and what it indexes in real world have a certain equivalence. To abstract this process, when I see that image on screen, I think the realism of that image becomes a representation of what it indexes in real world and that reciprocally guides me to conceptualize that image.^{xxx}

Before I delve further into representation, I would like to discuss the aesthetic aspect in documentary. In *The art of record: A critical introduction to documentary* (1996), John Corner claims "documentary theory" is "a set of connected propositions and concepts concerning the socio-aesthetic nature of documentary practice."^{xxxi} No matter in West and China, documentary has been used as an instrument of propaganda^{xxxii}, which indicates it can have a social nature. Then, how about aesthetic nature? Is the social nature more important or even independent from an aesthetic nature? According to Brown, in 1990s, "the de-essentialization or de-ontologization of the Beautiful (as well as the Good and the True)" seemingly destroyed the possibility "to establish consistent relations between aesthetics, politics, and reality."^{xxxiii} However, at the same time, "the derealization of canons of beauty allows scholars to view them as social and historical constructions and to think about how 'reality' is crafted in art, not only aesthetically but also politically."^{xxxiv} Though there are two types of representation, social representation and aesthetic representation in accord with social-aesthetic nature, I shall focus on aesthetic representation to demonstrate the aesthetic aspect in documentary.

First, in aesthetic representation, "the 'realism' of any representation cannot be determined solely on the basis of the reality of its objects or contents."^{xxxv} In other words, documentary representation does not only represent "the reality," but the representation itself is also shaped by a particular aesthetic paradigm. So, what is this aesthetic paradigm? As an example considers that

when a documentary director decides to produce a documentary, he/she will “confront certain choices that are inherent in the act of aesthetic making.”^{xxxvi} For example, choices of camera equipment and filmstock, shooting methodology, lighting and sound recording methods, artwork and animation, editing, sound track, and processing film. “Out such stylistic choice under which those above may be subsumed is that of genre.”^{xxxvii} So, aesthetic paradigm here is related to genre. In other words, “documentary,” the notion itself is the aesthetic paradigm in documentary, and it is also the act of aesthetic making.

So, in this section, first, documentary has an obligation to “reality” but it cannot document “reality” since “reality” itself is a complex conception and the process of making a “documentary” is also an obstacle to documenting the “reality.” However, documentary is still inseparable from “reality” and representation is the connection between documentary and reality. Hence, the next section’s focus is representation.

1.2 A Theory of Representation

Since representation is how a documentary portrays the “reality” through representation as a process, my concern in this section is how to define representation or its alternative. First of all, I will still focus on western “documentary critique” scholarship. Second, based on my research, I shall examine four major modes of representation.^{xxxviii}

Nichols argues, “Modes of representation are basic ways of organizing texts in relation to certain recurrent features or conventions.”^{xxxix} Basically, modes of representation are important because they show how “documentary” itself acts as the aesthetic paradigm and the act of aesthetic making and how “documentary” filming itself becomes an obstacle to documenting “reality.” In *Representing Reality: Issues and Concepts in Documentary* (1991), Bill Nichols described four major modes of representation. The first one is expository, for example, the commenter plays the

role of God and uses an omniscient voice to narrate. The second mode is observational, in which the director's presence is hardly visible to the spectator. The third mode is interaction, driven by scene in which "the filmmaker and social actors acknowledge one another overtly in conversation, participatory actions, or interviews."^{xl} The fourth mode is reflective, in which the spectator mainly concentrates on the form of the filmmaking work itself. So, no matter which of these modes are applied in documentary film, cinematic choices embedded that are obstacles to documenting a complete "reality." When such cinematic choices are embedded in representation, "documentary" itself acts as the aesthetic paradigm and the act of aesthetic representation result in a documentary that can never document the complete "reality."

However, in Nichols' words, "the four modes belong to a dialectic in which new forms arise from the limitations and constraints of previous forms and in which the credibility of the impression of documentary reality changes historically."^{xli} Nichols admits that documentary film documents are not the "reality" of real world. However, new modes can "convey a fresh, new perspective on reality."^{xlii} He argues that "documentary reality" is different from the "reality" documentary film documents from the real world. It is a new kind of reality that he terms "documentary reality." Moreover, "documentary reality" is produced by representation. However, "documentary reality" can become more like the "reality" in real world since each mode provides new perspective of "reality."

However, spectator is the one who perceives "documentary reality." "Reality" is a spectator's sense of what is portrayed in documentary film. In brief, Nichols ideas lead to the conclusion that the spectators create their own interpretation of the documentary film and "documentary reality" is the spectators' senses of the reality portrayed, even if that "reality" of what has been portrayed is not the "reality" of real world.

However, as I stated at the beginning, representation is a process, and "documentary reality" includes a complex interaction among the spectators, the director, and documented contents.

Generally, according to W. Hugh Baddeley (1970), from the director's point of view, documentary film production includes preparation, shooting, editing, and distribution.^{xliii} As for the phases related to representation, I will focus on preparation, shooting and editing. Additionally, related to representation, within documentary film there are narrative structure, image, genre, sound recordings, and photography technique. All of these elements can shape the representation.

In preparation phase, there are two parts, preparation of the script and documentary planning. According to Baddeley, "The script is the blueprint from which a film is made."^{xliv} Since shooting a documentary is an attempt to capture the "reality" in the real world, and because the real world is filled with unexpected incidents, the script cannot be precise. A script "must allow the director and cameraman considerable latitude to deal with the unpredictable and the uncontrollable."^{xlv} As for shooting and editing, Baddeley said: "Shooting, for instance, is so tightly bound up with editing that the two stages cannot be discussed separately."^{xlvi} So, I will discuss them together. First, in shooting, a director arranges the shots, but in doing so, he cannot document the "reality" of the real world in a completely natural way. In other words, director may ask cameraman to "select his own angles, decide when to shoot and when to cut, be responsible for securing material that can be put together on the editing bench in a smooth-flowing way."^{xlvii} Also, in editing, the director may ask an editor to edit the "work-print" as the editor prefers. Therefore, as a director, producing a documentary film, the representation of the "reality" in real world is shaped by preparation of the script, shooting and editing. And, "documentary reality" is the results from the implementation of these activities. As for narrative structure, image, genre, sounds, and photography technique, these elements also shape the representation.

Therefore, based on the earlier analysis in this chapter, I can show the process explicitly that the "reality" is shaped and transformed into "documentary reality" through representation. The process is performed through interactions among the "reality," the director's creation or portrayal of the "reality," and spectators' interpretation of the documentary film. Starting from "reality" to

“documented reality,” documentary film uses four major modes to represent the “reality” in real world. In the meantime, in this documentary representation process, between director and “documentary reality,” director uses narrative structure, image, genre, sound, and photograph technique within three phases e.g. preparation, shooting and editing to shape the representation. So, from spectators’ point of view, this representation presents a new kind of reality, “documentary reality” as the result. It is different from the “reality” in the real world and it confirms the conclusion from earlier “documentary critique” scholarship that a documentary includes “something beyond the reality.”

In summary, firstly, documentary itself is associated with the “reality” of the real world. Moreover, the relationship between documentary and the “reality” is built upon representation. However, the “reality” in real world is complex. Furthermore, “documentary” is also shaped by aesthetic paradigms. Consequently, a documentary cannot document the complete “reality” of the real world. However, as for spectator, though a documentary cannot document the “reality” of the real world, it can create a new kind of reality, “documentary reality.” In addition, from the director’s point of view, a documentary’s representation of the “reality” in real world is also shaped by three phases of documentary production. In conclusion, through representation, documentary cannot document the “reality” of real world and it produces “documentary reality.” Rather, there is “something beyond reality” in documentary.

Though there is “something beyond reality” in documentary, but what that “something beyond” may be? After I review relevant literature, I realize Nichols ignores a possibility that director does not only use three phases of production to influence the documentary’s representation, but also imposes individualized perspective and perception in the representation. As for documented contents and spectator, they may resonate with what director’s perspective and perception bring about. Therefore, there is a necessity to explore the nature and source of director’s perspective and perception since it may behave as an approach to “something beyond reality” in documentary.

1.3 Brain Massumi's Idea

In *Parables of The Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (2002), Brian Massumi writes: “There seems to be a growing feeling within media, literary, and art theory that affect is central to an understanding of our information- and image based late capitalist culture, in which so called master narratives are perceived to have foundered.”^{xlvi} In the case of documentary, image is a crucial component. Within image, *content* is the central element. What content indexes can be an object extracted from any conventional context, but when this object appears in an image, it needed to be understood in an inter-subjective context, or in its “sociolinguistic qualification.”^{xlvi} Plus, “the strength or duration of the image’s effect could be called its *intensity*.”^l In such argument, content has two levels, in which one is objective-narrative and another is emotional. And “the qualifications of emotional content enhanced the images’ effect, as if they resonated with the level of intensity rather than interfering with it.”^{li} So in this process, “intensity will be equated with affect.”^{lii} In other words, the event of spectator’s reception of the image is a crucial participation in affect development.

Theoretically, among the image, the content of the image and the spectators, there are four interactive processes and they influence “the strength or duration of the image’s effect.”^{liii} Within the image, there is image content and spectators reacts to them separately. At first, spectators see an image and so image has an effect on spectators. These two interactive processes constitute a complete course. Meanwhile, when spectators see an image, they are also connected to the content of that image. So the interaction between the content of the image and the spectators will influence that image’s effect.

Practically, when the spectators see an image on screen, they will think about the content of that image and what that content means, additionally what the image represents compared to what it indexes in “reality,” or even they will relate their thoughts of that image with their own life

experiences. So, it is in accord with the image making an effect on spectators. However, this process is initiated by the content of the image, which indicates it stimulates spectators to start reacting, but in the initial phase, the image may not be completely understood. If spectators want to understand the content of the image, they have to understand it in “an inter-subjective context.”^{liv} In other words, they cannot view the content as an isolated object, which is extracted from a conventional context. In fact, they have to connect the content to other contents of other images, and connect what the content indexes in “reality” to other objects in “reality” to understand the content of that image. This is how spectators react to content of the image.

Now, I am going to discuss the image’s effect again. Normally, this effect has a strength or duration. So, what factors can influence this strength or duration? The answer is the interaction between content of the image and the spectators’ psychological processing. In other words, when a spectator is thinking and gradually understanding the content of an image, that individual is also interpreting the strength or duration of that image’s effect. In fact, when that individual is psychologically processing the content of an image, that individual is simultaneously feeling something emotionally. And such emotional feelings will enhance the image’s effect eventually. For instance, if a spectator feels “like” towards one image, and another one feels “ecstatic” towards another image, evidently, the latter image’s effect is stronger and longer than the former one. And the image may also have degrees of negative impact on the viewers. Therefore, the reason the strength or duration of an image’s effect is not logically connected to the content in any straightforward way^{lv} is the content itself does not directly influence the image’s effect. It has to be received and analyzed by the spectators at first (i.e., psychologically processed) and then the interaction between the content of the image and the spectators can influence the image’s effect’s strength or duration.

Then, Massumi defines the image’s effect’s strength or duration is intensity, additionally, intensity can be equated with what Massumi called “affect.”^{lvi} Affect is a result of psychological

process. This process is not a physical concept or manifestation. Rather, it refers to a psychological measurement of a process's effect. And specifically, degree (strong or weak) and lasting time (long or short) are the two psychological measurements. Within psychological process, the spectators' reception of the image is a crucial participation. However, the spectators receive the image and the content of the image, and so I must consider the significance of both.

In the case of documentary, firstly, director produces the image and image is an important component of documentary representation. An image includes the content, since director creates it, the image also contains director's perception and perspective. So the image cannot completely represent the "reality." Secondly, theoretically, the content of the image is equivalent to documented contents. Hence, when the spectators see an image in a documentary, they both receive documented content's sociolinguistic qualification^{lvii} and the director's perception and perspective. These elements will influence the interactions among the spectators, the image and the content of the image. Eventually, these elements will influence "affect."

Between documented contents and spectators, firstly, the director's perception and perspective influence documentary representation, and in this argument, representation is shown in image. Secondly, the spectators receive and psychologically process the image's effect and perceive the strength or duration of it. The result of this psychological process is "affect." Therefore, the interaction between director and spectators is not direct. The image, as a factor shaping the documentary representation is the bridge. Additionally, spectators also sense the director's impact on representation and include this sensation within "affect."

Building on above analyses, the interactions among director, documented contents and spectators are reversible. What Massumi called "affect"^{lviii} is the key to understand these interactions. As for the interaction between director and documented contents, the resonance between director's perception and perspective and documented content's sociolinguistic qualification^{lix} is the key. However, the reason this resonance exists is both are "affective body."^{lx}

William Mazzarella states: “The affective body is by no means a *tabula rasa*; it preserves the traces of past actions and encounters and brings them into the present as potential.”^{lxi} On the one hand, when a director chooses what contents to document, his selection is restricted by his perspective and perception. His perspective and perception preserve his past actions and encounters. On the other hand, because the chosen documented contents have sociolinguistic qualification^{lxii}, they can also function as “affective body.”^{lxiii} As for documented people, their sociolinguistic qualification^{lxiv} are shown in its past actions and encounters associated with society. Therefore, because their past actions and encounters associated with society are preserved, documented people can function as “affective body.”^{lxv} As for documented object, its’ sociolinguistic qualification^{lxvi} is normally shown in its context. Therefore, because past contexts are also preserved, documented object can function as “affective body.”^{lxvii} Hence, the interaction between director and documented contents is reversible because both are “affective body.”^{lxviii}

However, since affect is a result of psychological process, does affect equate with emotion? In *We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism And Postmodern Culture* (1992), Lawrence Grossberg defines affect quantitatively as the strength of an investment and qualitatively as the nature of a concern.^{lxix} In other words, affect has no structure and form, but it is analyzed in effect. However, In Massumi’s words, “affect is most often used loosely as a synonym for emotion.”^{lxx} But in his argument, (here affect is intensity), emotion and affect are not synonymous. He writes as “Emotion is qualified intensity, the conventional, consensual point of insertion into semantically and semiotically formed progressions, into narrativizable action-reaction circuits, into function and meaning.”^{lxxi} Emotion is owned and recognized by intensity.^{lxxii} Even affect is not equated with emotion, but it is always inseparable from emotion. Hence, spectators’ emotional feelings shape “the strength or duration of the images’ effect,”^{lxxiii} i.e. “affect.” Since emotion is inseparable from body, the next question is what is the relation between affect and body?

1.4 Baruch Spinoza's Idea

First of all, Massumi summarizes Baruch Spinoza's idea of affect and writes, "one of his basic definitions of affect is an 'affection [in other words an impingement upon] the body, *and at the same time the idea of the affection* (emphasis added)."^{lxxiv} Based on this definition, there is an impingement upon the body and the idea of the affection. When there is an impingement upon the body, he then describes the body as "being in state of passional suspension in which it exists more outside of itself, more in the abstracted action of the impinging thing and the abstracted context of that action, than within itself."^{lxxv} If there is an outside impingement upon the body, the action of that impinging thing will be abstracted and so is the context of that action, then the body will exist in such an outside of itself, rather the inside of itself.

In a documentary, the director will select and portray the documented contents. His perspective and perception will shape this process. By applying above theory, his perspective and perception are the impingement. When this impingement is upon the documented contents, they also become "affective body,"^{lxxvi} the documented contents will exist more outside of themselves, more in the abstracted action of the impinging perspective and perception and the abstracted context of that action.^{lxxvii} When the director's perspective and perception impinge on the documented contents, the latter one will absorb the director's perspective and perception and change. However, since the documented contents are portrayed in a documentary, presented mainly in image, only recognize the spectators how it absorbs the director's perspective and perception. For example, in my earlier analysis, when a spectator looks at specific documented content in an image, that individual will start to think what that documented content means related to what it indexes in the "reality." That individual will also feel something simultaneously emotionally. In addition, that individual may relate personal life experience to think and understand that documented contents. Within these three processes, that individual gradually recognize how the portray of that documented content absorbs

the director's perspective and perception. Hence, standing on this point of view, the "reality" is transforming into "documentary reality."

The interaction is reversible. The documented contents are also "affect body."^{lxxviii} Their sociolinguistic qualification^{lxxix} also influence the director's perspective and perception. When the sociolinguistic qualification^{lxxx} encounters the director's perspective and perception, they interact with each other. However, the result of this interaction will change how documented contents' sociolinguistic qualification is portrayed in the image. When spectators see that image, they will compare the portray of that sociolinguistic qualification compared to how they are shown in the "reality." Therefore, the interaction between director and documented contents will create "something beyond reality" in documentary (film or television). In this argument, specifically, I have to consider the director and the documented contents as "affect body."^{lxxx} In the second subsection, I have discussed that the director can use three phases of documentary production and other techniques to shape the documentary representation. But in this argument, the director also uses perspective and perception to shape the documentary representation. However, the interaction between director and documented contents is not the exclusive way for director to impose it. I will discuss the interaction between the director and the viewers as following

As the above analyses show, the director's perspective and perception will influence the documentary representation. Hence, the documentary representation will interpret and integrate them. However, the documentary representation is the midpoint within this interaction. The second half is between this representation and the spectators. They will receive and react to it. While they are accepting this representation, they will consciously or unconsciously use their own perceptions and perspectives related to their personal lives to shape the process of their reception. At the same time, they are also portraying their own representations of the documentary representation including the director's perspective and perception. In other words, when the documentary representation, which has included the director's perspective and perception, impinges on the

spectators, meanwhile, spectators provide their own interpretations of this documentary representation restricted by their perspectives and perceptions. And these interpretations will help the spectators to realize there is an impingement, the documentary representation, which absorbs the director's perspective and perception, upon them.

Within spectators' representations, they will not only compare the documentary representation with what it indexes in the "reality," but their perspectives and perceptions will also resonate with the directors'. This resonance is a part of the process in which the spectators influence the director.

I now discuss the interactions between spectators and documented contents. As the earlier analyses show, the documented contents, as "affective body,"^{lxxxiii} have their sociolinguistic qualification.^{lxxxiii} When spectators perceive documented contents, their perspectives and perceptions will resonate with them. Therefore, as for the director, the spectators, and the documented contents, each can be affection and each can also be affect body.

Within the six interactions among these three roles, each interaction is "*the idea of an affection*" (emphasis added).^{lxxxiv} Therefore, the context and content of all interactions are which Spinoza defined "affect."^{lxxxv} Hence, Spinoza's idea of affect is also a key to deepen the understanding of the documentary representation of the "reality."

In addition, as for the idea of the affection, when it is "doubled by an *idea of the idea of the affection* that it attains the level of conscious reflection."^{lxxxvi} So the idea of affection is recursive, which means it was consciously reflected. The interactions among the three roles are in motion, which increases the level of each role's conscious reflection. For example, in the interaction between director and documented contents, the reversible interactions are in motion and so both roles can influence the documentary representation of the "reality." Thus and thus, the six interactions move recursively to influence the documentary representation of the "reality" and create "something beyond reality" in "documentary reality."

In addition, such process removes the impingement in two orders. One is with the body and the other is with the mind. The first one is “a first-order idea produced spontaneously by the body: the affection is immediately, spontaneously doubled by the repeatable trace of an encounter, the ‘form’ of an encounter.”^{lxxxvii} In other words, the body’s reaction to the encounter with that impingement is immediately and spontaneously. For example, within the interaction between spectators and documented contents, spectators encounter latter one and sense the impingement from it. Such reaction is along with the first order.

And “the trace determines a tendency, the potential, if not yet the appetite, for the autonomic repetition and variation of the impingement.”^{lxxxviii} The body’s reaction leads to a tendency, which is provided for further repetitive and variable reaction toward the impingement. For example, within the interaction between spectators and director, after spectators react to documentary representation of the “reality,” which includes the director’s perspectives and perception, the spectators’ perspectives and perceptions also shape their own interpretations of that representation. Their perspectives and perceptions are not only related to their personal lives. These perceptions and perspectives are also resulted from their former reactions. So spectators’ former reaction provides a reference for their further reactions.

From the last paragraph, the abstracted action of that impingement and the abstracted context of that action are consciously reflected. And “the order of connection of such dynamic abstractions among themselves, on a level specific to them, is called mind.”^{lxxxix} Then the tendency comes from body’s reaction will become a mind activity. Hence, “mind and body are seen as two levels recapitulating the same image/expression event in different but parallel ways, ascending by degrees from the concrete to the incorporeal, holding to the same absent center of a now spectral – and potentialized – encounter.”^{xc} In other words, mind and body, as two different orders of connection, produce a receptivity: affect. Therefore, affect is also a key to understand the process of reception.

1.5 Conclusion

In chapter 1, I have argued documentary itself became associated with the “reality” of the real world. Moreover, the relationship between documentary and the “reality” is built upon representation. However, the “reality” in real world is complex. Furthermore, “documentary” also is shaped by aesthetic paradigms. Consequently, a documentary cannot document the complete “reality” of the real world. However, as for a spectator, though a documentary cannot document the “reality” of the real world, a documentary can create a new kind of reality, “documentary reality.” In addition, from the director’s point of view, a documentary’s representation of the “reality” in real world is also shaped by three phases of documentary production. In conclusion, through representation, documentary film cannot document the “reality” of real world and it produces “documentary reality.” Rather, there is “something beyond reality” in documentary.

Pursuing an approach to “something beyond reality,” I have argued two interpretations of the idea of affect and their relations with documentary representation of the “reality.” Firstly, I have examined Brian Massumi’s idea. Based on his argument, I understood affect as a result of psychological process. It referred to a psychological measurement of a process’s effect. Then, I turn to argue the relation between affect and emotion. I realized affect also relates to the concept of body. Hence, I have examined Baruch Spinoza’s idea. Based on his argument, I understood affect as a key to interpret the process of reception. Unlike Massumi, Spinoza tended to portray affect as a combination of the impingement and the context of that impingement. I interpreted this idea in the event of documentary representation of the “reality.” Additionally, William Mazzarella promoted an idea of “affective body.”^{xc1} Because the director and the documented contents are “affective body,”^{xc2} affect becomes a key to connect three important roles in documentary representation of the “reality,” the director, the documented contents, and the spectators. After detailed analyses, I concluded that Spinoza’s idea of affect is a key to deepen the understanding of the documentary

representation of the “reality.” Furthermore, in documentary representation, affect helps the “reality” to transform into “documentary reality,” and affect is the key to understand “something beyond reality.”

So far, chapter 1 have provided two theoretical analyses. I intended to explore the New Documentary Movement in China as historical context for further discussion in chapter 2.

Chapter Two: The New Documentary Movement

Chapter 2 examines the historical characteristics of The New Documentary Movement since 1980s. My approach is to review and analyze western documentary film history and Chinese television documentary history. Then, I turn background knowledge of The New Documentary Movement and next three interviews with three directors, Wu Wenguang (吴文光), Chen Xiaoqing (陈晓卿), and Wang Zijun (王子军). Finally, I produce the synthesis of ideas related to The New Documentary Movement's impact on *A Bite of China*.

2.1 Western Documentary Film History

Lewis Jacobs wrote: "The documentary film came to be identifiable as a special kind of picture with a clear social purpose, dealing with real people and real events, as opposed to staged scenes of imaginary characters and fictional stories of the studio-made picture."^{xciii} In 1984, the World Union of Documentary defined documentary film as

... all methods of recording on celluloid any aspect of reality interpreted either by factual shooting or by sincere and justifiable reconstruction, so as to appeal either to reason or emotion, for the purpose of stimulating the desire for, and the widening of human knowledge and understanding, and of truthfully problems and their solutions in the spheres of economics, culture, and human relations.^{xciv}

Other filmmakers added additional facets to the definition of documentary film. An American filmmaker defined documentary as "a film in which *the elements of dramatic conflict represent social or political forces rather than individual ones*."^{xcv} Therefore, this context suggests documentaries can have an epic quality. Also, documentaries cannot be a re-enactment. The social

documentary deals with real people and real situations - with reality.^{»xcvi} However, there is another definition, given by Philip Dunne, an American filmmaker and producer:

By its very nature the documentary is experimental and inventive. Contrary to the general impression it may even employ actors. It may deal in fantasy or fact. It may or may not possess a plot. But most documentaries have one thing in common: each springs from a definite need, each is conceived as an idea-weapon to strike a blow for whatever cause the originator has in mind. In the broadest sense, the documentary is almost always, therefore, an instrument of propaganda.^{xcvii}

The above definitions hint that the “documentary approach was basically propagandist rather than aesthetic”^{»xcviii} However, an aesthetic aspect is indispensable, which I will discuss in following paragraphs. According to Lewis Jacobs, “the earliest hint of the character of documentary was evident in the very first motion pictures projected on a screen”^{»xcix} which “could perceive and represent reality.”^{»c} In such films, “reality was not treated as background, but was the very subject.”^{»ci} In later years, “the documentary idea caught on so strongly... and soon it was being utilized prominently for humanistic and artistic expression... as it achieved greater *social vitality* and *aesthetic sensibility*, it became an essential element of the film tradition.”^{»cii} During 1930s, with the Great Depression, and continuing through the World War II, documentary film was used as “a means of political persuasion, and by the time the decade came to a close it had been developed into a major medium of propaganda.”^{»ciii} However, in the same period, there was a challenging film, *The City* (1939) expressing “the need to formulate a design for living in an environment grown more and more destructive of humanity.”^{»civ} This documentary explored representations of the realities of contemporary city life. In the 1950s, an emerging “creativity, intellectual conviction, and zest for individualism.”^{»cv} combined with “a reawakened critical attitude toward modern life.”^{»cvi} with the result that a dominant vitality was added into documentary film.

Later, as the television documentary evolved, there was “a wide spectrum of compelling topics and themes.”^{cvi} A dominant trend became *cinéma-vérité*: “aimed at establishing dramatic continuity, without plot or storyline, by recording the ‘reality’ inherent in human personality and human relationships.”^{cvi} Interestingly, researchers argued that: “The power of *cinéma-vérité* is to seize the immediate, the extemporaneous, the unexpected, and, with these unstructured elements, to build dramatic impact.”^{cix} However, many researchers felt there was a shortcoming namely documentaries failed in the sense that: “the effort to maintain a rising dramatic interest from insistently literal and mundane actions, without the ability to probe the nuances of these actions, diminished the final result.”^{cx}

Hence, in western documentary film history, documentary film initially focuses on social significance and is associated with “reality.” But in the middle of documentary form development, I begin to find emphasis on humanistic responsibility. Later, the theme, photography technique, and narrative structure of documentary film develop significantly. So, all these characteristics build documentary as a form. The television model of the West is imported to China in the late 1950s.

2.2 Chinese Television Documentary History

So, in earlier pages, I can see next of the history of documentary film in the West. Then, what is the relation between western documentary evolution and Chinese television documentary history? According to Liang Ying and Ouyang Hongsheng^{cx}, Chinese current television documentary form is imported from West and altered. According to He Suli^{cxii}, there are four phases in Chinese television documentary history. From 1958 to 2008, the four phase are: 1) political documentary phase; roughly from 1958 -1977; 2) humanistic documentary phase: from 1978 – 1992; 3) plebian documentary phase: from 1993 – 1998; and 4) socialized documentary phase: during the period 1999 – 2008.

According to He^{cxiii}, within this fifty years, the main transformation of Chinese television documentary is movement from a political propaganda tool, towards a socialized media examining social relations (including politics) dominated by the market for television. Undoubtedly, Chinese television documentary has always loyally documented the social development of China. In other words, its relation with Chinese society is compact. Such relation has changed along with social development in different periods. Generally, when the social environment is highly complex and unusual, its relation with Chinese society is more compact. From 1958 to 1977, and owing to sensitive political circumstances, Chinese television documentary had a strong attachment to politics. Initially there was no independent documentary form, so the Chinese documentary model copied the form of other television shows. For example, in the first and second phases (1958 – 1992), though the relation between Chinese television documentary and Chinese society is single, it is extraordinarily compact. The narrative structure, genre, image, sounds, and photography techniques, which came from this history period, have significant uniqueness. Furthermore, since Chinese television documentary was a political propaganda tool, the relation between documentary form and Chinese society was hierarchical. Chinese society dominates the Chinese television documentary.

However, in the third phase (1993 – 1998), Chinese society's political influence of TV weakens, and the relation between Chinese television documentary and documentary itself shifts. In this period, the Chinese television documentary focuses on the relationships among Chinese people who live in the Chinese society. In other words, from 1993 to 1998, Chinese society no longer dominates the Chinese television documentary. Rather, a focus on relationships begins to dominate. In Chinese television documentary, the main goal was to document the “reality” of documented objects.

Then, in the last phase (1999-2008), the relation among Chinese television documentary, Chinese society and Chinese market shifts the development of Chinese television documentary. In

this period, Chinese people are still the main documented contents, but the preference is a focus on highly socialized people. In other words, unlike the third phase, the last period of Chinese television documentary does not only document people, but emphasizes the social environment related to documented people. Importantly, since the Chinese market is a crucial facet of the social milieu, commercialized influences on Chinese television documentary has a profound impact. For instance, the process of making a documentary became enmeshed in a paradigm shift that focused on preparation, production, but also distribution and sales. More importantly, this shift revitalizes the Chinese television documentary.

Therefore, in the West, especially in United States, documentary film is born as an instrument of propaganda. So, documentary film carried strong social responsibilities. When the documentary form was imported into China around 1958, the propaganda model dominated. However, the documentary form evolved through distinct phase through fifty years. For example, in the first two phases, because Chinese social environment is highly complex and unusual, the Chinese television documentary focuses on social environment entirely. But there were minor differences between the first phase and second phase. For instance, in the second phase, even though television documentary was still used to propagandize Chinese national spirit, the documentary form moved away from heroic characters, forwards collective humanistic symbols extracted from real Chinese people. In the meantime, documentaries also portrayed Chinese geography, great mountains, and historically important sites, such as the Yellow River, the Yangzi River, and the Great Wall. There all symbolized Chinese national spirit. Through these changes, it is obvious that Chinese television documentary in the second period starts to shift towards socialized media instead of a total political propaganda tool. Even though it still carries strong social responsibility, the documentary focused increasingly on the Chinese people and the interaction between Chinese people and Chinese society. However, second phase's outcome is magnificent. For example, "Silk Road" (《丝绸之路》), "Yangzi River" (《长江》), "Yellow River" (《黄河》), "Great Wall of China"

(《万里长城》) are great television documentaries which document Chinese great mountains and rivers and still successfully propagandize Chinese national spirit.

In the third phase, Chinese television documentary starts to focus on humanistic responsibility. The main object is Chinese people, but unlike the fourth phase, the documented Chinese people are less socialized. In other words, such humanistic responsibility is portrayed with academic purpose. This period's television documentary documents various Chinese people's lives in different social environments (usually marginal areas), but only focuses on various people. In other words, these television documentaries are similar to ethnographic films. Furthermore, the television documentaries in the third phase not only document various Chinese people's lives, more importantly each television documentary is a form of cultural encoding. (Banks, 127) For example, "The Last Mountain God" (《最后的山神》) describes the last Shaman of the Chinese Oroqen, Meng Jinfu's over one year's hunting life. This television documentary was produced in 1992 and distributed one year later. Through Meng Jinfu's life, this documentary introduces the Chinese Oroqen's culture, especially the dying traditional Oroqen's culture. Hence, the third phase of television documentary concentrates on introducing less socialized Chinese people's life to present various Chinese cultures, especially dying traditional kinds. Due to such focus, the third phase's television documentary doesn't carry as much emphasis on social responsibility as former two phases. And also because of such focus, there are few television documentaries documenting the Chinese society during 1993-1998 though several significant social events all happen in this period. For example, this is the period that includes the Handover of Hong Kong and the growing prominence of the Falun Gong movement.

In the fourth phase, there are two main characteristics, market and social responsibility. Unlike the third phase, taking a strong social responsibility becomes the basic characteristic of Chinese television documentary from 1999 to 2008. Even though Chinese people are still the main documented contents, the focus is no longer marginalized people but the highly socialized people

who live in urban area. Furthermore, those documented people are no longer isolated from surrounding. In fact, they are highly related to the events, surroundings and even general social background. The market also takes on a dominative role. Thanks to the market, Chinese television documentary starts to become more diverse and assumes a role as a social media. At first, unlike former two phases, politics is no longer the mainstream. Also, unlike the third phase, marginalized ethnic Chinese groups are no longer the mainstream. In this period, documentary directors have more freedom to choose documented contents and they pay more attention on relating the documented contents to social environment.

For example, “migration” (《迁徙的人》) describes seven migrations under different social backgrounds in modern China. This television documentary was distributed in 2007. The main purpose of this television documentary was to show that as a Chinese person, under historical background and national needs, no matter how much you will miss your homeland, you will have to find your new life through migration. In other words, this television documentary focused more on the relation between Chinese people’s lives and their general social environment. Moreover, even though the documented contents are still Chinese people, but unlike the third phase, this television documentary uses Chinese people as a lens to see through their lives and look at how their lives are associated with their social environment. Therefore, the forth phase of Chinese television documentary refocuses on social environment through Chinese people’s diverse lives.

So, He^{cxiv} stops at 2008. But Chinese television documentary is still developing. What may happen next? Based on the above review, starting from the forth phase, Chinese television documentary has become part of an industry - the Chinese documentary industry (中国纪录片产业). This industry is driven by commercial market concerns. However, based on He and Jiang (2011)’s evaluation of the Chinese documentary industry in 2010, the immature state of the market in China and the incomplete articulation of industry chain has resulted in a slow pace of industrialization for Chinese television documentary. For example, most television stations don’t

know how to distribute their television documentaries. Hence, the problematic issue of this industrialization is two-fold, (1) there is a lack of a market entity; and (2) there is a lack of market principle. So the development of buyer and producer are not yet articulated into a commercial model. The buyers are waiting for products while producers don't have any desirable products in hand.

However, the Chinese documentary industry also has several successful creative attempts. First, Guizhou television station, Hubei television station, Jilin television station, Xizang television station, and Shanxi television station increased investment in television documentary production. Second, CETV-3 applied new management strategies to improve budgets and invested more in the television documentary market. Third, at the end of 2010, CCTV established CCTV-9, the Documentary Channel.

Moreover, though the Chinese television documentary is being industrialized, the industry still carries a huge social responsibility to document the Chinese society. After the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, this social responsibility also included portraying a positive national image. Starting from phase two, there is a noticeable change: humanistic-plebian-socialized-industrialized. What causes this change? After I review relevant literature, I realize The New Documentary Movement may play an important role. Therefore, there is a need to explore the nature and source of this movement.

2.3 The New Documentary Movement --- Background

The New Documentary Movement starts at the end of 1980s in China. Within this movement, there are a lot of marginal documentaries produced by many independent producers and these documentaries are awarded in western competitions later. At the beginning, Wu Wenguang (吴文光), who used to work in the Kunming television station, shoot a documentary "Wandering Beijing

- The Last Dreamer”(流浪北京——最后的梦想者) to present countryside artists' lives in Beijing.^{cxv} In fact, what Wu Wenguang does also implies that documentary director can be independent producer. Starting from 1990, there are more and more independent producers. Their lives provide a perspective to discuss power discourse in this decade.

Usually, these independent producers' identities are modified by “marginal,” “underground,” “unofficial,” and so on. All these labels are opposite to “central,” “on the ground,” “official,” and so on. The first relationship “marginal- central” comes from postmodernism, which indicates a bunch of complex power relationships. As for the one who is “marginal,” it can be an automatic escape from the central power discourse, or it can be an unwillingly escape because of the oppression from the central power discourse. Hence, being in the “marginal” status indicates that they are oppressed, isolated or monitored. As for the “underground documentary,” it is not allowed to be distributed in the legal channel. However, being in the “underground” status gives them an identity to be distributed on the ground later. As for the one which is “unofficial,” it becomes a substitute of “freedom” and “independence.” Hence, being in the “unofficial” status indicates it is not restrained by “official” power or it has an independence power away from the “official.” Therefore, it seems that these independent producers attain a free and independent power discourse, but in fact, they still live within the central power discourse.

The market economy forces these independent producers to leave “Dan Wei” (单位), and so they attempt to find another way to survive. They become “free people.” However, they can't abandon center power discourse since their behavior is still monitored by the market, which is inseparable from the Chinese central government. Hence, these independent producers still lived in the central power discourse. This relationship is two sides of a coin. Their independence is tolerated by the Chinese central government. If “official” represents the ideology or discourse hegemony, what “unofficial” represents is another kind of ideology or using oppression to share the discourse hegemony. In the meantime, the labels these independent producers put on themselves are more

easily accepted by western power discourse, therefore, their documentaries are more or less awarded in many western competitions.

However, the market and central power discourse still position these independent producers in an awkward position. On the one side, they are not accepted by the mainstream media discourse, like Chinese Central Television (CCTV) and other major province television stations. The mainstream media discourse only accepts them when they are labeled as “different kind.” On the other side, when they face western power discourse, they are forced to be labeled as “communism,” “orientalism,” “the third world,” and so on. In other words, even though they claim themselves as independent, their independence is hardly recognized and achieved. They are forced to face many contradictory relationships, such as “history- reality,” “the third world- the first world,” “communism – capitalism.” And they had to find a space to survive.

More specifically, within this movement, many independent producers, like Duan Jinchuan (段锦川), Kang Jianning (康建宁), Jiang Yue (蒋樾) and Wang Zijun (王子军), they all turned to document individuals’ daily lives. Most of them are not professionally trained documentary directors. They are amateurs. They abandon professional equipment and choose DV to document. Unlike professionally trained directors, they only document what they are interested. They abandon the revolutionary discourse. Rather they focus on individualized daily life discourse. However, due to their awkward positions, their documentaries have to be accepted by western power discourse. So these documentaries still constitute a stereotype that presents “China- Orientalism – Communism” in western world. More ironically, because these documentaries are welcomed and awarded in western competitions, Chinese mainstream media discourse start to accept them later, which indirectly influences development of whole Chinese documentary, including *A Bite of China*.

In following three sections, I will discuss Professor Xinyu Lü (吕新雨) and Wu Wenguang, Chen Xiaoqing and Wang Zijun’s individual interviews to outline how The New Documentary Movement influence development of Chinese television documentary. All interviews are partly

selected from Professor Lü's book *Documenting China: The New Documentary Movement in Contemporary China* (Jilu Zhongguo: Dangdai Zhongguo Xinjilu Yundong 记录中国：当代中国新记录运动).

2.4 Interview with Wu Wenguang

Lü titles her interview with Wu Wenguang as “Individualized Writing Style – Wu Wenguang Interview” (个人化写作方式—吴文光访谈).^{cxvi} It has six sections, “On the Way” (在路上)^{cxvii}, “Back to Unpolished Gem, Back to Reality” (返璞归真)^{cxviii}, “‘All Corners of the Country’: Title” (《江湖》：主题)^{cxix}, “‘All Corners of the Country’: Method” (《江湖》：方式)^{cxx}, “‘All Corners of the Country’: Problem” (《江湖》：问题)^{cxxi}, and “Appendix and Correctness After Six Months” (半年以后的补充与校正)^{cxxii}.

Under section three “‘All Corners of the Country’: Title”

Lü says:

“When I talked about my thoughts about Chinese documentary to others, I felt very disappointed about what Chinese intellectuals did in past. I felt they had never faced Chinese society directly, so they didn't know anything about Chinese society. They had never faced the reality of Chinese society. However, the current Chinese documentary people, they had faced the reality of Chinese society directly, and this was why I paid my attention to them. They might didn't know what they did has significance.” (Wo ceng zai dui bieren tandao dui Zhongguo jilupian de kanfa shi shuo, wo dui xuduo Zhongguo zhishifenzi yiqian suozuo de shi ganda shiwang, wo juede tamen meiyou zhenzheng mianxiang Zhongguo shehui, bu liaojie Zhongguo shehui, meiyou zhimian Zhongguo shehui de zhenshi. Er zhepi Zhongguo jilupianren, tamen shi zhijie miandui le Zhongguo shehui de xianshi, zheshi cushi wo guanzhu

tamen de feichang zhongyao de yuanyin. Er tamen keneng hai butai mingbai tamen suozuo de zhexie gongzuo de yiyi 我曾在对别人谈到对中国纪录片的看法时说，我对许多中国知识分子以前所做的事感到失望，我觉得他们没有真正面对中国社会，不了解中国社会，没有直面中国社会的真实。而这批中国纪录片人，他们是直接面对了中国社会的现实，这是促使我关注他们的非常重要的原因。而他们可能还不太明白他们所做的这些工作的意义。)

Wu replies:

“(If) they understand it (the significance of their work), it may turn terrible. If they understand it, they will lose the most instinctive things.” (Mingbai le jiu zaogao le, mingbai le jiuhui sangshi le zui zhijue de dongxi 明白了就糟糕了，明白了就会丧失了最直觉的东西。)

Lü replies:

“(They) might lose very sensitive and first perceptual knowledge of life, so everyone of you insisted your own standpoint as keeping documentary as independent one to differ from current relatively popular thoughts. Furthermore, you could exclude popular culture from your own documentary. Everyone could maintain independence of each documentary and document independently. Eventually, when everyone put each documentary together, you could see a common thing and this thing is real.” (Keneng jiuhui sangshi hen mingan de, dui shenghuo de diyi ganxing renshi, suoyi nimen meigeren jianchi ziji geren lichang shi jilupian baochi dulixing, qubie yu xianzai bijiao liuxing de sixiang, paichu liuxing wenhua ganrao de yige henhao de qianti. Meigeren dou baochi ziji de dulixing, duli de qu zuo, hui zai yiqi jiu keyi kandao yige gongtong de dongxi, zhege dongxi jiushi zhenshi de 可能就会丧失很敏感的、对生活的第一感性认识，所以你们每个人坚持自己个人立场是纪录片保持独立性，区别于现在比较流行的思想，排除流行文化干扰的一个很好的前提。每个人都保

持自己的独立性，独立地去做，汇在一起就可以看到共同的东西，这个东西就是真实的。^{cxxiii}

From this interview part, Lü states the difference between independent producers and former intellectuals is whether this group is tied to reality of Chinese society. The way independent producers attain their knowledge of Chinese society reality is keeping their instincts and excluding popular culture's influence. However, as for independent producers, how do they face reality of Chinese society?

Under section four “‘All Corners of the Country’: Method”

Lü says:

“...You have mentioned your change of direction to me. You changed direction to substratum people. You used to document artist, people who were Red Guard. But now you change to focus on substratum people, which you haven't had in past. I thought this is a transition for you. Were you consciously aware of such transition? How did you think of documenting big-arch shelter? How did you change your focus on this since you used to face other directions?”

(...Ni cengjing dui wo tando guo ni de zhuanxiang, ni dui xiacengren de zhuanxiang. Ni yiqian pai de shi yishujia, dangguo hongweibing de ren, er ni xianzai zhuanxiang dui xiacengren de guanzhu, zheshi ni yiqian meiyou de dongxi. Wo juede zhe dui ni laishuo shi yizhong zhuanbian, zhezhong zhuanbian shibushi you zijue de yishi? Ni zenme hui xiangdao qu pai dapeng de? Ni de muguang zenm zhuandao zheli de? Yinwei ni yiqian de muguang doushi chaozhe bie de fangxiang de ...你曾经对我谈到过你的转向，你对下层人的转向。你以前拍的是艺术家，当过红卫兵的人，而你现在转向对下层人的关注，这是你以前没有的东西。我觉得这对你来说是一种转变，这种转变是不是有自觉的意识？你怎么

会想到去拍大棚的？你的目光怎么转到这里的？因为你以前的目光都是朝着别的方向的。)

Wu replies:

“What you just mentioned “change of direction,” didn’t mean I started to change my documented contents from artists or significant historical event to substratum people, ordinary people.... I felt I didn’t intend to do some documentaries solely focusing on substratum people, to present their unknowing life part for others. I felt I was documenting our lives. In a sense, I was one of them, not owing to our different inhabited environments and jobs. We were same kind of people. I hoped their lives would be included in our lives.”

(Ni gangcai shuo de “zhuanxiang,” bing bu shuoming wo cong yishujia huo zhongda lishiticaikai shi zhuanxiang xiaceng, putong ren le. ... Wo juede wo genben bushi xiangzuo yixie xiacengren shenghuo de dongxi, ba tamen yixie women bu shuzhi de dongxi qu gaosu gei bieren. Wo juede wo pai de jiushi women de shenghuo, cong mouzhong yiyi shang shuo, wo ye shi zhaxie ren zhong de yiyuan, er bushi yinwei women zhu de huanjing bu yiyang, gongzuo bu yiyang, women doushi zheyang de yixie ren, wo xiwang tamen de shenghuo ye baokuo zai women de shenghuo li 你刚才说的“转向”，并不说明我从艺术家或重大历史题材开始转向下层，普通人了。... 我觉得我根本不是想做一些下层人生活的东西，把他们一些我们不熟知的东西去告诉给别人。我觉得我拍的就是我们的生活，从某种意义上说，我也是这些人中的一员，而不是因为我们住的环境不一样，工作不一样，我们都是这样的一些人，我希望他们的生活也包括在我们的生活里。) ^{cxixiv}

In Wu’s opinion, documented contents share same life with him, as director. So the way he faces reality of Chinese society reality is involving himself into documented contents’ life. His standpoint is rediscovering himself when he is documenting. Then, he finds himself in substratum, ordinary

people's life. Related to Chapter 1's theoretical analyses, since both director and documented contents are "affect body," both resonate with each other. In this case, resonance is substratum, ordinary people's life.

2.5 Interview with Chen Xiaoqing

Lü titles her interview with Chen Xiaoqing as "Travel Far Away: Within Current Reality and History – Chen Xiaoqing Interview" (远游：在现实与历史中—陈晓卿访谈).^{cxxv} It has six sections, " 'Make My Own Documentary' " ("做自己的片子"),^{cxxvi} "'Home Away in Beijing': Home for Heart" (《远在北京的家》：心灵的家),^{cxxvii} "'Dragon Spine': Travel Far Away and Look For" (《龙脊》：远游与寻找),^{cxxviii} "Embarrass by Situation" (境遇的尴尬),^{cxxix} "Make History more 'Amorous'" (让历史具有"风情")^{cxxx}, and "Reality and 'State'" (现实与"境界").^{cxxxi}

Under section one "'Make My Own Documentary'"

Chen says:

"...He (Georg Henri Anton "Joris" Ivens)¹ made me understand that in past, when we needed something for specific documentary, we went to find them from documented contents. But we ignored their (documented contents) lives. This understanding overthrew what school had taught me and shocked me strongly." (...Ta rang wo mingbai le yige daoli: guoqu women zhishi pianzi li xuyao dian shenm cai dao bei paishe duixiang nali zhaodian shenm, er hushi le tamen de shenghuo benshen. Zhe jiu ba xuexiao jiaogei wo de dongxi jinxing le yici dianfu, gei wo de zhenhan feichang da 他让我明白了一个道理：过去我们只是片子里需

¹ Georg Henri Anton "Joris" Ivens (18 November 1898 – 28 June 1989) was a Dutch documentary filmmaker. "Joris Ivens," Wikipedia, last modified on Mar 16, 2016, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joris_Ivens.

要点什么才到被拍摄对象那里找点什么，而忽视了他们的生活本身。这就把学校教给我的东西进行了一次颠覆，给我的震撼非常大。) ^{cxxxii}

Influenced by western documentary filmmaking theories, Chen realizes the importance of original context of documented contents. Though not rigorous like Wu's idea, this change of focus indicates Chen, starts to treat documented contents' life with respect and take them into account. As the same director for *A Bite of China*, his standpoint here is valuable.

Under section two “‘Home Away in Beijing’: Home for Heart”

Chen says:

“...All these made me feel we (AnHei girls and me) had something in common, and I felt an impulse to sympathize with disadvantaged groups. These were reasons for producing ‘Home Away in Beijing.’ (Zhe shi wo juede zhexie Anwei nühai mouzhong Chengdu shang yu wo you xiangtong de defang, ziji ye you yizhong tongqing ruoshi qunti de chongdong, wo xiang zhexie jiushi pai ‘Yuanzai Beijing de Jia’ de yuanyin ba! 这使我觉得这些安徽女孩某种程度上与我有相通的地方，自己也有的一种同情弱势群体的冲动，我想这些就是拍《远在北京的家》的原因吧！)

Lü replies:

“It looked like you tried to find an identification from them, so when you documented them, you treated them equally. Such equal and respectful treatment was very impressive at that time.” (Kanlai ni xiang zai tamen shenshang zhaodao yizhong rentong, suoyi zai shijiao shang ye tebie pingshi. Ruci de pingshi he pingdeng de duidai tamen, zhe zai dangshi shi yige feichang da de xingwei 看来你想在她们身上找到一种认同，所以在视角上也特别平视。如此的平视和平等地对待她们，这在当时是一个非常大的行为。) ^{cxxxiii}

Lü continuously asks:

“When you were documenting (them), were you very affective?” (Ni zai paipian shi ziji de qinggan touru shifou henda 你在拍片时自己的情感投入是否很大?)

Chen replies:

“Yes, very much.” (Dui, feichang da 对, 非常大。) ^{cxxxiv}

Lü replies:

“What I listened to you earlier made me feel your documentary contained a large amount of your self-identification and self-affection.” (Wo tingxialai, jue de ni de pianzi li you yizhong henda de ziwo rentong, ziwo ganqing jituo de chengfen zai limian 我听下来, 觉得你的片子里有一种很大的自我认同, 自我感情寄托的成分在里面。)

Chen replies:

“Yes. If a documentary couldn’t affect myself, it would hardly affect others.” (dui. Yige pianzi gandong buliao ziji, jiu hennan gandong bieren 对。一个片子感动不了自己, 就很难感动别人。) ^{cxxxv}

Chen’s words indicate his way of portraying documented contents is highly related to “affect.” Same as Wu, he also tries to find himself in documented contents. But different from Wu, he relates to them through affection. Noticeable, he doesn’t only position himself as director, he also put himself as spectator to be affective related to documentary. In brief, the resonance between he and documented contents is affection.

2.6 Interview with Wang Zijun

Lü titles her interview with Wang Zijun as “What can ‘common people’s home’ contribute for Chinese documentary?--- Wang Zijun Interview” (《百姓家园》能为中国纪录片贡献什么?)

——王子军访谈).^{cxxxvi} It has four sections, “Beginning” (创业),^{cxxxvii} “Purpose” (目的),^{cxxxviii} “Operation” (操作),^{cxxxix} and “Future” (未来).^{cxl}

Under section two “Purpose”

Lü asks:

“Did you think the purpose of this program is exploring a new viewpoint?” (Nimen xianzai juede zhege jiemu de lijie jiushi kaituo le yige xin de shidian ma 你们现在对这个节目的理解就是开拓了一个新的视点吗?)

Wang replies:

“Yes. We thought this program would be a new business, others in station wouldn’t know how to operate.” (Dui. Women juede zhege lanmu shi yige xin de hangye, taili qitaren dao zheli hui yixiazi mobuzhaobei 对。我们觉得这个栏目是一个新的行业，台里其他人到这里会一下子摸不着北。)

Lü continuously asks:

“When I heard this, I felt it was very meaningful. Previous documentary was professional and official activities, so they had power to explain life. Now you transferred this power to common people, so these people could have power to speak of their lives. At first, it was us to uncover life, now it was life itself showing itself. This was a revolution of notion.” (Yiqian jilupian doushi zhuanye he guanfang de xingwei, jieshi shenghuo de quanli douzai tamen shouhang, xianzai nimen ba zhege quanli xiafang dao laobaixing shouli , rang tamen you quanli shuo tamen ziji de shenghuo, benlai shi women qu jieshi shenghuo, xianzai shi rang shenghuo ziji chengxian chulai. Zheshi yige guannian de geming 以前纪录片都是专业和官方的行为，解释生活的权利都在他们手上，现在你们把这个权利下放到老百姓手里，让他们有权利说他们自己的生活，本来是我们去揭示生活，现在是让生活自己呈现出来。这是一个观念的革命。)^{cxli}

Lü continuously says:

“Compared to other artistic fictional films, documentary was naturally related to reality.

When common people were documenting their own lives, which made documentary be born with reality. ... Within documentary, documented people lived in the same country, city, community, even were neighbor. I saw myself from people same as me, so I could self-identify meaning of my life. This was ‘same type reaction,’ which suggested documentary back to life.” (Jilupian yu qita yishulei de gushipian xiangbi, henda de yige butong jiuzaiyu yu xianshishenghuo youzhe zhijietianran de gurouqinyuanguanxi, er laobaixing ziji pai ziji de gushi, geng shi shi jilupian genzhi yu shenghuo zishen, ... limian de renwu jiu shenghuo zai women tongyige guojia, chengshi, shequ, shenzhi gebi, zheshi yige benzhi qubie. Cong he wo yiyang de ren shenshang kan ziji, conger queren ziji shenghuo de yiyi, zhe zhengshi zhezhong tongleifanying de hanyi. Ta yinggai shi jilupian huigui shenghuo benyuan de biao xian 纪录片与其他艺术类的故事片相比，很大的一个不同就在于与现实生活有着直接天然的骨肉亲缘关系，而老百姓自己拍自己的故事，更是使纪录片根植于生活自身... 里面的人物就生活在我们同一个国家，城市，社区，甚至隔壁，这是一个本质区别。从和我一样的人身上看到自己，从而确认自己生活的意义，这正是这种同类反应的含义。它应该是纪录片回归生活本源的表现。) ^{cxlii}

Wang’s attempt shows documented people’ three-fold roles. Most directly, they behave as documented people. Then, they can be director since documented contents are their daily lives. Programs like “Common people’s home” hand over them power to document. Or as spectators since they are able to find themselves in documentary. In summary, as Zhu and Mei ^{cxliii} state: “The New Documentary Movement constituted a non-governmental power discourse.”

2.7 Conclusion

Therefore, this movement changes Chinese documentary history. Since the documentary as a form is imported from West in 1958, documentary has a unique development history in China through an evolving Chinese television documentary form. Initially used as a propaganda tool for political purpose and class struggles, documentaries evolved during a second period, to focus on national spirit. Then, a third period unfolds as a focus on marginal Chinese people's lives and preservation of various Chinese cultures. The fourth period, the relation between common Chinese people's lives and general Chinese society becomes the documentary focus. Then, from 2008 to present, Chinese television documentary is transforming from a social media into an industry, the Chinese documentary industry (中国纪录片产业) .

Chapter Three: “A Bite of China” --- A Case Study

Chapter 3 briefly analyzes a particular Chinese television documentary, *A Bite of China*. This analysis takes the form of a case study, which will integrate the analyses of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2. My approach is to examine three facets of “A Bite of China”: (1) a survey conducted by Central China Television (CCTV); (2) literature relevant to documentaries in China; and (3) an analysis of an interview that had been conducted with the director Chen Xiaoqing (陈晓卿). I then will analyze the Yao couple’s story in the third episode – “Transferred Inspiration” (转化的灵感) in detail. Finally, I will examine the tremendous success of “*A Bite of China :Season I* (Pinyin: Shejian shang de Zhongguo: Diyiji 舌尖上的中国 : 第一季) in Chinese documentary industry (中国纪录片产业), with a particular focus the relevance of affect and The New Documentary Movement.

3.1 A Gift to Food

“*A Bite of China :Season I* (Pinyin: Shejian shang de Zhongguo: Diyiji 舌尖上的中国 : 第一季) is a documentary television series from China that explores the history of food, eating, and cooking. It is directed by Chen Xiaoqing (陈晓卿), and narrated by Li Lihong (李立宏), and has original music composed by Roc Chen (阿鲲).”^{exliv} The theme is Chinese people’s pursuit of gourmet food and a good life. Within seven episodes, it introduces Chinese culture by presenting stories of local cuisines in over 60 locations within mainland, Hong Kong and Taiwan. After it was first aired on China Central Television (CCTV), it garnered widespread popularity. So, why was this documentary series so popular?

Before further analysis, I turn to the result of a study conducted by Chinese Central Television in CCTV studied “*A Bite of China*” (《舌尖上的中国》大调查) in order to examine possible reasons for this television documentary’s success. The study was conducted using a survey with four multiple-choice items: (1) Why did you like it? (2) How did you watch it? (3) Did you want to see a sequel? (4) Within the seven episodes, which one did you like the most? For each item, respondents could select answers. Data also were collected on the respondents’ home provinces. The survey was automated. As a respondent completed the survey, their responses were collected and tabulated. The data collection system then collated and analyzed results.^{cxlv} I note that the survey was implemented in (date) and the analysis I present is limited participants’ opinions at that time.

Figure 1 provides CCTV data summaries for the first question. There were four survey items, but only the first one focused on the spectators’ perceptions of why they like this documentary. Item two surveyed how people viewed this documentary. Item three simply asked whether people would be likely to view a sequel of this series. Interestingly, over ninety percent of respondents indicated they would look forward to a sequel. Finally, I note that survey item four simply asked the spectators which episode they preferred.

Based on my analyses of the survey results, I feel that survey item one is more specifically related to the research questions of my thesis. Therefore, I focus most completely on the results of survey item one. In Figure 1, which shows the results for survey item one. Data are organized in the following manner: (1) the top of Figure 1 provides a percentage histogram, with the responses listed left to right in decreasing order of selection. (so item response 2 is selected most frequently, then response 1, and so on); (2) a tabular array provides additional data summary; (3) in the first two columns the responses are listed in the order shown for the first question item; (4) the third column provides a bar percentage as well as a numerical percentage showing the percentage of respondents selecting the respective response; (5) the fourth column lists the number of respondents selecting the respective response; and the fifth column is a button to access another table that shows

a breakout of responses by region of respondents. The Chinese translations of the five vertical columns labels are: “Number list,” “Option list,” “Percentage list,” “Amount of ballots list,” and “Region analysis list.”



Figure 1^{cxlvi}: The Statistic Data of The First Question

In Figure 1, that the rows of the tables are the response choices, which are translated as: (1) Spectators can have a great visual experience about the gourmet food; (2) This television documentary tells various behind the scenes stories to present the culture of “Chinese cuisine”; (3) This television documentary presents those documented people’ strong feelings for their hometowns; (4) This television documentary honors those diligent workers; (5) Others. Among all the participators, 38.65% chose the second option. 20.59% chose the first option. 20.48% chose the

third option. 17.76% chose the fourth option. 2.52% chose the last option. I find this statistic result very interesting because none is over 50%. Though the percentage of the second option is the highest, the percentages of the first option and the third option are very close. Hence, in my opinion, the reason this television documentary is absorbing to the spectators because (1) it provides a great visual experience about the gourmet food; (2) it tells various behind the scenes stories to present the culture of “Chinese cuisine”; (3) it presents those documented people’s strong feelings for their hometowns. Related to chapter 1 and 2, the first reason indicates the interaction between the images’ effect and the spectators. It also indicates how the image shapes the documentary representation of the “reality.” The second reason indicates how the interactions in which the documented people participate influence the documentary representation of the “reality.” The third reason indicates the interaction between the documented people and the spectators. In addition, both the second and third reason indicate that as The New Documentary Movement shows, documented people’s daily lives, including their life stories become common documented contents and affect spectators who share that experience.

According to Zhang^{cxlvii}, “*A Bite of China*” appears to captivate audiences because of the presentation of stories about gourmet food. However, the tremendous success seems to be related to how the documentary presented a particular interpretation of the relation between Chinese people and food. This television documentary appears to deepen a spectator’s understanding of the relation between Chinese gourmet food and Chinese people through refined camera shots and meaningful narrative structure. More specifically, this television documentary presents documented people’s characteristics, for example, the wise and diligent nature of the documented people. In brief, the documented people, meaningful narration, and refined camera shots appear to be critical to the popularity of the show.

First, and in regard the selection of the documented people, a unique aspect of this television documentary is that all the documented people are not famous head chefs or food experts. They are

mostly common Chinese people in mainland, Hong Kong and Taiwan. This characteristic strongly carries what The New Documentary Movement brings about, that common people's lives become documented contents mostly. Common people have power discourse to be shown on television.^{cxlviii} For example, Guo Shaofen (郭少芬), is an elder woman at Zheng Xiangxing Shrimp shop (郑祥兴虾铺) in Hong Kong. She operated this shop all by herself after her husband died. In her story, spectators not only see the history of this shop, but they can get a sense of her lasting love of her husband.

For the elder generation portrayed in the series, food seemed to represent a memory of the past life. Interestingly, the director used a different way to portray the young generation. Most of the younger generations left their hometowns and worked in big cities in order to create a better life for themselves and their families, but they still loved their home food and they missed their hometown. For younger generations, the taste of food represented a taste of home. Hence, when the director portrayed two generations together, the food became an accumulated feeling. In the meantime, the food also became an inheritance of tradition and a development of tradition.

As documented contents, director's portrayal of food holds deep affection of documented people's past lives or hometown. In Chapter 2, Chen has tied his portrayal with the resonance between him and documented contents. It is reasonable he continues to preserve this in *A Bite of China*. As Chapter 1 concludes, such representation also supports "food" to transform into "affective food."

Now to take a second perspective, the narration. *A Bite of China* used two narrative angles--- the third person and the first person perspective. The third person was embodied in the narrator, which was Li Lihong' (李立宏). The third person carried an objective narration angle. Since the documentary was representing the "reality," the director usually chose this angle. However, the content of this television documentary's third person narration was not a plain description of the

food or life story. For example, in the fourth episode “The Taste of Time” (“时间的味道”; the Guo Shaofen’s story) , the narrator said:

“Guo married Mr. Zheng at twenty, and since then, she has participated in the management until Zheng passed away in 2011. It’s most ideal to appreciate the sunset at Da Ao. Here, what she appreciates may not be the natural view.” (Guo Shaofen Ershi sui jia dao Zhengjia, congci yu xiansheng yiqi jingying zhejian bainian laodian, zhidao erling yiyi nian xiangruiyimo de zhangfu qushi. Da ao shi Xianggang guanshang riluo zui lixiang de defang. Zai zheli, zhi de yexu bu jinjin shi fengjing. 郭少芬 20 岁嫁到郑家，从此与先生一起经营这间百年老店，直到 2011 年相濡以沫的丈夫去世。大澳是香港观赏日落最理想的地方。在这里，指的也许不仅仅是风景。)

The third personal narrative objective perspective described Guo Shaofen’s life, her husband and their shop, and also Da Ao--- the town in which they lived and worked. The representation of Guo Shaofen became more than just the portrayal of an old woman who made a living by operating a shrimp paste shop. The shrimp shop symbolized her married life, her lasting love for Mr. Zheng, her husband, but also integrated Da Ao as a place, which, by the way, was an ideal place to appreciate the sunset in Hong Kong. Consequently, in Guo Shaofen’s life, Da Ao was portrayed as the place where she had a home. Additionally, the food, or specifically, the shrimp paste, embodied some of her memories and love for her husband and life in Da Ao. Hence, when spectators listened to this third person narration, they did not only see the shrimp paste and sense how tasteful it was, but they also sensed a bittersweet life story.

In *Documentary Production* (《纪录片创作》)^{cxlix}, Zhu said: “since narration is inseparable from image and sound, when image and sound cannot represent a ‘compassionate care,’ narration needs to represent it.”(2008, 301-302) Therefore, narration is a supplement of image and sound in documentary representation. In terms of developing a narrative structure that engages a spectator in

“compassionate care,” the third person narrative of *A Bite of China* integrates first person perspectives.

The first person perspectives emerge from the captured narrative of the documented people as they speak about themselves. Interestingly, and unlike the objective voice (objective in the sense of the director describing “factual” elements or events), the first person voice of documented people is subjective in the sense they are interpreting their lives, even though they may add in factual information. For example, the fourth episode is “The Taste of Time” (“时间的味道”), about a woman named Wangjie. Wangjie narrated part of her story as follows:

As a woman, I had to dress up. Whether I was fat or skinny, I had to go shopping. When I went to shopping with my friends, once I saw there was a food market on the sidewalk, they would lose me. (They asked): “Where is her? Where is that person who wants to buy this pair of shoes?” (I) went to the food market. I would rather go to the food market. (Nüren ma, ye haohao chuang yifu. Buguan wo pang huo shou, wo ye dei qu guangguang. Pengyou yiqi guangjie, wo zhiyao kandao pangbian you caishichang, tamen zhaobudao wo le. Ren ne? Gangcai maixie de ren ne? Pao caishangchang qu le. Wo qingyuan qu guang caishichang. 女人嘛，也好好穿衣服。不管我胖跟瘦，我也得去逛逛。朋友一起逛街，我只要看到旁边有菜市场，他们找不到我了。人呢？刚才买鞋的人呢？跑菜市场去了。我情愿去逛菜市场。)

This narration revealed Wangjie’s passion about the food market was larger than her passion about shopping. She admitted that shopping was a natural hobby for every woman. However, when she had to choose, she chose the food market. Because this was a first person narration, when the spectators listened to this narration, they could have sensed her strong passion about food market. The first person narration enhanced the spectators’ sensation of “strong.” In the above analyses, I discussed two narrative angles separately. In this television documentary, sometimes the director

also combined both together. In Wangjie's story, before the above first person narration, there was a short third person narration that: “

In Shanghai, the one who has not tasted Wangjie's cooking was not top gourmet. Wangjie was good at cooking Nibo cuisine, Shaoxing cuisine, and Shanghai authentic cuisine. For example, sauced pork, braised prawns, pan-fried butterfish, braised spring bamboo shoots, fried flour-dipped crab. (Zai Shanghai, mei changguo Wangjie shouyi de, keneng hennan yi dingji laotao ziju. Wulun shi Ningbo cai, Shaoxing cai, haishi nongyouchijiang de Shanghai benbang cai, biru Jiangzhi rou, Hongmen xia, Jian changyu, Youmen chunsun he Miantuoxie dengdeng, Wangjie yangyang jingtong. 在上海，没尝过汪姐手艺的，可能很难以顶级老饕自居。无论是宁波菜、绍兴菜，还是浓油赤酱的上海本帮菜，比如酱汁肉、红焖虾、煎鲳鱼、油焖春笋和面拖蟹等等，汪姐样样精通。)

This third person narration was presented before the above first person narration. This third person perspective introduced Wangjie was a great chef who specialized in Ningbo cuisine, Shaoxing cuisine and Shanghai authentic cuisine. When the viewers listened to this narration, they could have developed a first impression of Wangjie as a great chef. Because they had this impression beforehand, when they listened to the following narration, they would understand Wangjie's passion and sense it.

Of course, narrative is most usually embedded within a video stream of images. Consequently, I also included analysis of image structure and sequence. From other work on video production and documentaries, a complex dynamic must evolve among the director, the film crew, the film editor, and the scene location manager. Furthermore, this complex dynamic is shaped the human interactions among the director, film crew, and documented people and objects. Engaging documentary production must be built on refined camera shots that both engage the spectators while also conveying aesthetic as well as content and contextual elements. Key imagery in *A Bite of*

China include close shots of food as it is prepared and served, as well as in the contexts of the lives of the people preparing the food and eating the food.

Firstly, the camera shots were refined and engaging because they were filmed in high definition. The high definition quality provided a quality of images that could allow spectators to sense the degree of deliciousness of portrayed food. Secondly, the majority of imagery was filmed in close-up shots. As for close-up, it had strong color contrast and simple compositions. For example, in the third episode “Transferred Inspiration” (“转换的灵感”), there was a series of close-ups on a tofu cuisine. In the center of a white plate, there was a piece of square tender yellow egg tofu. On the top of this egg tofu, there was a layer of bottle-green vegetable puree. On this layer, there were some light brown mushrooms. On the bottom of this egg tofu, there were some bright lemon yellow sauces. At last, the chef put two tender green pea shoots on the very top. Hence, when the spectators saw these close-ups, on the one hand, they were impressed by a series of strong color contrast, white-tender yellow-bottle-green-light brown-bright lemon yellow-tender green contrast. On the other hand, this tofu cuisine was the only documented object, so the spectators concentrated on it. Hence, these close-ups created visual stimulations. In brief, such film techniques allowed the spectators to engage in these visual stimulations and to sense the degree of deliciousness of the food as well as the pleasure of eating.

In the above analyses, I have discussed the documented object, gourmet food, or Chinese cuisine, documented people, like Guo Shaofen and Wangjie, and the spectators. But the role of director is also important. I will use an interview to discuss the director’s perception and perspective in this television documentary.

This was an exclusive interview discussed the first season of *A Bite of China*. The interviewer was Songtao Yang (杨松涛), the host of a television show “Dialogue with Media Professional.” Songtao Yang interviewed Xiaoqing Chen(陈晓卿), the director, and mainly focused on the director’s thoughts about *A Bite of China*. In Xiaoqing Chen’s words, the uniqueness of this

television documentary was this was not a documentary documenting the gourmet food. The gourmet food was the medium. This television documentary was using the gourmet food to interpret the Chinese people, the relationship between the Chinese people and the food, and the relationship between the Chinese people and the Chinese society. And as the director, since he was a gourmet, he had a personal strong feeling about the food.

In the historical context of The New Documentary Movement, Chinese common people's daily lives became the main documented contents which ensured following development of Chinese television documentary. In this case, Chinese food was a window for director and spectators to see and resonate with internal affection of documented people's lives. Also, different from The New Documentary Movement, *A Bite of China* showed a balance between central power discourse and non governmental power discourse. Refined camera shots were only available because of sufficient funding offered by CCTV. But Chen reserved characteristics of the movement, documenting common people's lives respectfully and equally, which guaranteed interactions among director, documented contents and spectators.

In the above analyses, I have discussed in general terms how the documented object and documented people, the director, and the spectators interact with each other. Such reactions influence this television documentary's representation. There is an "actual reality," moment by moment, in the lives of people cooking and eating food within some time and place. However, when a television documentary attempts to capture an "actual reality," the complex interactions among the director's perspective, the film crew, the documented peoples and objects, the film location and scene management, the editing of the film to a director's vision of the documentary, the integration of narrative structures, and perception and the spectators' shifts what is actually real to an interpretation of what is real. In *A Bite of China*, the documented objects and people became a way to interpret the Chinese food, the relationship between the Chinese people and the food, and the relationship between the Chinese people and the Chinese society. And each interpretation, while

meant to capture the reality of a part of the culture of “Chinese cuisine,” is the reality that emerges from enormously complex interactions among director, film crew, film editor, documented people and objects, and spectators. This complexity has been called the “documentary reality” by some researchers. I examine this complexity and “documentary reality” in the next subsection.

3.2 Episode Three --- “Transferred Inspiration” (转化的灵感)

In this subsection, I analyze an episode of *A Bite of China*. My intent is to provide more detail about the complexities of documentary representation. The focus will be Episode 3, which focused on a couple, Yao Wengui(姚文贵) and Wang Cuihua(王翠花). This couple made a fermented Tofu snack. Yao Wengui’s Tofu stall was small and on the side of a seemingly busy street. Customers paid for snacks with shelled corn. “One corn for one piece of Tofu.” (quoted from the narrator, min 7:38). Yao Wengui couple was happy with big smiles. Through the camera lens, their image suggested they had a happy family with a lovely grandchild. Their Tofu business provided a self-sufficient livelihood. According to the narration, they felt their Tofu snacks were very precious because these snacks helped them to support their children and sustained a happy family life. (quoted and rephrased from the narrator, min 9:20).

“Yao is more sensitive than anyone else to this subtle relation between wind, water, sunshine and Tofu.” (quoted from narrator, min 4:50) The narration describes China as an agriculture based society for more than 2000 years, noting that the Chinese people had accumulated rich experience on the relation between food and nature. The narrator said, “Change because of fermentation.” (quoted from narrator, min 2:26) The documentary narrative hints that within a nature-based perspective, Chinese people can be inspired by and interested in food and cooking, especially when much food and cooking in life can be tedious and boring. However, Chinese people always find new inspiration. “There is no time to lose, fresh Tofu will quickly turn sour. It means that Wang

Cuihua has to work very quickly without any rest.” (quoted from narrator, min 2:34) The narrative notes that Chinese people have traditionally be portrayed as hardworking. “To the couple, every piece of Tofu is precious. It helps them to support their children and to sustain a happy family life.” (quoted from narrator, min 9:16) Family was the top priority in Chinese culture. As for Yao couple, the documentary portrays them as feeling that food was not only for feeding themselves and their children, but it was also a way to express their love to children and the love among their family. Therefore, Chinese food was always immersed in love, to children, to parents, and to family.

In this story, the documented object was the fermented Tofu snack and the documented people were Yao couple. The Tofu snack represented a result of transferred inspiration. However, at the end of this story, it was portrayed as a way to express the Yao couple’s love to their children and the love among their family. Where did this love come from? The interaction between Yao Wengui and Wang Cuihua showed it. For example, Yao Wengui and Wang Cuihua were “complaining” about each other. Wang Cuihua said: “(He) had no merits. (He) only had demerits. Lazy. (He was) lazy and clumsy. (Meiyou Youdian. Doushi Quedian. Lan. Youlan Youben. 没有优点。都是缺点。懒。又懒又笨。)” While she was saying these, she was smiling. Yao Wengui didn’t respond to her immediately. He was also smiling. Then, he said: “You had all the merits. She had all the merits. (Ni Quanbu Doushi Youdian. Ta Quanbu Doushi Youdian. 你全部都是优点。她全部都是优点。)” On one hand, he complimented her with a big smile. On the other hand, she was also smiling. Hence, the documentary hinted that they were not “really” complaining about each other, but that such “complaints” were a way to show their love.

The above analysis of the Episode 3 examined an interaction between the documented object and the documented people. The director’s perspective and perception became evident in the focus on how to make the gourmet as the medium to interpret the Chinese people. That was, the Tofu snack as an object became a vehicle for interpreting the love between the Yao couple. The film narrative and scene selections also allowed spectators to sense the love between the couple. Yunho

Jeung commented: “The first couple was so warm (Di yi dui Fufu Hao Wenxin a! 第一对夫妇好温馨啊!).”^{cl} As a spectator, Yunho engaged with the images within the story, and psychologically processed her viewing, thinking and understanding. This engagement led to or at least shaped her comment. This result was created through the complex interactions among her (as spectator), Chen (as director), and the Tofu snack and the Yao couple (documented object in relation to documented people). Related to my analyses in chapter 1, this engagement with complex interactions, and as evidenced by the spectator’s comment, can be defined as affect. In addition, this comment also showed the spectators’ perspective and perception. Hence, this Tofu snack’s portrayal evolved from the representation. Affect shaped this representation. Therefore, the Tofu snack was no longer a fermented food, through representation, it interpreted the Yao couple, and its’ portray resonated with the spectators.

Furthermore, Yao couple with fermented Tofu snack, as documented contents, was basic element of Chinese common people’s daily lives. Documenting it indicated the ultimate change The New Documentary Movement brought to Chinese documentary history.

3.3 Conclusion

In Chapter 3, firstly, I examined the reasons “*A Bite of China*” is popular. They are (1) it provides a great visual experience about the gourmet food; (2) it tells various behind the scenes stories to present the culture of “Chinese cuisine”; (3) it presents those documented people’ strong feelings for their hometowns. All three reasons are shown in its representation of the specific documented objects and people. As shown in Figure 1, these three points are consistent with the highest percentages of responses by the spectators. In fact, the highest percentage of spectators (38.65%) liked the show because of their interest in the relationship between the “Chinese cuisine” and culture. The second highest percentage of spectators (20.59%) liked the visual presentation of

imagery. And, the third highest percentage of spectators (20.48%) connected with the documented people's deep feelings to their hometowns.

The reason the documentary represents those objects and people is, at least in part, the director's choice related to his perspective and perception of what he is trying to show as an "actual reality." However, such choices within the context of the director's perceptions and perspectives results in a "documentary reality" that is not only a Chinese gourmet food television but also uses Chinese gourmet food to interpret Chinese people, the relationship between the Chinese people and the food, and the relationship between the Chinese people and the Chinese society. The episode "Transferred Inspiration" provides a specific example to demonstrate how this television documentary moves from "actual reality" to "documentary reality." Such a transformation from "actual" to "documentary" involves complex dynamics that shape representation of a reality. The director's representation produces "something beyond actual reality." However, in this case study, the "something beyond reality" requires engagement of spectators. Consequently, the complex relationships among director, documented people and objects, and spectators can lead to a variety of interpretations of the "documented reality." Certainly, and if the spectator favored the director's narrative structure, the interpretations could become that there are interesting relationships between Chinese culture and "Chinese cuisine." Such an interpretation is supported by selection of response two in item the first survey item of the CCTV study. As you can see in Figure 1, 38.65% of respondents' choice response 2 to item 1.

Conclusion

This thesis attempts to explore within what historical context and with what documented content, *A Bite of China* garners widespread popularity. In conclusion, by theoretical analyses and case study, I have acquired more understanding of the nature of and motivation behind *A Bite of China*. In study of documentary as a form, theoretically speaking, this thesis advances “affect” as an approach to further understand “documentary reality.” In study of Chinese television documentary, practically speaking, this thesis provides a new viewpoint on how *A Bite of China* becomes a popular Chinese television documentary.

I originally assume that in the documentary form, through representation, there is “something beyond reality,” and “affect as a possible approach to understand ‘something beyond reality,’” which is theoretically analyzed in Chapter 1. Then, in practical deployment, compared to Western documentary film history, The New Documentary Movement in China modifies Chinese television documentary history. It also provides historical context for *A Bite of China*. In fact, this movement makes common Chinese people’s lives and general Chinese society become main documented content, which constitutes a non-governmental power discourse. Furthermore, in Chapter 3, the integration between governmental discourse and non-governmental discourse provides historical context for *A Bite of China*. As for documented content, the intertwined representation between the representation of Chinese gourmet food and affective resonance among director, documented people and spectators makes *A Bite of China* popular. In conclusion, *A Bite of China* is not incidentally to be a popular Chinese television documentary.

However, this thesis has limitations. First, though I choose “affect” as an important theoretical concept, I doesn’t include its theoretical development in cinema study. Second, in Chapter 2, I partly select three directors’ interviews as main argument, which may cause readers question the comprehensiveness of this argument. Third, since the director of *A Bite of China* is active in both

governmental and non-governmental discourses, conducting a face-to-face interview with him may bring more concrete argument for this thesis.

In future, inspired by this thesis, I am preparing to produce a television documentary entitled “Chinese Express People” (中国快递人). Such practice can supply more up-to-date qualitative argument to discuss theoretical analyses in Chapter 1. In fact, to better analyze “affect as a possible approach to understand ‘something beyond reality’ in the documentary form,” quantitative research is necessary. So I need a quantitative measurement experiment to further argue how affect relates to “documentary reality.”

Endnotes

ⁱ Note: Another idea is the first one is a twenty minutes' silent television documentary "Nine Years' Anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China," (Zhonghua Renmin Gongheguo Jianguo Jiuzhounian 中华人民共和国建国九周年), which was produced on Oct 1st, 1958.

ⁱⁱ Zryd Michael. "Irony in Documentary Film: Ethics, Forms, and Functions" (doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1999), 6-7

ⁱⁱⁱ "A Bite of China," Wikipedia, last modified on Dec 9, 2014, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Bite_of_China/.

^{iv} 舌尖上的中国, Slide 6, uploaded Jun 6, 2012, http://wenku.baidu.com/link?url=D1sGumEgD0lcocILvzd33ZgPoaK_FdodeD8V2OP9iIPV37un13PaZQ2zB2iDzsEoSd5S8Gkk0Z2QcdR47FfU2h4T2ZhjSFcYK_OGroW7hji.

^v 《舌尖上的中国》收视堪比 BBC 纪录片, 新浪娱乐, May 23, 2012, <http://ent.sina.com.cn/v/m/2012-05-23/11003637756.shtml>.

^{vi} Note: "*Douban.com* (Douban 豆瓣), launched on March 6, 2005, is a Chinese SNS website allowing registered users to record information and create content related to film, books, music, and recent events and activities in Chinese cities.... for unregistered users, the site is a good place to find ratings and reviews of books/movies/music," Wikipedia, last modified on Feb 24, 2016, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Douban>.

^{vii} 舌尖上的中国 第一季 (2012) , 豆瓣评分 9.3, <https://movie.douban.com/subject/10606004/>

^{viii} 舌尖上的中国, Slide 9-11, uploaded Jun 6, 2012, http://wenku.baidu.com/link?url=D1sGumEgD0lcocILvzd33ZgPoaK_FdodeD8V2OP9iIPV37un13PaZQ2zB2iDzsEoSd5S8Gkk0Z2QcdR47FfU2h4T2ZhjSFcYK_OGroW7hji.

^{ix} Richard Norman, *On Humanism (Thinking in Action)*, (London: Routledge, 2004). 5.

^x "Full Text of Hu Jintao's Report at 17th Party Congress." Xinhuanew.com. Last modified Oct 24, 2007. http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2007-10/24/content_6938749.htm/.

^{xi} William Mazzarella. "Affect: What is it good for?" in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. by Saurabh Dube (London: Routledge, 2007) 292.

^{xii} Ibid.

^{xiii} Chen Xiaoqing (陈晓卿), interviewed by Yang Songtao (杨松涛), *Dialogue with Media Professional*, May 4, 2012.

^{xiv} Xinyu Lü. *Documenting China: The New Documentary Movement in Contemporary China* (Jilu Zhongguo: Dangdai Zhongguo Xinjilu Yundong 记录中国：当代中国新记录运动). (Beijing: Shenghuo•Dushu•Xinzhishi Sanlian Shudian, 北京：生活•读书•新知三联书店 2003.), 23.

^{xv} John Corner, *The Art of Record: A Critical Introduction to Documentary* (Manchester and New York, Manchester University Press, 1996): 2.

^{xvi} Christopher Williams, *Realism and the Cinema: A Reader/Edited by Christopher Williams* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul in association with the British Film Institution, 1980): 6.

^{xvii} Ibid.

^{xviii} Ibid., 7.

^{xix} Ibid.

^{xx} Ibid., 8.

^{xxi} Ibid.

^{xxii} Ibid., 9.

^{xxiii} Ibid., 10.

^{xxv} Ibid.

^{xxvi} Ibid.

^{xxvii} Ibid., 11.

^{xxviii} Ibid., 13.

^{xxix} Michael J. Shapiro, *The Politics of Representation: Writing Practices in Biography, Photography, and Policy Analysis*. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988): page number, quoted in Richard Harvey Brown. "Realism and Power in Aesthetic Representation," in *Postmodern Representation*, ed. Richard Harvey Brown (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995): 135.

^{xxx} Ibid.

^{xxxi} John Corner, *The Art of Record: A Critical Introduction to Documentary* (Manchester and New York, Manchester University Press, 1996): 9.

^{xxxii}

^{xxxiii} Michael J. Shapiro, *The Politics of Representation: Writing Practices in Biography, Photography, and Policy Analysis*. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988): page number, quoted in Richard Harvey Brown. "Realism and Power in Aesthetic Representation," in *Postmodern Representation*, ed. Richard Harvey Brown (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995): 135.

^{xxxiv} Ibid.

^{xxxv} Ibid., 136.

^{xxxvi} Richard Harvey Brown. "Realism and Power in Aesthetic Representation," in *Postmodern Representation*, ed. Richard Harvey Brown (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995): 136.

^{xxxvii} Ibid.

^{xxxviii} Bill Nichols, *Representation Reality: Issues and Concepts in Documentary* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991): 32.

^{xxxix} Ibid.

^{xl} Ibid., xiv.

^{xli} Ibid., 32.

^{xlii} Ibid., xiv.

^{xliii} W. Hugh Baddeley, F.R.P.S., M.B.K.S., *Documentary Film Production* (New York: Hastings House, 1970): Contents.

^{xliv} Ibid., 13.

^{xlvi} Ibid.

^{xlvi} Ibid., 89.

^{xlvi} Ibid., 90.

^{xlvi} Brain Massumi. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2002.), 27.

^{xlix} Ibid.

^l Ibid.

^{li} Ibid., 25.

^{lii} Ibid., 27.

^{liii} Ibid., 24.

^{liv} Ibid.

^{lv} Ibid.

^{lvi} Ibid.

^{lvii} Ibid.

^{lviii} Ibid.

lix Ibid.

lx William Mazzarella. "Affect: What is it good for?" in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. by Saurabh Dube (London: Routledge, 2007) 292.

lxi Ibid.

lxii Brain Massumi. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2002.), 24.

lxiii William Mazzarella. "Affect: What is it good for?" in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. by Saurabh Dube (London: Routledge, 2007) 292.

lxiv Brain Massumi. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2002.), 24.

lxv William Mazzarella. "Affect: What is it good for?" in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. by Saurabh Dube (London: Routledge, 2007) 292.

lxvi Brain Massumi. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2002.), 24.

lxvii William Mazzarella. "Affect: What is it good for?" in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. by Saurabh Dube (London: Routledge, 2007) 292.

lxviii Ibid.

lxix Lawrence Grossberg. *We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conversatism and Postmodern Culture*. (New York: Routledge. 1992), 82.

lxx Brain Massumi. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2002.), 27.

lxxi Ibid., 28.

lxxii Ibid.

lxxiii Ibid., 24.

lxxiv Ibid., 31.

lxxv Ibid.

lxxvi William Mazzarella. "Affect: What is it good for?" in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. by Saurabh Dube (London: Routledge, 2007) 292.

lxxvii Brain Massumi. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2002.), 31.

^{lxxviii} William Mazzarella. “Affect: What is it good for?” in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. by Saurabh Dube (London: Routledge, 2007) 292.

^{lxxix} Brian Massumi. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2002.), 31.

^{lxxx} Ibid.

^{lxxxii} William Mazzarella. “Affect: What is it good for?” in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. by Saurabh Dube (London: Routledge, 2007) 292.

^{lxxxiii} Ibid.

^{lxxxiv} Brian Massumi. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2002.), 24.

^{lxxxv} Ibid, 31.

^{lxxxvi} Ibid.

^{lxxxvii} Ibid.

^{lxxxviii} Ibid., 32.

^{lxxxix} Ibid.

^{xc} Ibid.

^{xc} Ibid.

^{xc} William Mazzarella. “Affect: What is it good for?” in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. by Saurabh Dube (London: Routledge, 2007) 292.

^{xc} Ibid.

^{xc} “A Bite of China,” Wikipedia, last modified Dec 9, 2014, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Bite_of_China/.

^{xc} Rui Zhang, “Jilupian ‘Shejian Shang de Zhongguo’ de Tese Tanxi.” *Yi Shu Ke Ji*. no. 10 (2013): 90.

^{xciii} Lewis Jacobs, *Documentary Tradition* (New York: Hopkinson and Blake, 1971), 2.

^{xciv} Paul Rotha, *Documentary Film* (New York: Hastings House, 1952), 30-31.

^{xcv} Harrison Engle, “Thirty Years of Social Inquiry: An Interview with Willard Van Dyke,” *Film Comment*, 3, No. 2 (Spring 1965), 26.

^{xcvi} Ibid.

^{xcvii} Philip Dunne, "The Documentary and Hollywood," *Hollywood Quarterly*, 1, No. 2 (Jan. 1946), 167.

^{xcviii} Richard Meran Barsam, *Nonfiction Film: A Critical History* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1973), 8.

^{xcix} Lewis Jacobs, *Documentary Tradition* (New York: Hopkinson and Blake, 1971), 2.

^c *Ibid.*

^{ci} *Ibid.*, 5.

^{cii} *Ibid.*, 9.

^{ciii} *Ibid.*, 72.

^{civ} *Ibid.*, 76.

^{cv} *Ibid.*, 282.

^{cvi} *Ibid.*

^{cvii} *Ibid.*, 368.

^{cviii} *Ibid.*, 377.

^{cix} *Ibid.*, 378.

^{cx} *Ibid.*, 379.

^{cxii} Ying Liang and Hongsheng Ouyang, "A Comparative Study of Chinese and Western documentary aesthetic paradigm' per Google Translate," *Dian Shi yan jiu*, no. 11 (2006): 61-63, accessed Apr 2, 2015, <http://azilliad.library.arizona.edu/illiad/illiad.dll?Action=10&Form=75&Value=1425841>.

^{cxiii} Suli He, "Zhongguo Dianshi Jilupian Huayuquan yu Huayufangshi de Yanjin," *Dian Shi Yan jiu*, no. 9 (2009): 32-34.

^{cxiiii} *Ibid.*

^{cxv} *Ibid.*

^{cxvi} Xinyu Lü, *JiLu Zhongguo: Dangdai Zhongguo Xinjilu Yundong* (Beijing: Shenghuo • Dushu • Xinzhi Sanlian Shudian, 2003), Preface, 5.

^{cxvii} *Ibid.*, First Part, 3.

^{cxviii} *Ibid.*, First Part, 3.

^{cxviiii} *Ibid.*, First Part, 8.

^{cxix} Ibid, First Part, 12.

^{cxx} Ibid, First Part, 17.

^{cxxi} Ibid, First Part, 24.

^{cxxii} Ibid, First Part, 28.

^{cxxiii} Ibid, First Part, 17.

^{cxxiv} Ibid, First Part, 20-21.

^{cxxv} Ibid, First Part, 169.

^{cxxvi} Ibid, First Part, 169.

^{cxxvii} Ibid, First Part, 172.

^{cxxviii} Ibid, First Part, 175.

^{cxxix} Ibid, First Part, 182.

^{cxxx} Ibid, First Part, 183.

^{cxxxi} Ibid, First Part, 191.

^{cxxxii} Ibid, First Part, 170.

^{cxxxiii} Ibid, First Part, 172.

^{cxxxiv} Ibid, First Part, 173.

^{cxxxv} Ibid, First Part, 174.

^{cxxxvi} Ibid, First Part, 243.

^{cxxxvii} Ibid, First Part, 243.

^{cxxxviii} Ibid, First Part, 244.

^{cxxxix} Ibid, First Part, 247.

^{cxl} Ibid, First Part, 249.

^{cxli} Ibid, First Part, 246.

^{cxlii} Ibid, First Part, 249.

^{cxliii} Jingjiang Zhu & Bing Mei, *Zhongguo Duli Jilupian Dnag'an* (Shanxi: Shanxi Shifan Daxue Chubanshe, 2004), Preface, 2.

^{cxlv} cctv. Com “Shejian Shang de Zhongguo Dadiocha”, Accessed Date: Apr 23, 2015
<http://app1.vote.cntv.cn/viewResult.jsp?voteId=5946/>.

^{cxlvi} cctv. Com “Shejian Shang de Zhongguo Dadiocha”, Accessed Date: Apr 23, 2015
<http://app1.vote.cntv.cn/viewResult.jsp?voteId=5946/>.

^{cxlviii} Jingjiang Zhu & Bing Mei, *Zhongguo Duli Jilupian Dang'an*. (Shanxi Shifan Daxue Chubanshe, 2004) 152.

^{cxlix} Jinghe Zhu, *Jilupian Chuangzuo*. (Beijing: Renmin University Press, 2008) 301-302.

^{cl} <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S7DKVOAw6-E>

Bibliography

- A Bite of China (Season I)*, directed by Chen, Xiaoqing (2012; Beijing, China: CCTV).
- Adorno, A. *Aesthetic Theory*. Translated by C. Lenhardt. London: Routledge, 1984.
- Agnes, Heller. *Everyday Life*. London; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.
- Allen, Jeanne. *Self-Reflexivity in the Documentary*. Cine-Tracts, 1, No. 2. Summer 1977.
- Allen, Richard. *Projecting Illusion: Film Spectatorship and the Impression of Reality*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Allen, Richard, and Murray Smith, eds. *Film Theory and Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1997.
- Allen, Robert C., and Douglas Gomery. *Film History: Theory and Practice*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1985.
- Andrew, Dubley. *Concepts in Film Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Archard, David. *Consciousness and the Unconscious*. Lasalle, IL: Open Court, 1984.
- Arthur, Paul. "Jargons of Authenticity (Three American Moments)." *Theorizing Documentary*. Ed. Michael Renov. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Aufderheide, Pat. "The Trouble with Truth." San Francisco International Film Festival Catalogue, 1989.
- Baddeley, W. Hugh. *The Technique of Documentary Film Production*. 2nd ed. New York: Focal Press, 1970.
- Barbash, Ilisa. and Lucien Taylor. *Cross-cultural Filmmaking: A Handbook for Making Documentary and Ethnographic Films and Videos*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.
- Barnouw, Erik. *Documentary: A History of the Nonfiction Film*. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Barsam, Richard Meran, ed. *Nonfiction Film Theory and Criticism*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1976.
- Barthes, Roland. "The Photographic Message." In *Image/Music/Text*. Ed. And trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.
- Benson, Thomas W., and Carolyn Anderson. *Reality Fictions: The Films of Frederick Wiseman*. Carbondale: U of Southern Illinois P, 1989.
- Bernstein, Mathew. "Visual Style and Spatial Articulations in Berlin: Symphony of a

-
- City." *Journal of Film and Video*, 5-12. 36, No. 4. Fall 1984.
- Blumernberg, Richard M. "Documentary Films and the Problem of 'Truth.'" *Journal of the University Film Association*, 19-22. 29.1. 1977.
- Branigan, Edward R. *Point of View in the Cinema: A Theory of Subjectivity in Classical Film*. Berlin: Mouton, 1984.
- Brown, Richard Harvey. *Postmodern Representations: Truth, Power, and Mimesis in the Human Sciences and Public Culture*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1995.
- Carroll, Noël. "From Real to Reel: Entangled in the Nonfiction Film." *Philosophic Exchange*, 5-45. No. 14. 1984.
- _____. "Fiction, Non-fiction, and the Film of Presumptive Assertion: A Conceptual Analysis." *Film Theory and Philosophy*, 173-202. Edited by Richard Allen and Murray Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Casebier, Allan. *Film and Phenomenology: Towards a Realist Theory of Cinematic Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Chen Xiaoqing (陈晓卿), interviewed by Yang Songtao (杨松涛), *Dialogue with Media Professional*, May 14, 2012.
- Clough, Patricia T. *Autoaffection: Unconscious Thought in the Age of Technology*. 1st ed. University of Minnesota Press. 2000.
- _____. "Affect and Control: Rethinking the Body 'Beyond Sex and Gender'." *Feminist Theory*, 359-364. 4(3). December 1. doi: 10.1177/146470011030043010.
- Corner, John. *The Art of Record: A Critical Introduction to Documentary*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996.
- Crawford, Peter Ian, and David Turton, eds. *Film as Ethnography*. Manchester: Manchester UP/ Granada Centre for Visual Anthropology, 1992.
- De Brigard, Emilie. "The History of Ethnographic Film." *Principles of Visual Anthropology*. Ed. Paul Hockings. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.
- Eaton, Mick. *Anthropology, Reality, Cinema: The Films of Jean Rouch*. London: BFI, 1979.
- Faris, James C. "Anthropological Transparency: Film, Representation, and Politics." *Film as Ethnography*, 171-182. Edited by Peter Ian Crawford and David Turton. Manchester: Manchester UP/Granada Centre for Visual Anthropology, 1992.

-
- Foley, Barbara. *Telling the Truth: The Theory and Practice of Documentary Fiction*. Ithica: Cornell UP, 1986.
- “Full Text of Hu Jintao’s Report at 17th Party Congress.” Xinhuanew.com. Last modified Oct 24, 2007. http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2007-10/24/content_6938749.htm
- Haack, Susan. *Evidence and Inquiry: Towards Reconstruction in Epistemology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
- He, Suliu(何苏六). *Zhongguo Dianshi Jilupian Shilun*. Beijing: Zhongguo Chuanmei Daxue Chubanshe, 2005.
- Hockings, Paul. *Principles of Visual Anthropology*. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.
- Jacobs, Lewis, ed. *The Documentary Tradition*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1979.
- Jiang Juan(姜娟). *Zhongguo Duli Jilupian Yanjiu – Zhuti, Guandian, Biaoda*. Beijing: Zhongguo Chuanmei Daxue Chubanshe, 2007.
- Jones, Rebecca, Edward S. Reed, and Margaret A. Hagan, “A Three Point Perspective on Pictorial Representation: Wartovsky, Goodman, and Gibson on Seeing Pictures,” 55-64. *Erkenntnis*, 15. 1980.
- Levin, G. Roy, ed. *Documentary Explorations*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1971.
- Lü Xinyu(吕新雨). *Jilu Zhongguo: Dangdai Zhongguo Xinjulu Yundong*. Beijing: Shenghuo•Dushu•Xinzhi Sanlian Shudian, 2003.
- Manovich, Lev. “The Practice of Everyday (Media) Life: From Mass Consumption to Mass Cultural Production?” 319-331. *Critical Inquiry* 35(2). 2009.
- Marr, David. *Vision: A Computational Investigation into the Human Representation and Processing of Visual Information*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1982.
- Massumi, Brian. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 2002.
- Meibing(梅冰) and Zhu Jingjiang(朱婧江). *Zhongguo Duli Julupian Dang’an*. Xi’an: Shanxi Shifan Daxue Chubanshe. 2004.
- Michael, Zryd. Rev. of *Representing Reality* by Bill Nichols. *Canadian Journal of Film Studies* 3.1. 83-86. 1994.
- _____. Rev. of Brian Winston’s *Claiming the Real*. *Film Quarterly* 50.2 (1996-97): 49-51.
- Mulvey, Laura. “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema.” *Screen* 16(3). 6-18. 1975.

-
- Negri, Antonio. "Value and Affect," *Boundary 2* 26 (2). 77-88. 1999.
- Nichols, Bill. *Ideology and the Image*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981.
- Ouyang Hongsheng(欧阳宏生). *Jilupian Gailun*. Chengdu: Sichuan Daxue Chubanshe, 2010.
- Richard, Norman. *On Humanism (Thinking in Action)*. London: Routledge. 2004.
- Sparshott, Francis. "Truth in Fiction." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 26, No. 1. 3-7. Spring 1967.
- Tagg, John. *The Burden of Representation: Essays on Photographies and Histories*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1988.
- White, Hayden. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality," 1-24. In *On Narrative*. Ed. W.J. T. Mitchell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Wikipedia, s.v. "A Bite of China," last modified Dec 9, 2014, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Bite_of_China
- Williams, Christopher, ed. *Realism in the Cinema*. London: Roulledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.
- William, Mazzarella. "Affect: What is it good for?" in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, edited by Saurabh Dube, 292. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Winston, Brian. *Claiming the Real: The Documentary Film Revisited.* London: BFO, 1995.
- Xiaochuan Shenjie (小川绅介), translated by Feng Yan (冯艳). *Shouge Dianying: Zhuixun Jilupian zhong Zhigaowushang de Xingfu*. Shanghai: Renmin Chubanshe, 2007.
- Yu Fanqi(于凡奇). *Zhongguo Duli Jilupian Shinian Zouxiang Yanjiu*. Guangdong: Jinan Daxue, 2011.