Západočeská univerzita v Plzni

Fakulta filozofická

Bakalářská práce

Film v kontextu sovětské a postsovětské etnografie

Yauheniya Hryb

Plzeň 2020

Západočeská univerzita v Plzni

Fakulta filozofická

Katedra antropologie

Studijní program Antropologie

Studijní obor Sociální a kulturní antropologie

Bakalářská práce

Film v kontextu sovětské a postsovětské etnografie

Yauheniya Hryb

Vedoucí práce:

Mgr. Tomáš Hirt, Ph.D.
Katedra antropologie
Fakulta filozofická Západočeské univerzity v Plzni

Plzeň 2020

Prohlašuji, že jsem práci zpracovala samostatně a použil(a) jen uvedených pramenů a literatury.

Plzeň, květen 2020   ……………………

Content

INTRODUCTION

Ethnographic film is a specific type of film within the documentary genre that represents and reflects a particular ethnographic reality. This type of film provides with ethnographic knowledge and may become a way of investigation. The soviet and post-soviet ethnographic filmmaking is interesting by its unexplored character and variable and changeable style. Each age produced different types of filming and research which could be captured and described. Not all the films and film project have been intentionally ethnographic but eventually provided with ethnographic information.

The subject of this work is two films from large ethnographic projects. These projects are described in details and presented in a broader context of the development of visual anthropology and ethnographic filmmaking in soviet and post-soviet times. Particular projects had been chosen for scrutiny according to subjective criteria of personal interest. These projects weren't initially ethnographic by nature; they had own different preconditions and purposes. However, during preparations and filming, the projects have unexpectedly acquired an ethnographic character. As a result, they both can be perceived and studied as ethnographic films. Also, they are exciting and meaningful in their art form and pragmatic content. Hence, the purpose of this work is to introduce the context that generally affects the filmmaking process, find appropriate film analysis methods and apply them to particular films from the mentioned projects. Detailed examination of the films from different angles is supposed to be conducted.

This work consists of three chapters, and each of them is divided into separated parts. The first chapter introduces the context of the appearance and development of ethnographic films in the Soviet and

post-soviet times and emphasises the films that were chosen for scrutiny. The first part is devoted to the history of ethnographic films, including a more detailed consideration of the first film project. The second part focuses specifically on the circumstances of the emergence of the second film project. The second chapter introduces possible methods of detailed analysis of ethnographic films. The first part presents Karl Heider's instruction of examination of ethnographic documentaries. The second part introduces some selected methods of a semiotics of cinema that are applicable to documentaries. These methods would be implemented in the last chapter. The third chapter is devoted to an analysis of chosen films introduced in the first chapter by techniques presented in the second chapter. The division is simple: the first part focuses on the first film, the second part concentrates on the second film.

1 THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

1.1   Ethnographic film in the Soviet Union and Russia

Ethnographic film is a way to represent ethnographical/anthropological knowledge. A film director represents a reality in extent he has understood it. His research pretends to be objective but still is subjective (not even inter-subjective). Methods of emotional influence can be used in such a type of film as ethnographic. Some concepts that are difficult for utterance may be expressed in a visual format. This type of documentary may be analysed from technical and artistic sides. This work pays special attention to cinematographic projects that involve ethnographic information through them a particular ethnographic reality can be perceived and reflected. Projects, that initially had own purposes, eventually started to overlap with ethnographic/anthropological purposes even operating different methods. These projects are revolutionary in their form but regular in their content. Ethnographic material combines with artistic methods of presentation.

Cinema came in the Russian Empire at the end of the XIX century and existed in the form of a newsreel. These newsreels were mostly about the Romanov family and the life of Lev Tolstoi, a famous old writer. Sometimes accidentally film directors captured sceneries of life of "ordinary people", but it wasn't an intention. Instead, B. Matuszewski and A. Yagelsky had been exploring the vast territory of the Russian Empire and shooting some material about life in Caucasus and Urals for commercial use rather than for intercultural communication. Then some directors and even organised film studios had arrived intending to make ethnographically oriented films about indigenous peoples of remote parts of Russia (like A. Drankov, N. Minervin and F. Bremer) (Batalin 2011: 8-9). They weren't ethnographers and specialised in cinematography, not in humanities

(but what can we expect in those days, even R. Flaherty wasn't an anthropologist).

After World War I and the revolution in Russia, there was a necessity to make efficient propaganda and shift the public mind to a new direction. A young revolutionary inspired student Denis Kaufman was matching this purpose perfectly. He became world-famous as Dziga Vertov subsequently. His project "Kino-Nedelya" starting in 1918 and "Kino-Pravda" starting in 1922 revealed some types of life of people from different social groups (Vertov 1966: 79). Vertov performed own cinematographic method under the bright slogans about new art, new truth in cinema and rejecting previous ("traditional") types of art of documentation. This type includes rapid cuts and montage as a main instrument to transform and perform reality. Later he proclaimed himself as an "observer" (not director) and had prepared to film and present reality "as it is", without professional actors, complicated montage, but with long cuts with simultaneous speech, and thereby violating his own rules (Roshal 1982: 28).

Vertov had attempted to express his new struggle in the film "The sixth part of the world". Initially, it had to become an advertisement of Gostorg, an organisation that managed foreign trade in an early period of the Soviet Union (Golovnev 2019: 1389). But the director decided to make it according to his principles of artistic work. Despite the fact it has an agitational task and a pompous form, the film may be considered as a specific ethnographic vision on existing reality. Vertov had sent eight teams of cameramen (he called them kinoki - cinema-eyes) to remote parts of the Soviet Union to film different wealthy lands and peoples. They had to study and record the whole economic cycle during the year for each ethnicity. Special attention should be paid to traditional domestic and economic activities like reindeer breeding, sheep farming, the fur trade. He tried to represent various ethnics and ways of living, catch as many details as possible from everyday life, peoples' struggle to survive in harsh

climate conditions. 26 thousand meters of the tape was produced during the journeys in total, only one thousand was used (Golovnev 2019: 1389-1392). In a relatively short film (only 73 minutes) the director has combined information from numerous expeditions, this fact determined shortness of each episode of the film dedicated to a single ethnic group. Later these cameramen had edited their expanded ethnographic films using shooted expeditions' material not included in the main film. For example, P. Zolotov had edited the "Tungus" film, Y. Tolchan - the film "Bukhara" (Aleksandrov 2018: 76). So, we can regard "the sixth part of the world" not as a single film but as a whole project. The main great idea was to show ordinary people uniting in their struggle to change the world, to work on behalf of economic development (don't forget it was a propaganda film). All the nations, according to the author, ought to have contributed to building a new socialistic world and have become a single nation over time. As a scent of revolution and changes was in the air, the time (the 20s) demanded a specific discourse (even if this term was not invented yet). An implementation lied in mass media propaganda which, besides its main goals, touched on ethnographic topics and finally facilitated developing of this science. Although this project is perceived as a documentary cinema, it is a piece of art either.

This project had inspired many people to investigate nationalities in the vast country, make ethnographically focused films or at least newsreels. For example, A. Litvinov has shot a film "Forest people" about Udege in taiga region with consultations with ethnographer V. Arseniev. Later he had some more film expeditions and produced a few prominent ethnographic films about northern peoples (Golovnev 2018: 68). But at the beginning of the 30s, it was obvious that creative inspirational age passed and was replaced by apprehensible mass culture. The new age promoted popular science. "Kino-atlas of the USSR" is another project dedicated to introducing some basic information about the country to the mass audience (Golovnev 2016).

Experiments with searching for new cinema language and form ceased. A number of travel films rose, but the scientific quality of them declined. This tendency defined a later situation.

After World War II propagandistic and scientific films still were in demand. By the 60s, about 25 newsreel studios were producing short non-fictional movies that were widely promoted and became a part of the life of a Soviet citizen. Such films had a unified structure and told of geographical characteristics of a particular region, its economy, agricultural and industrial production, portraits of labourers and artists (Aleksandrov 2018: 81). There was no space for improvisation and changes. Most of the studious were badly equipped: it wasn't possible to make long cuts and synchronous sound. Although there were filmed various travelogues with geographers' and ethnographers' consultation (Sarkisova 2017), they provided with a little ethnographical information and were ideologically biased. Directors had to choose what is more important for them: to show the authenticity of a particular regional situation (maybe in a bit monotonous manner) or to affect the audience efficiently. That is a reason modern ethnologists shouldn't fully trust such a type of films. At the same time, in some ethnographic institutions and picture laboratories (like Lomonosov Moscow State University or Leningrad State University) films with more scientific content appeared (Kubeev 1958: 47). Unfortunately, they weren't promoted as widely as mentioned scientific films and still had the same structure. Ethnographic filming was the main activity of scientists in Miklukho-Maclay Institute of Anthropology and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. It is the only example of such a situation. One of the researchers, A. Oskin, had conducted many film expeditions across the Soviet Union and had released many ethnographic films (Aleksandrov 2018: 82). In the 60s soviet ethnographers and film-makers have seen some western documentaries (like "Chronicle of the summer") and a novel genre of new-wave. It was an inspiration to find new means of cinematography

and investigate reality in a new way. Young directors throughout the country started to shoot something new for them and provoked a rise of interest to national and ethical issues. This facilitated the national self-determination process at the end of the 80s. One of the film-makers has become the president of Estonia (talking about Lennary Meri and his film "The winds of the Milky Way" about Ugro-Finnish peoples) (Aleksandrov 2018: 85).

These tendencies defined the later establishment of visual anthropology in a Soviet/Russian academic field. In 1987, the first festival of visual anthropology has occurred in Estonia. Previous forms of documentaries were dismissed; researchers came with the new vision on scientific cinema, new approaches to the film-making process, new theoretical attitudes concerning the filmed objects and reality. This fact urged many ethnologists to start their film projects, set new laboratories and support international communication with foreign colleagues in the late 80s and 90s (for example, like Asen Balikci, the professor of Melbourne University). Since that time visual anthropology is thriving in Russia. Numerous conferences, workshops, laboratory work, fieldwork, festivals, and even academic work are conducted in universities and other organisations across Russia. A significant one was the Lomonosov Moscow State University. Vladimir Magidov and Andrey Golovnev played an important role in establishing of ethnographical filmmaking there (Aleksandrov 2018: 86-93). Unfortunately, each former Soviet republic has a different attitude to this field of study and a different way of development of visual anthropology. Two tendencies of ethnographic filming can be found in Russia. Moscow institutions keep a tradition of making an ethnographic film as a film with means of aesthetic expression. Institute of Anthropology and Ethnography, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow State Pedagogical University, and the Higher School of Economics support this point of view and create various educational programs. On the contrary, in northern cities like

Novosibirsk, Tomsk, Samara and so forth there is a framed intention to make ethnographic films as a visual addition to presentations and teaching materials, not as an independent entity. In other respects, universities and museums produce and apply audio-visual materials, accumulate collections of them (Aleksandrov 2018: 95).

All the modern filmmakers and their ethnographic/anthropological projects are attractive for study. But unexpectedly one artistic project named Dau has emerged in 2019. It combines an artistic form with ethnographic content. Making of this project was mysterious, its premiere was scandalous. I strongly suggest this deserves close attention. The method of creation and presentation may contribute to visual anthropology and ethnographical filmmaking.

1.2 The Dau project

Dau is a multidisciplinary cinematographic project of Ilya Khrzhanovsky. It has been lasting for more than 10 years. Final material consists of about 700 hours including 13 feature films, 3 series, 4000 hours of audio records, scientific films and performances. All the material is integrated into a digital platform through which a viewer can be immersed in an "artificial" reality of a project (Belikov 2020).

Initially, Ilya Khrzhanovsky wanted to make a biopic about a soviet physicist, Nobel laureate, Lev Landau (who was nicknamed as "Dau" by all his friends) based on memoirs of his widow Kora subjectively describing their life in the Soviet Union from the 30s to the 60s. Preparation for the filming was overextended and problematic. Director has quickly found an actor for the lead. It was Teodor Currentzis, a Greek musician living in Russia. To find other roles, the director has conducted an audition among thousands of theatre actors

all over Russia. After that, he realised that professional actors couldn't play "conceived" characters and emotions properly. He concluded that a person in a film should have a certain organisation of his soul, letting him play and even live in a role. Curiously, Khrzhanovsky's previous film was designed in the same manner with the half of unprofessional actors in the cast. He unintentionally did it again. Starting to make a film in the "Lenfilm" studio in Saint-Petersburg with a written scenario, the director has realised that his created world is wider than he could have imagined (Khrzhanovsky 2020). He came to the idea to install large movie sets to make a story livelier. A group of designers and architects had built The Institute in Ukrainian Kharkov. It is supposed to be an autonomous facility with conditions for regular life inside. Thousands of auditions were conducted to inhabit this place. On this occasion, there were ordinary people, not professional actors. People were recruited according to their actual occupation. Mostly it was service personnel: cooks, cleaners, laundresses, vendors, guards and so forth. Then real scientists were invited there to work and live. Real military officers were working as NKVD employee. If an individual had a new profession, it would be changed according to an internal time of the Institute. All the people had to do their regular work but with a little condition: everybody should transform their appearance entering the facility (Shnurenko 2010).

Returning to the time issues in the Institute, it was different concerning "real" one. First of all, according to a concept, the Institute is located in Moscow. This has defined a time zone inside, it was one hour faster than "actual" Ukrainian. A year was different too: the story starts with the founding of the Institute in 1938 and ends with its destruction in 1968. Actors (if we can call them "actors") had to pass through 30 years while living there from 2008 to 2011. This time wasn't linear; it changed according to domestic rules and current events. People who lived in the facility have always been in that time (Khrzhanovsky 2020). People who lived in Kharkov and went to the

Institute every day to work had to go through the procedure of transformation and thus change their own time. A large number of garments were made to this project. Every item in a territory of the Institute was designed for an appropriate time. Nothing modern could break into the facility; even food has been repacked. Real prison guards controlled an implementing of this protocol. Hence all the workers and visitors had a sense of body search entering the Institute as it might have been at the arbitrary 40s (Shnurenko 2010). As the director says, actors had accustomed to such transitions and included it in their worldview. Interestingly, characters are ageing during that long time. This problem was solved by specific greasepaint that actors could wear every time and refresh only once a day. Consequently, they saw themselves older than they were. As a result, it affected their self-perception and behaviour, convince them of the realness of imposed age (Khrzhanovsky 2020).

All these technical aspects helped create a reality that nevertheless never existed. Although this reproduction was accurate in details, it still was another reality that impresses by its absolute realness. Ambience returned actors to the imaginary Soviet Union (an eternal seemingly unchangeable world) and thus provoked hidden senses of something familiar and apprehensible. As well as there was no scenario and general plan, participants were free to act whatever they think is right. The film director didn't manage the progression; he sometimes instigated an action by adding new personages or circumstances. Generally, Khrzhanovsky had chosen people for a project according to his notion of a relevant character of each person that allows him to integrate into predisposed reality, change it in a certain way. Director says that he approximately imagined what to expect from each actor and where is he going in this reality but has never known it exactly (Khrzhanovsky 2020). This particular reality was designed by its participants and not dramatically influenced by the filming crew. Therefore the question of authorship is relevant. The

director insisted that the final version of a project is under the influence of participants, camera (as a part of a process of producing reality), editors (with their intimate relation to the raw material) and spectators that perceive and interpret it. Own life experience and experience through watching forms estimation system for further analysis of own personality.

Why the Dau may be perceived as an anthropological project? As it was mentioned above, there was no scenario. This "artificial" reality had a range of protocols inside. People there were living their ordinary life within conventions. However, actual life has inherent conventions too. They were free to act. Historic dress allowed them to escape responsibility in part. An isolated space, a limited number of people induced to build relationships with each other. The director started to film after half of the year due to waiting for the emergence of personal relations (Khrzhanovsky 2020). Appeared social structure was undoubtingly real as well as all the emotions and attitudes. People came there with an accumulated experience that affected their further behaviour (like in a real life). None of the filming crew instructed actors what to do. All the occasions derive from the free will of personages. They participated under their real names. Their reality was "blinking" (Khrzhanovsky 2020). On the one hand, actors didn't act but lived emotions. On the other hand, they minded the conventional character of occurring. Thus, their reality was "real" and "not real" simultaneously. The Institute created a life that could have been real in the Soviet era; a life that may be called "reconstructed". Instead, there was reproduced an existing modern reality in a historical entourage. As the director says, alongside known atmosphere of a Soviet institution, old forgotten rules of behaviour and thinking have awakened. He was surprised that young people have also felt these rules and followed them (Khrzhanovsky 2020).

An initial game format assumed consciousness of participants about befalling. This means actors should have realised that extreme

violence would not be allowed (at least physical). But they believed in the realness of circumstances. As a result, fear, anger, hate and a range of strong negative feeling were real and excited people to action. The director insists on the fictional character of the film. At the same time, he assumes that in many years this project would have become a testimony about modern people (even existing in different circumstances) (Khrzhanovsky 2020).

The situation with video material is ambiguous. The director says the films are only trailers to a whole digital platform. The platform will give access to particular scenes of the life of participants. A spectator may choose a story he is interested in and proceed further within a developing storyline to other videos. In this way, an ethnographic material stays segmented and should be perceived beyond the cinematographic framework. Fortunately, this material was assembled to particular films according to personages, events, places, developing storylines and so forth (Belikov 2020). The films were edited by the dramatic rules of narration that influenced a final perception of it. That means it is possible to choose only one film for further analysis.

2 METHODS OF FILM ANALYSIS

2.1 Analysis of form

This chapter is dedicated to methods of analysis of visual ethnographic material, respectively films. Criteria of analysis differ from usual methods regarding the peculiarity of ethnographic documentary. Special attention should be paid to representing of ethnographic reality (although a term "reality" is relative; the [ethnographic] reality is constructed and adjusted in a moment of research and filming through academic concepts). However, the movie is always manipulative and represents a director's point of view, his comprehension of occurring. Besides that, an ethnographic film is still acceptable for the endeavour of scientific analysis. The analysis can be provided by examination of technical aspects, conditions of ethnographic research, content and artistic approaches of creating meaning. Karl Heider's instruction from his book "Ethnographic film" and Jury Lotman's interpretation of a concept of semiotics would be considered in this chapter.

Karl Heider adduced a range of attributes that are appropriate for film analysis (Heider 2006). These attributes are useful for all the film genres, but he adjusted them exactly for ethnographic cinema and added more attributes according to ethnographic particularities for complete and accurate analysis. The list of the attributes is demanded in this work to explain the way of the further scrutiny in chapter 3. Additionally, I should say that this author regards ethnographic cinema as cinema first of all, and then as something related to ethnography. This means he considers it more as art for the general public, not an only specific facility for scientific purposes. This approach expresses an emphasis on an entertaining component to make the film watchable.

The first attribute is the appropriateness of sound (Heider 2006: 51). Although the film is taken as a visual work, the sound plays its indisputable role in the whole perception. Sound can be synchronous and "wild". Synchronous sound is recorded during the shooting, "wild" one is an additional sound that is recorded separately, like a narration reading or noise. Surprisingly, accompanying sounds could be taken from other shootings or recordings or even places to make an appropriate effect in a particular film. Speech of the characters may be translated or not (if it is redundant for narration). Music may be native or alien depending on the goal and the means of the author. The next attribute is narration (Heider 2006: 54). Narration is an explanatory text accompanying an image in ethnographic film. It may be of two types: "added information" (new information comparing to the visuals) and "visual relevancy" (similar information like in visuals). It is essential to make a narration correct, not redundant and over-wordy, but also appropriate to an image. A narration may clarify an occasion or place it in a larger context. Ethnographic films are likely based on an explicit theory (Heider 2006: 58), that means that they are usually not a pure description of something, but a projection of existing concepts. It is connected with printed materials (Heider 2006: 59). An ethnographic film may be based on a particular ethnographic work or may be supplemented by written material. In any case, printed material is demanded to broaden the context of the film actions, explain some aspect in details and not to overload an image with excessive narration. If a film is accompanied by a voice, it has its point of view (Heider 2006: 60). An ethnographer can say something about the image on a screen. Or characters of the film may comment on their activities or tell the story of their lives. Even a silent film has a range of specific shots in a particular sequence. Each film always has its' point of view, regardless of a film kind: descriptive or explanatory. They both are biased and can't pretend to say "truth". It is difficult to explain an ethnographic context and try to stay impartial. A description seems like a more accessible way to provide "objective" information about

actuality. For this reason, such an approach was considered as more "scientific" and was often used for ethnography.

The next attribute is holism (Heider 2006: 64). Anthropology defines itself as a social science uses a holistic principle in research. That means it tries to embrace all the aspects of an investigated culture. For this, behavioural and physical contextualisation is significant (Heider 2006: 66). Physical contextualisation describes a landscape, place where events in a film occur for a feeling of the integrity of a whole story. Behavioural one is essential to introduce characters, to find a meaning of their actions in a particular culture, finally to make a narration comprehensible. Those two attributes are necessary for further analysis. We should mention an aspect of the ethnographer's presence (Heider 2006: 67). It is an undeniable fact that an ethnographer and/or film crew interfere in the life of the "indigenous" filmed people and has an impact on them in a particular way. As a result, characters behave a different way than they do any other time. This should be shown in a film, this impact on occurring in order not to mislead a viewer, to display an action not as perfectly "natural" because it isn't. Some films mention the presence of ethnographer or even show him interacting with characters, some of them don't. In any case, ethnographic films may be ranged according to their attitude towards the ethnographer's presence.

One of the most important attributes is the whole act (Heider 2006: 70). This concept means completeness of action (or cycle). Continuance of action may vary from a few seconds to a few years. An ethnographic film usually tries to catch and understand an ethnographic "reality" (it is an aim of ethnology and every other science). The right approach to do it is to anticipate an action as a single phenomenon, distinguish its beginning, peak and end, and record it completely. Sometimes a film director (or ethnographer) may not be able to identify a whole act and records only some parts of it. The value of such shooting is lower because it doesn't represent a

particular reality. But sometimes it is made for strong emotional impact on the viewer if a film is more artistic (it is possible with a different interpretation of the meaning of ethnographic film). Often it is easy to notice only a peak of an act, but a director should be careful to see a beginning (it also may be reconstructed later) and lead a story to its logical end. The whole act is more a structural form, it can be affected by the culture of a director (or ethnographer) in using some cinematographic cliché, which is common for western movie-making. Information in a film (visual and audial) should be adequate for a particular topic and viewers. It means that a film shouldn't be overloaded with information to make it watchable, even despite the whole act. An anthropologist can try to reduce some detailed shots and scenes for a mass audience. Such a thesis in these attributes based on the book by Karl Heider emphasises an artistic kind of ethnographic film.

The next attribute is closely related to the previous one, narrative stories (Heider 2006: 76). It examines a film if it is a complete story, or only some loose episodes, or even a sequence of unrelated to each other shots. The whole bodies attribute is a manner of camera work (Heider 2006: 78). Close-up shots are common for featured films for a greater emotional effect; therefore they are used in ethnographic films. But is it appropriate for a genre that is ought to "show the truth"? The film that shows sometimes absolutely different cultures should be fulfilled by important information like body motions. There is a recommendation to avoid close-up shots in ethnographic films because holistic perspective may not be achieved, but at the same time, some cinematographic methods can be used. The next attribute is a bit similar to the previous: whole interactions (Heider 2006: 82). Most ethnographic films don't depict real verbal or non-verbal communication, because it is too difficult to catch it real. In some cases, editing may make the interaction more vivid, but a live one is preferable to show nuances of the process. Whole people attribute

deliberates over specific people in a film (Heider 2006: 84). Ethnographic work, a printed material, usually (not always) describes theories and the entire situation and doesn't pay special attention to individuals. Therefore an ethnographic film based on such a work has a choice to describe people as a faceless mass or tell a personal story (which is more emotionally engaged).

One of the most important aspects of the filmmaking process is distortion (Heider 2006: 85). Every stage of the process is affected by someone's choice: a director chooses an act to film, a cameraman decides what to film, and an editor selects shots from a videotape. As a result, it is a pertinent question to ask if such a film endeavours to reflect the reality as anthropology should. It tries. There are some types of distortions according to film aspects. Time in a storyline can be condensed or real, or be absent (in case of a range of detached stories). The film may display an actual sequence of events or compound a scene from shots taken separately at different times. A tremendous question in anthropology is an influence on investigated objects by the fact of the presence of the anthropologist. The filming process is not an exception. This sort of behavioural distortion is uncontrolled and almost can't be reduced. This problem may be solved by using a hidden camera, but it is more an ethic question. Distortions may also be intentional. A director may ask people to reconstruct their behaviour in some events, to "act" on the "stage" for own reasons (for example, to prove his theories), or interrupt an action flow to solve technical issues. All the distortions can be explained and justified later in a printed additional work or during the film. This step will help viewers to understand a particular reality and the way its construction during filmmaking. The last attribute is an attitude to culture change. Society is not stable, ethnographic works should pay attention to its development over time. The ethnographic film should not show a "timeless present", if possible, but analyse culture changes (Heider 2006: 101). Often a film intends to make a statement about the

displayed society, generalise that; this film performs an ordinary life. This may be true or not depending on the factors described above.

2.2 Analysis of structure

All of the previous analysis attributes are useful for ethnographic film scrutiny. But criteria are rather "technical" and estimate an extent a particular film is ethnographic. Even though they involve valuable guidance for documentary analysis, it is still highly-specialised. For a deeper understanding of such films (and chosen films in this work), it would be expedient to use some approaches of analysis of an inner structure of a film and meaning of its separated parts. This would make a viewer comprehend a film, grasp the sense of it. As semiotics handles signs and their relation to each other and the whole system, we can apply such an approach to documentary analysis. Most researchers use semiotics to investigate fiction films (as they are more common than the others). But fiction films and documentaries are not that different in their styles, use similar editing technics and follow the same narrative rules to achieve a dramatic effect. That is the reason why we can apply these practices to analyse documentary film either. The brochure "Semiotics of cinema" by Jury Lotman was used as the main inspiration source for analysis. It could be possible to use some other works from other researchers (maybe even turn to the classics like Peirce), but especially this interpretation of the semiotics theory in an analysis of structure seems to be comprehensive, coherent, and convenient to apply.

Information, in general, may be transmitted verbally or graphically. If verbal way prevails in our life, it doesn't mean it is the main. Lotman distinguishes pictorial and conventional signs (Lotman 1973: 11). They are both conditional and relative, intersect and interact with each other, may exchange their qualities. Charles Peirce elaborated a theory of signs and grouped signs in categories such as icon (an image of an object), index (a direct reference to an object)

and symbol (a conventional meaning of an object) (Peirce 1955). These types of signs may overlap. They also create a relation according to the characteristics of a type.

First of all, the reality is an illusion in a film (by the fact of time distance between shooting and watching) (Lotman 1973: 16). Even documentary cinematography - search for truth - turns into artistic means of comprehension. A film is constructed of shots. A shot is a single fragment of reality (Lotman 1973: 31). It not only represents reality but also fill it with meaning. Director (or/and cameraman) has chosen a frame to represent an "existing" reality. It is an intensified action, maybe even naturally provoked by the camera, not a linear life. Furthermore, a shot is covered by a veil of director's comprehension of an action. It seems that space doesn't exist behind a shot (Lotman 1973: 106), but especially in the ethnographic film, we should mind an independent life course.

Cinema experience is an act of communication. A sender transmits an encoded message in a certain context through a channel to a receiver (Lotman 1973: 48). It is a basis for formulating analysing principles. Some elements of a cinema language are still involved in a documentary. For example, an interruption during narration creates a semantic node and a further meaning (Lotman 1973: 43). Metaphor and metonymy encode information and thus produce a secondary sense (Lotman 1973: 52).

Cinematographic meaning is meanings that are expressed through means of cinema and unfeasible without it. Cinematographic meaning conveyed by coherence of semiotic elements. Such visual images are juxtaposed with similar images or the same image at another time, or conjecturally with real-life events (Lotman 1973: 57). If juxtaposition is a grammar of a film, then its lexicon is photos of real people and objects that become signs of them. Such signs abandon their material meaning and acquire more abstract content. Images of

objects turn into a network of abstract concepts. But the main sign is a human being. All his body parts, gestures and behaviour are a wide field of possible metaphors and interpretations (Lotman 1973: 58). It is also connected with the role of an actor (characters in a documentary/ethnographic films are still actors in some sense "playing" themselves). Their reality is "blinking": all their previous experience embedded in a film reality (Lotman 1973: 121). However, such a reality pretends to become "actual". At the same time, it isn't because of the newly created reality of a film.

Distinct elements assemble in an abstract level in a chain through montage - a medium of formation of artistic value. Repetition is a significant element of narration designing a cycle (of events or thoughts) that generates associations and logic. Montage creates a similarity of a text from elements and sequences (Lotman 1973: 64). It is a way of creation of cinematographic meaning. Montage compares and contrasts different shots in a sequence. Thus, the whole structure of cinematic narration can be discrete (consisting of separated signs) and continuous (meaning as an entire text). That means different meaning hides in sentences and text simultaneously. For such a chain, images should have a common denominator. Distinct shots may be arranged as a sequence or as a transformation of a shot in time, a development of action inside (Lotman 1973: 82). In general, organised shots limit a course of life, emphasise the most important (corresponding director's plan) and leave the rest.

Director's plan is revealed in a storyline (even a documentary has it). It follows the same dramatic rules as a fiction film and consists of background description and extraordinary event interrupting an "ordinary life". An entire structure of a storyline is paradigmatic (comprehensible without context), single actions are syntagmatic (integrated into context) (Lotman 1973: 87). Dramatic technics in a documentary film (including ethnographic) make the film watchable and have an emotional impact. Director may apply various artistic

methods to explain his idea. Interestingly, a higher extent of conventionality makes a feeling of higher credibility to a narration, forces a viewer to believe in realness of events (Lotman 1973: 80). Whereas seeming accuracy looks "too real to be true".

We should also ascertain what is happening to time in a film (Lotman 1973: 101). It is always present on a screen, but the passage of time may vary in different parts of a film. This affects inner created reality and its external perception.

The documentary is not a finished text. It is not possible to conduct a correct analysis of such a film as a text with semiological principles. In this case, documentary (especially ethnographic) is a dynamic entity including the process of watching, comprehension, and emotional reaction. However, individual parts of a film may be perceived as "phrases" and "sentences". Being together, they create an additional meaning along with an intentional one (Lotman 1973: 11). In this sense, the film is a process of continual cognition of a displayed reality, seeking "truth". At the same time, a film director shows us his perception of reality (a subjective one), it attaches importance to personal experience. An author tells a story about reality as he has understood it by chosen means of narration. It is important to remember it during analysis.

We should take into account relativity of such instructions and their approximateness. Analysing of every specific film is different because of using different filming technics, being in distinct semantic fields and goal-settings. However, we should pay much attention to basic film elements like mise-en-scene, sound, camera and montage.

3 ANALYSIS OF FILMS

3.1 „The sixth part of the world"

The film "The sixth part of the world" was made in 1926 in Moscow (The Soviet Union). This time and place determined some characteristics of a film, including technical issues. First of all, this film was silent just because technological progress didn't allow to record synchronous sound. Then, the whole cinematographic industry was nationalised had to obey governmental directives. All the directors in the Soviet Union should have passed through many commissions and committees to have an opportunity to make a film and to release it later. The industry was subsidised by the government, therefore directors ought to follow the rules. As a result, films were biased (at least partly) in favour of dominating ideology of the Soviet Union to create a new type of socialistic society. A situation with Dziga Vertov was another: he was ideologically biased by his nature in favour of the Bolshevist revolution. He believed strongly in the Marxist and Soviet idea. He urged to create a new form of art for the sake of the bright future. Since Dziga Vertov's worldview corresponded with official ideology at that time, he had an artistic freedom to express his unique style (Golovnev 2019: 1388; 1392). As it was mentioned above, this film was made by combining shots from different expeditions to remote parts of the Soviet Union. The aim was to catch elements of everyday life and spiritual culture, mention a position of women in society and show a Sovietization and positive change of these cultures during the time of socialism. The source material was much longer than the final version of the film. However, it was used to edit other ethnographic films (Golovnev 2019: 1390).

This chapter is dedicated to film analysis according to criteria elaborated in the second chapter. These criteria of different approaches will be applied concurrently. As this film is silent, no sound

was recorded during expeditions. Each film screening was accompanied by live music played simultaneously. But a music choice differs from place to place. Therefore the [silent] film is accompanied by titles - a written text between shots. In the case of this film, such a text forms a narration, divides it into separated parts, logical sentences. If the title usually adds information to an image, in this instance an image was added to the title. It is a part of an artistic technique of Dziga Vertov. Each shot with a text is a slogan, a statement for something against something else. This statement is strong enough to become an imaginary centre of gravity for surrounding images. It seems that shots clarify the text and always refer to it thus forming indexical relationships.

Although cameramen had year-long expeditions, lived in an appointed area with local peoples they still were cameramen. They conducted ethnographical researches according to their task and requirement. But they didn't regard it in scientific terms. However, some films have become a unique testimony of the life of some peoples or significant rituals (like Vogul's Bear festival) (Golovnev 2019: 1391). None of the expeditions was based on scientific ethnographic works. They also weren't accompanied by printed material broadening the context. Dziga Vertov had written some articles in magazines, but he had rather argued his artistic method than commented on preparations. The next analytical attribute (voice: point of view) is problematic. Silent films haven't got any sound including voice. Filmed people speak with a cameraman and describe their actions, but their voices are mute, there are no subtitles. They can't speak for themselves and show an emic perspective of their reality. This attribute is more about an author's attitude toward the described object. Interestingly, at the beginning, the film shows an auditorium watching this film. By that, this film uses meta-language and acquires features of an independent conscious subject that can speak for itself. It turns to a spectator and displayed entities (people or

objects) simultaneously (it repeats the words "I see" and "you" frequently). There is a feeling that this written film's "voice" is ideologically biased but doesn't belong to the director although agrees with him. Even if several cameramen tried to be objective during their researches (unfortunately, we know nothing about it), the director would select shots to create a concept and express his ideas.

The next attribute is about physical and behavioural contextualisation. The director gives a brief introduction to the place of shooting, naming an ethnos living there and depicting a landscape of their natural area. As people in the frame are doing something, the film gives a short description of their actions (or at least a hint to comprehend it). Still, it is not a demanded detailed explanation. But it is not so critical within this genre and film's purpose. A presence of a camera (and/or ethnographer), along with local people, has an obvious impact on them. Some of them are looking at the camera or say something to cameraman. We can't discuss the extent of an observer's influence on local communities. Along with the purpose to show various ethnic groups, such an impact is not crucial. External influence has reached filmed peoples long before expeditions came. Fragments of the film usually show short parts of continuous actions. According to these elements, we can conclude that the whole acts were filmed correctly. But the final version of the film includes only some appropriate parts for a narration, usually the most impressive. For example, ritual murder of a deer was shown in the most active phase - a murder, not in preparational or conclusive phase (but I am convinced the source material has it all). According to the purpose to acquaint viewers with "exotic" peoples, this approach might be effective.

The attribute of narrative stories is another problematic attribute. The concept of the film is ultimate. Under an artistic method of Dziga Vertov, various distinct elements are used to create an integral story. In this particular case, this is not a story but a prolonged statement. Detached shots are juxtaposed in a sequence to achieve an emotional

effect. As a result, each cinematographic sentence is complete in its meaning. The meaning occurs within contradictions, it is emphasised by contrast images. High speed of footage changing evokes a feeling of chaos in some scenes. This situation was achieved by an elaborated montage. Consequently, each scene has numerous shots that have been filmed in different places at different time, but they were put together in a storyline. This situation is ambiguous: on the one hand, the film consists of a sequence of unrelated components relieving each other; on the other hand, the story is complete. Creation of a concept prevails over accuracy.

"The sixth part of the world" is not dedicated to a story of one personage or one group. According to a character of this film, both cinematographic and ideological, an individual storyline or action is not possible. People are united and function as a whole. Although close-up shots and portraits are common for this film, each personality is incorporated into the range of the same personalities. They are united in their differences. However, real emotions appear on faces, it makes an impact on viewers. Their motions and gestures are perfectly seen. This fact adds some [ethnographic] objectivity to the footage. But mainly people are shown as a [revolutionary] mass. People are interacting with each other, doing the same work. Some of these scenes are staged; some of them seem to be real. Conducting a ritual, wool shearing of walking on the town street - all of these activities is a "natural" part of people's life. Their communication pretends to be real too.

An attribute of culture change was perfectly reviewed in this film. The main idea of a project consists in progress (technological, economic, social, and political) in a newly formed country. Indigenous peoples are initially shown as primitive with their traditional culture, religion and economic activities. Then we see they have modern (for 1926) commodities over time. Eventually, they participate in modern global trade combining it with the organised educational process. In

the end, people deny religion and patriarchal organisation. The film manipulates facts and tells about the consciousness of these nations in their endeavours to help the government to modernise the country. An image shows us people work voluntarily, deliver their goods and finally leave a traditional way of life to become a single industrialised nation. This artistic method generally manipulates the narration. Original shots are turned out from natural context and posed in a sequence organised by dramatic principle to achieve a greater emotional effect. For example, a juxtaposition of shot with an opposite meaning to emphasise a contrast ("capitalistic" dinner party along with working slaves in colonies) or to model similarity and create a metonymy (icebreaker moves forward and machines are working - a syntagmatic symbol of progress). There had been also used a technique of overlapping images (a man and working machine) to summarise meanings of them and create a new one (a man as a mechanism acting for the sake of the bright socialistic future). The camera is static or moving depending on the style of each cameraman. The film also operates with the abstract idea of space. Wide shots of homogeneous scenery are used for the concept of distance. Close-ups of people, animals or machines are used to confirm the presence in imaginary [cultural] "here" (even speaking about remote lands). The time accelerates with the image of working machines as a symbol of inevitable progress and keeps the real speed (a slower one) with images of traditional [=primitive] living. But a time of the scenes is not linear as single shots were taken from different footages from a different time and place. Although, the whole film is formed by consistent thoughts that are developing according to the internal time of the film and supported by various shots. This sequence creates an inner flow of narration. In this case, the time of this "flow" is linear.

The main idea of this film was to show the creation of a new society all peoples living on the territory of a newly formed country. The film presents them working for the sake of general prosperity and

technological progress. The artistic method of the director is expressed in rapid succession of the shots with a similar or different meaning. It has an emotional impact on a viewer. Although the director doesn't get into ethnographic material, he creates an independent narration with its help.

3.2 „Dau. Natasha"

Video material of the project was divided into several films. This form is pertinent for presentation in film festivals and further release. The film "Dau. Natasha" was edited according to the story of a waitress that was working in a cafe in the Institute in the 1950s. This film was one of the two films of the Dau project presented in the Berlin international film festival in 2020 (the second was "Dau. Degeneration"). "Dau. Natasha" was nominated on the "Golden Bear" - an award for the best film of a year. But it finally received the "Silver Bear". More precisely, a cameraman Jurgen Jurges has got this award for an "outstanding artistic contribution". Especially for the project he had invented a method allowing shooting a film without extra light, only with the natural light of conventional light sources in rooms (Khrzhanovsky, 2020). In return, this fact let not to create a film set from the living and working area, but integrate equipment naturally into a facility. A reaction to this film was ambiguous. Some critics were accepting of it and called it a new form of cinematographic art (Macnab 2020). The others doubted a relevance of violence (both physical and psychological) in modern cinema and the ethics of exploitation of actors and showing their real life (Zelvensky 2020). In any case, this project is remarkable and deserves attention.

As in the first part of this chapter, this film should be analysed according to criteria elaborated in the second chapter. The first attribute regards the sound. The whole sound is synchronous and was recorded during the shooting. It seems that no "wild" sound was added

to a narration. But sometimes surrounding sounds are intensified to create a tense atmosphere. That is a common artistic method. There is no additional music except a native one playing on camera during a party in the Institute. Since a purpose was to depict life as it is, there was no definite reason to add music in an editing phase. Speech of the Russian-speaking characters is translated and presented in the form of subtitles for foreign spectators. Speech of the characters with other languages (only one, Frenchman, in this film) is translated to other characters by an interpreter inside a story. There is no explanatory text accompanying and image. All the information is provided by a narration. As the action was spontaneous, there was no explicit theory expressed in filming either; no scientific concepts the whole film was based on. Initially, the idea of the Dau project was based on a book of memoirs of Kora Landau (as it was mentioned in the first chapter). Later the project became much more extensive. 4000 of audio records od dialogues between characters were made during the years of the project. The director had transcribed it all and had a plan to publish it (Khrzhanovsky 2020). Some of the scenes in "Dau. Natasha" may coincide with certain parts of this text. Consequently, the film is accompanied by written material. The director (an "ethnographer" in this case) doesn't have a voice, he doesn't comment on anything explicitly or implicitly. Surprisingly, the film doesn't have a point of view; it depicts a piece of the life of an ordinary woman. It doesn't sympathise or accuse her actions. Maybe it is among the few examples of almost objective and truthful movies. This particular film is not holistic. It describes only some locations inside the Institute and only a restricted number of participants. However, some of the rest of them are mentioned or even emerge in a film but don't play any significant role. Actions of the main characters are contextualised but not explained. Their motivation is hidden; we can only assume.

An attribute of a whole act is controversial concerning "Dau. Natasha". On the one hand, actions were captured entirely, from

beginning to end. The camera stayed for hours to observe happening. On the other hand, this film was edited especially for the festival, obeyed its rules about timing, and adapted distinct scenes to a format of a feature film. As a result, this film doesn't include complete scenes with all the phases of actions. But a digital platform of the project (described in the first chapter) will contain extended scenes. According to the character of this film, there is a distinct homogeneous storyline. Every part of the film connected with a plot. "Dau. Natasha" is not divided into separated stories. However, other films of the Dau project may be constructed by different rules of narration.

Since this film is dedicated to the life of one woman, it corresponds with the attribute of whole people. Each character is a person in this project; nobody was left in the background. Particularly in this film, some [irrelevant] personages appear as a nameless mass. However, they have their plots beyond. Development of a story involves communication between actors. Each following action was triggered by the previous one. Characters interact with each other in various ways evoking strong emotions like hate, joy, lust, fear. As we remember the essence of the project to show an actual life, the behaviour was natural. There was no reason to hide bodies. On the contrary, they are revealed during interactions. Body motions, gestures are shown in details. That constructs personages and promotes empathy for them. Culture change is the next appropriate attribute. The life in the Institute was developing by internal rules that were similar to a real situation. Communication, occurring, events were an engine of a social change over time. Only a few days are described in this particular film. Therefore we can see a personal transformation that gives us a hint to its impact on further social change.

One of the essential parts of the analysis is an estimation of probable distortions. A cameraman chose scenes to shoot by unscientific terms of "vibrant energy" in people's dialogues. The

camera was hidden. Moreover, actors had accustomed to it within several years. That is the reason a presence of camera didn't affect actions. But life didn't stop behind the frame. Although each shot captured only a small part of space and time, other space was implied. Editing process added an emotional colouring to the film by selection of shots. Although distinct scenes were quite emotional by its content, montage has deformed them and transformed into something new.

Camera movements affect the perception of a film. The camera is never static, it always pursues characters, regards them. A viewer may have a feeling he is personally there intervening occurring. It has an all-embracing emotional effect on the auditorium. But that was a purpose. The time in the film is linear; events unfold one after another. Speed of shots is always regular. Elements from a different time (like memories) are not integrated into the narration. There is an effect of real life in a frame. Space is always understandable. It is not constructed theatrically; it doesn't have hidden senses on the background. This space is a working and living area. Therefore it is created by inhabitants for functional purposes. A meaning that we can find here is spontaneous and unintentional. But it does not detract from the artistic quality of this film. Some distractions in the film may be caused by actors. They intend to bring with them own vision of a personage. In this case, character traits were in demand for a "role" that was indistinguishable from real personality. Finally, a juxtaposition of shots has formed and presented this story. Montage acts as an acceleration of life of the main character. Its only function is to show us the main point of happening by cutting long scenes to a shorter format. Each scene is a complete sentence with a meaning That is the reason "seams" in the narration are rare and don't have a function of compare and contrast but combination and illustration. each following scene explains the previous one and adds new information to a narration. That gives some hints to the motivation of characters and their unuttered feelings.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this work was to analyse some ethnographic films of Soviet and post-soviet times. Films for examination were chosen from large cinematographic projects. For better understanding their background, the historical context was introduced in this work. The history of the development of ethnographic filmmaking was contradictional. Each time had its own attitudes toward ethnography, processes in society, and the role of cinematography in general. This fact affected the concept of films, the process of preparations to shootings, film editing and its subsequent release. Reviewed cinematographic projects were placed in a context that partly clarifies the purpose and method of their emergence. In addition to the historical background, concept and a case of occurrence was considered. This presented a broad view of examined projects. Only one film from each project was chosen for further analysis. The next step was to introduce methods of such analysis. For this reason, some criteria within existing concepts were selected. They are briefly described and explained depending on the purpose of their implication. Finally, chosen films were analysed according to elaborated criteria. Analysis of "technical" features of the films revealed their correspondence to criteria of ethnographic filmmaking. This examination also considered an artistic form of a particular film, its inner structure, relationships between single shots, and their organisation. All of these aspects let to conceive an emotional impact that films create.

REFERENCES

ALEKSANDROV, Evgeny. 2018. The role of documentary filmmaking in formation of visual anthropology in Russia. EtnoAntropologia. 2018, Vol. 6, 1, pp. 63-99.

BATALIN Victor, MALYSHEVA Galina. 2011. Istorija Rossijskogo gosudarstvennogo arhiva kinofotodokumentov. 1926–1966 g. Saint-Petersburg : Liki Rossii, 2011.

BELIKOV, Egor. 2020. "Ja chelovek pravil": Ilya Khrzhanovsky otvechajet na glavnyje voprosy o "Dau", objuze i Tesake. Interview Afisha Daily. [Online] III 3, 2020. [Cited: V 15, 2020.] https://daily.afisha.ru/.

GOLOVNEV Ivan, GOLOVNEVA Elena. 2016. Vizualizaciya regiona sredstvami kinematografa (na primere «Kinoatlasa SSSR»),. Izvestia. Ural Federal University Journal. 2016, Vol. 22, 3, pp. 146-151.

GOLOVNEV, Ivan. 2018. Fenomen sovetskogo etnograficheskogo kino (tvorchestvo A. A. Litvinova). Moscow : IAE RAS, 2018.

GOLOVNEV, Ivan. 2019. Visual Anthropology of Dziga Vertov. Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. 2019, Vol. 61, 4, pp. 1386-1403.

HEIDER, Karl. 2006. Ethnographic film. Texas : University of Texas Press, 2006.

KHRZHANOVSKY, Ilya. 2020. Projekt "Dau": mezhdu iskusstvom i antropologiej. [interv.] G. Kostrov E. Petrovskaja. Anthropological school in Moscow, Moscow : youtube.com, IV 30, 2020.

KUBEEV, Boris. 1958. Nauchnaja kinodokumentacija , vypolnennaja v vuzah v 1945-1957 gg . Moscow : Sovetskaya nauka, 1958.

LOTMAN, Jury. 1973. Semiotika kino i problemy kinoestetiki. Tallinn : Eesti Raamat, 1973.

MACNAB, Geoffrey. 2020. DAU. Natasha review, Berlin Film Festival. Independent. [Online] II 26, 2020. [Cited: V 15, 2020.] https://www.independent.co.uk/.

PEIRCE, Charles. 1955. Philosophical Writings of Peirce. [ed.] Justus Buchler. New York : Dover Publications, 1955.

ROSHAL, Lev. 1982. Dziga Vertov. Moscow : Iskusstvo, 1982.

SARKISOVA, Oksana. 2017. Screening Soviet Nationalities: Kulturfilms from the Far North to Central Asia. London : I. B. Tauris, 2017.

SHNURENKO, Igor. 2010. "Kak nachinalsa "Dau" - vpechatlajushij i neverojatno dorogoj projekt v istorii kino". Sobaka.ru. [Online] 2010. [Cited: V 15, 2020.] http://www.sobaka.ru/.

VERTOV, Dziga. 1966. Stat'i, dnevniki, zamysly. Moscow : Iskusstvo, 1966.

ZELVENSKY, Stanislav. 2020. Dnevnik berlinskogo kinofestivala. Afisha Daily. [Online] II 27, 2020. [Cited: V 15, 2020.] https://daily.afisha.ru/.

RESUMÉ

The purpose of this work was to analyse selected films by elaborated methods within a context of development of ethnographical filmmaking in the Soviet Union and modern Russia. These films were chosen according to criteria of their ethnographic character and engaging form of presentation. The first part of this work introduces the historical context and process of development of ethnographic film. Special attention was paid to the background of films that were chosen for analysis. The films were a part of different cinematographic projects. Although these projects weren't initially ethnographic, their final versions may be perceived as a representation of ethnographic knowledge. The work proceeds with the selection of methods of proper analysis of films. Two different approaches to the investigation from various angles were reviewed. One of them was created especially for the examination of ethnographic films. Another one was designed from fiction film analysis methods and adapted to the study of documentaries. Finally, the chosen films were scrutinised according to the outlined methods. This examination revealed a strong impact of the artistic form of presentation on the final perception of films. A particular ethnographic reality was displayed through the vision of the director, his comprehension of it.

RESUMÉ

Smyslem této práce bylo analyzovat promyšlenou metodou vybrané filmy, vzniklé v kontextu etnografického filmování v bývalém Sovětském svazu a moderním Rusku. Tyto filmy byly zvoleny podle kritérií, sledujících jejich etnografický charakter a poutavost formy prezentace. První část této práce představuje úvod do historického kontextu a procesu vývoje etnografického filmu. Zvláštní pozornost byla věnována pozadí filmů, vybraných pro analýzu. Tyto filmy byly součástí různých kinematografických projektů. Ačkoli tyto projekty nebyly původně etnografické, jejich výsledné verze mohou být vnímány jako reprezentace etnografického poznání. Práce dále pokračuje výběrem metod analýzy filmů. Byly představeny dva různé přístupy k výzkumu z různých úhlů pohledu. Jeden z nich byl vytvořen zvlášť pro zkoumání etnografických filmů. Druhý byl navržen na základě metod analýzy hraných filmů, adaptovaných pro studium filmů dokumentárních. Konečně byly vybrané filmy podrobeny oběma analytickým metodám. Tento rozbor odhalil silný dopad umělecké prezentace na výslednou podobu zkoumaných filmů. Partikulární etnografická realita byla zobrazována prostřednictvím vize a porozumění režiséra.