

CHAPTER «SOCIAL COMMUNICATIONS»

VISUALIZATION OF THE HOLODOMOR 1932–1933 (ON THE MATERIALS OF FILM DOCUMENTALISM AND JOURNALISM)

Oksana Kosiuk¹

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-406-1-10>

Abstract. The article is the first to examine and compare ways of presenting reality in the fields of journalism and documentary film. The historical dilemma of "author-developed vs fact-based" in documentaries of each director is solved in its own way. However, unfortunately, most often the solution is not in favour of journalism. **The purpose.** However, we will try to determine what parameters it is appropriate to identify and distinguish between documentary filmmaking and journalism. The material of our research will be the most rated documentaries and, in part, feature films and good-sized modern video projects of the amorphous genre, which captures the issue of the Holodomor in Ukraine in 1932–1933. **The research methodology** will be based on the theoretical foundations of the simultaneous relationship and self-sufficiency of the phenomena of reality and their media presentations and logical interpretations. Carrying out the research, we plan to use a number of methods and approaches, among which there are some determinative ones such as contrast, analogy and comparison of both specific modern and ancient media products, and journalism and documentary filmmaking in general. Analysis and synthesis, modelling for the interpretation and evaluation of phenomena and other methods will also be important. **Results.** It was found that, despite the apparent similarity and current modifications in the information space of the era of new technologies, these are functionally different areas. Documentary filmmaking actively uses all the latest journalistic methods of gathering information and uses certain aspects of its implementation.

¹ Ph.D., Associate Professor of the Department of Social Communications, Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Ukraine

However, by its nature, documentary remains the equivalent of journalism, so it uses a set of resources that balance between journalism and art: on one hand – relevance, efficiency, factualism, balance of ideas, etc., on the other – imagery, individualism, fiction and others. If we compare the first (non-fiction) films and modern documentaries and journalistic videos (for example, on the topic of the Holodomor in Ukraine), we see that the strength of the audience is dominated by traditional documentaries (obviously due to emotionality, subjectivity, imagery, powerful manipulative effects). Filmmakers who have a degree in journalism, successfully adapt their product to journalism, unfortunately, there are not so many of them. So in addition to positive factors (encouraging objectivity and factuality), convergence of documentary to journalism creates problems in the dimension of perception, evaluation and interpretation. **Practical implications.** The audience should be carefully prepared for such a statement, which should regulate the strategies of their own perception of information, depending on what is being viewed: a documentary or one of the genres of journalism. Our findings and conclusions can also be considered a field for future research and one of the priority areas for improving documentary and journalistic products.

1. Introduction

History of filmography development. The date of the birth of cinema should be considered a marker of the appearance of documentary filmmaking: the Lumière brothers demonstrated their first film on December 28, 1895. Since then "life in all its manifestations" (according to D. Vertov) is a current object of broadcasting with an emphasis on the consumed spectacular exotics such as natural disasters, military conflicts, the lives of public figures, technical innovations, etc. The modern documentary film as a television product is also primarily intent on increasing viewership and raising the ratings of the TV channel.

The activities of Ukrainian film organizations within the USSR began with the filming of revolutionary chronicles: "Figures of the socialist revolution in Ukraine", "Presentation of the flag to the Kiev military station – a gift from the Moscow Soviet of Workers' and Red Army Deputies", "Life of Red Army Cadets", "Spiders and Flies", "Parasite", "Four months with Denikin", "Red Star", "Red Forces against White Guards" and others. Unfortunately, the negatives of original versions haven't survived [14].

The forebear of Soviet audio visualization Dziga Vertov considered that the main task of movie-making is "to see and hear life", that is to capture symbolic phenomena – to draw a conclusion – to show the development of the "Soviet organism" through the lens of a film camera. In the work of this cult documentary filmmaker there is a widespread ideology, apparently, so one of the lead characters in his films (Lenin, the leader of the world proletariat) called cinema "the most important of the arts" [29]. Oleksandr Dovzhenko, the founder and genius of Ukrainian cinema, had a similar opinion. Propaganda technologies of industrialization and construction of a new life (by the way, as well as the subtle twists and turns of national tragedies) are clearly seen in all his films (they look like artistic, but at the same time they are chronic), especially in the silent ones: historical and revolutionary epic "Arsenal" (1928) and poetic film "Earth" (1930), and also in the already voiced movie-essay "Unforgettable"/"Ukraine in Flames" (1943).

It should be noted that Dziga Vertov and Oleksandr Dovzhenko interpreted a documentary film as art. And although they highly valued the truth, they denied the trivial recording of events. In the opinion of the first cinematographers, retransmission involves figurative interpretation of the reality, namely emotional excitement, symbolism and conceptual (in their case – ideological) orientation. The outlined foundations were significantly reflected in Dziga Vertov's author's project – the Kino-Pravda series (literally translated "film truth") [33].

The development of intelligence and technology should have had some influence on the ways of information presenting in cinema (particularly in documentary films), however, today, as in the early twentieth century, "unbiased cameras" are rare on television. As a rule, the creators of the movies support someone or something. Most often, they use the method of contrast known since ancient times. Its creator Esfir Shub (the author of chronicles *The Fall of the Romanov Dynasty* (1927), *The Russia of Nicolas II and Lev Tolstoi* (1928)), contrasted the dances of Russian aristocrats who were dancing till one drops with the hard labour of ordinary peasants, and thus subconsciously proved the reasoned emergence of revolutionary sentiments [27]. Using the similar approach, modern Ukrainian film director Oles Sanin shows the Great Famine of 1932–1933 against the background of unofficial administrative parties with exotic food in his film *The Guide* (2013).

During the Second World War, about 200 camera operators worked on the battle fronts to record events. Their work resulted in the film epic the Great Patriotic War (20 episodes), the creation of which involved not only works of Soviet and American filmmakers but also brutal fascist newsreels from the personal archives of the Third Reich [28]. Highly skilful work on propaganda materials contributed to the flourishing of the artistic onset in documentary filmmaking, which, unfortunately, only became intensified in the films about the reconstruction of the national economy. We say "unfortunately" because, in our opinion, this is sophisticated fakement).

But over time, television was still forced to implement the reporting function, because this is its integrated point (newspapers are not effective). As a result, the social analysis of events became deeper. M. Romm's film *Triumph Over Violence (Ordinary Fascism)* is considered to be a huge achievement of post-war documentary filmmaking [23], it is an attempt of "design" of an individual of the totalitarian era and for the first time, a direct parallel was drawn between the Soviet and fascist systems in it.

Actually, Ukrainian documentary film starts out with the film studio "Kyivnaukfilm", where about 400 media units per year were produced in the Soviet era. The products had a striking agitation character. And in the years of independence, it seems to have only changed the "plus" to "minus". It was the place where they worked on a large scientific and educational program of patriotic orientation "Unknown Ukraine", which rediscovered national history. The film "Shadows of War" by the murdered Georgy Gongadze was also made in this studio, the author shows soldiers of National Self-defence of Ukraine who fought in Georgia in 1992–93. In the introductory passage to the film Gongadze pointed out: "In this film I don't have pretensions to the ultimate fairness of presentation as I made it as an expression of gratitude to the people who shed their blood for the freedom and independence of my Land" [8].

Recent events in Ukraine and the world have provided, perhaps, the most topics and bright shots for the development of documentary filmmaking. The historical dilemma of "author-developed vs fact-based" in documentaries of each director is solved in its own way. However, unfortunately, most often the solution is not in favour of journalism. The hope that not only armed conflicts and tendentious political confrontations will set in motion the mechanisms of this genre sometimes sounds rhetorical.

However, we will try to determine what parameters it is appropriate to identify and distinguish between documentary filmmaking and journalism. The material of our research will be the most rated documentaries and, in part, feature films and good-sized modern video projects of the amorphous genre, which captures the issue of the Holodomor in Ukraine in 1932–1933. The research methodology will be based on the theoretical foundations of the simultaneous relationship and self-sufficiency of the phenomena of reality and their media presentations and logical interpretations. Carrying out the research, we plan to use a number of methods and approaches, among which there are some determinative ones such as contrast, analogy and comparison of both specific modern and ancient media products, and journalism and documentary filmmaking in general. Analysis and synthesis, modelling for the interpretation and evaluation of phenomena and other methods will also be important.

2. The theory of documentary filmmaking compared to journalism

Web of Science Core collection offers a wide range of topical controversy about documentary and artistic aspects of media production. We will try to enter into a discussion on various issues: the peculiarities of the functioning of modern feature, documentary and scientific films; aspects of audiovisual fiction and ways of manipulating the mass consciousness; consider the strategies of modern documentary filmmaking/discourse of exceptionalism; discuss verbal and nonverbal strategies for the representation of reality in professional and amateur documentaries; are also forced simultaneously to pay attention to the audiovisual resources of inciting international and national conflicts, etc.

14 articles of the international edition "Research in the field of documentary cinema" [31, p. 114–126] indexed in the scientometric base of Web of Science are devoted to the problems of comparing documentaries with artistic and scientific activities on which we also focused our attention in the research "Relevant interrelationships between science and mass communication" [12, p. 149–161]. The collection of articles contains materials of the conference "Documentaries and the Fiction/Nonfiction Divide" that took place at Queen Mary University of London on November 15-16, 2019. The guest editors and experts of this issue Mario Slugan (a lecturer in Film Studies at Queen Mary University of London

working on the intersection of cinema theory, history and philosophy) and Enrico Terrone (Associate Professor of Aesthetics at University of Genoa, who also was visiting researcher at Institut Jean Nicod in Paris and Juan de la Cierva Postdoctoral Fellow at LOGOS Research Group in Analytic Philosophy, Universitat de Barcelona) offer interesting reflections in the article "The Fiction/Nonfiction Distinction: Documentary Studies and Analytic Aesthetics in Conversation". Namely, they uphold the idea that there is a significant tendency to see the fiction/nonfiction border as permeable. The truthfulness of the story does not depend on the fact if it is fabrication or not, "it is imaginative engagement rather than the use of tropes/degree of fabrication that pushes documentaries into fiction", in the dimension "believe-imagine". And "it is not only analytic aesthetics but also the first researchers of documentaries became more sceptical about the possibility of a firm boundary". In particular, the authors turn to the Soviet tradition of distinction between "igrovoi/played" "vneigrovoi/unplayed" (the latter implied chronicles and various experiments such as documents, magazine publications, promoted stories, educational and scientific components). Apparently, the boundary was rather the presence or absence of historical distortions. And, of course, a feature film has always been based on a plot, and a documentary on a theme.

According to the researchers, the separate category is science fiction and detective stories which additionally testify that the difference between discursivity and art is relative. Imagination and an author's inner world (which is also based on reality) is the main issue in Gregory Currie's publications on analytic aesthetics (1990), he developed his theory of literature within the scope of Paul Grice's theory of communication (1960). According to scientists, the author of the work with their own intentions is a full participant in the communicative act. However, fiction is based on sentences, so the audience uses it as a support for the imagination; cinema is on images and sounds, therefore, this aesthetic-communication system does not provide opportunities to play pretend or fantasize. In general, art and fiction are relative. This statement relates to the presence or absence of tropes and angles. It all depends on the degree to which the theme and plot correspond to real events.

Caty Borum Chattoo and Will Jenkins examine the role of documentary filmmaking in solving the current problems of modern times in the article

"From reel life to real social change: The role of social-issue documentary in U.S. public policy" [5, p. 1107–1124]. The researchers study the three films about social issues of digital era such as "Sin by Silence", "Playground", "Semper Fi" and come to the conclusion that documentary is thus positioned as "situated knowledge" in a policymaking context – narrative that presents human implications and lived experiences. Ultimately, the policy impact of these documentaries is attributed to the dual defining characteristics of documentary: creative expression and reflection of truth.

The authors of "Media Education" ("Mediaobrazovanie") often turn to issues of nonfiction in mass media and modern journalism, in particular, in their publication "Mass Media Manipulations in Films", Oleksandr Fedorov and Anastasia Levytska show how movies use the most widely-used techniques of journalism in the context of which the media "become agents of manipulation and fraud", and the work of media workers is presented as a "technology of continuous deception and management of mass consciousness in the interests of certain influential groups" [15, p. 323–332].

The researchers also look into topics focusing on other attendant problems in documentary filmmaking. Hamdallah Akvani, Abdolhaved Zarifi, Hossein Fakhraei perform A Critical Analysis of the Political Discourse of Exceptionalism in the American Sniper Movie in the journal Media Studies ("Medijske studije") [3, p. 24–43]. The authors as well as their predecessor, Orientalist scholar Edward Said [24, p. 149–196], are convinced that movies are the very platform where political ideology is most actively developed and "installed" in mass consciousness. They systematically illustrate this point using Clint Eastwood's biographical film "American Sniper" as the example, the film is based upon the memoir by military snipers Cris Kyle, Scott McEwen and Jim DeFelice and it shows Hollywood's "Islamophobia" to religions and Middle East either in a hidden way or completely transparent. The authors observe: "With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, Western media, especially Hollywood, changed the idea of the communist threat into the danger of Islam as an emerging power in order to fill in the vacuum of communism as "Other"" [3, p. 24–43]. After the terroristic attack on September 11, 2001 the phobia gained strength and resounded stronger in feature and documentary films through the opposition "Self/Other". In American Sniper this "Self" is expressed thanks to use of words such as "duty", "sheepdog",

"patriot", "myth". "sacrifice and service", by contrast with "Other", who is described as "wolf", "savage", "evil person", "rubbish", "bad guy" etc. Thus, sympathy-antipathy of viewers is easily marked in this old-fashioned way, even without any special efforts.

Maryna Zheltukhina, Hennadii Slyshkin and others study "Verbal Special Features of Film Reviews in the Modern American Media Discourse". According to the scholars, "reviewers refer to the same words, the similar lexical set of terms" [34, p. 1–16], and while reading and looking through professional publications people enrich their own object-oriented lexicon and easily adapt it to their vision and understanding. According to M. Zheltukhina and H. Slyshkin, the experts' evaluation in the professional reviews balances between analytics (review), information block (scientific news) and cultural and educational group of genres (artistic journalism) and helps recipients to orientate comprehensively in the reviewed subject. Since the review in the modern world mostly appears as a think piece and reference, it allows showing the relevance of the problems identified in the thematic selections of films.

You can find out about non-verbal elements of fake news detection in the latest research done by English, Spanish and Portuguese scientists Hugo Queiroz Abonizio, Janaina Ignacio de Moraes and others [1, p. 1–3]. According to this group of scientists, most studies on the automatic detection of falsity are focused on English. Those who evaluate the product of other languages can be counted on one hand. However, no program identifies regardless of language, although the falsity may be detected by various signs, calls for expertise, the volume and sequence of quotations, and so on. Since the spread of fakes is a global problem, we should focus on secondary sign systems, which are clearly represented by cinema.

Mohamed A. Satti also studies the problem of verbal visualization in the context of difference between the content producing by the media conglomerate Al Jazeera Media Network in Arabic and English [26, p. 1–13]. It turns out that the most important information, such as the Gulf War, terrorism, etc. are published in parallel in English and Arabic (in equal proportions). A product that is directly related to Al Jazeera is also actively disseminated and perceived: the opening and closing of offices, legal conflicts etc., in a word – everything directly related to freedom of speech in the Muslim East. However, this information may be covered in

different ways, depending on the language of retransmission. But there are topics designed for a very narrow audience. Most often these are events in Africa. Such materials are published in one of the languages. Thus, the linguistic aspect plays an important role in the dissemination and perception of information.

The similar topic is touched in *Mapping Transnational Journalism in the Age of Flows: Or How I Ditched "Foreign Correspondence" and the "Immigrant Press" and Started to Love Histoire Croisée* by Christina Archetti. The researcher thinks that along with the mainstream media discourse "the lower forms of journalism" such as local news in English and others are very useful as from the point of media ecology they provide a balance of thoughts and is a means of spreading accurate information at the global level [4, p. 2150–2166].

In the article *Cross-Media Alliances to Stop Disinformation: A Real Solution?* Bella Palmo and Jon Sedano find out how the world media can cooperate in an area where "there is no culture of cooperation". In their opinion, "the audience, regardless of the topos of events, expects transparency and objective reporting". Unfortunately, non-English-speaking countries do check the facts less carefully. And this is problematic [20, p. 239–250].

Maarit Jaakkola defines boundaries between professional, amateur and educational (educational activities, blogging) kinds of journalism in the article *Journalists as Media Educators: Journalistic Media Education as Inclusive Boundary Work* [17, p. 1–21]. According to her assumption, it is just educational media activity that often associates information with political approaches, biased nature and fabrication. Although modern media pedagogy uses the latest technologies and is able to provide inclusive education, it should not reach the level of professional, and, moreover, "scheme" against it.

Alicia Prager and Michael Hameleers write about the contribution of journalism to inciting hostility in *"Disseminating Information or Advocating Peace? Journalists' role perceptions in the face of conflict"* [21, p. 395–413]. In their opinion, media play an important role in the formation of public opinion and can therefore be regarded as influential actors in conflict resolution in Columbia. In order to determine the positions, numerous interviews were conducted with media workers. Most of them think that so-called "Peace Journalism" is, in fact, propaganda that is in opposition to

non-biased journalism. A. Prager and M. Hamelers distinguish the roles of communicators: the disseminator who simply distributes information quickly, the interpreter who investigates claims of officials, the adversary who is in opposition to the authorities and the public mobilizer that initiates discussions at different levels. It is difficult to define the leading role in the Columbian media, but it stands out a mile that practical journalism "presents conflicts as a key value" by joint efforts [21, p. 401].

So, let's try to understand whether film documentaries and journalism are equivalent and how they should coexist effectively. Sociologist, later a film director, John Grierson is considered to be the first media maker who called a documentary a kind of mass communication. To tell the truth, he completely shared Dziga Vertov's ideas about propaganda functions, but he was the first who turned cameras from exotics to real life: working days, physiological needs, disability, unattractive actions of the crowd, death, etc. This can be traced in *A Postscript to the Story of Film* [6].

With the advent of television reporting as a genre of operational information in the 60s of last century, the function of information has automatically become secondary in documentaries. The formation of public opinion came into the picture again.

At the present stage, socially significant facts and events are the basis of any documentary. This allows us to classify it as a kind of journalism. There is also an indication in the definition of this film that documentary authenticity is required, which makes the footage a valuable historical document. Journalistic materials also deal only with reliable facts. But when we talk about documentary film as journalism, we should take into account, first of all, not the content, but the form, because the presence of the author's subjective factor is quite clear here. But the fact is that not all genres of journalism allow for such a factor. This is the prerogative exclusively of the block of opinion journalism. So, you should not confuse documentaries with interviews, news coverage, reports, notes, reviews, selections of comments, critical reviews, talk shows, press conferences – all these genres are also visualized and are quite voluminous, but figurality and imagination in them are completely inappropriate. In documentaries, as well as traditional feature journalism (notes, essays, feature stories, feuilletons, pamphlets), the function of information is secondary. An in-depth study of the topic, expert analysis, often testimonies, emotions and comments of third parties and the

author of the film come to the fore, and conclusions are always present. All this is presented in an aesthetic frame, otherwise it is impossible to interest the audience. Despite its subjectivity, artistic journalism is enormously valuable if, in addition to aesthetic factors, it contains the full range of information and analytical blocks. When journalists present their materials in the form of a documentary full of statements, the result is impressive: the work is logical and easily perceived by the audience, and the presence of effective arguments, indisputable documented facts and correctly applied social communication technologies undoubtedly convinces the truth of what is happening on screen.

A distinction should also be made between cinema, which uses the tools of mass media, and documentary as a phenomenon of journalism. Elements of journalistic work are used in all documentaries without exception: collection, recording of information and its optimal dissemination. However, if the product of the second group is high-quality journalistic material, the first as a result offers artistic author's documentary sketches. Criteria for distinguishing between the two varieties should be considered efficiency, relevance of the genre, up-to-dateness and social significance, audience coverage, reliability of the proposed arguments and facts, informativeness and adherence to the principles of journalistic ethics. If all of the above is present in documentary filmmaking, it can be considered the implementation of journalism. The main disadvantage of the documentary is that the authors are not responsible to the audience. If producers are not journalists, it is useless to demand truthfulness and objectivity, so you should be very careful and check the information at every opportunity.

The presentation aspects of the documentary expanded with the advent of convergent media. There is now a powerful YouTube video platform with the ability to publish copyrighted videos but broadcast them for free. Representatives of other online media can also distribute videos from this resource: both users of social networks and site owners. When a documentary is published in the online media, it is accompanied by a text description and sometimes screenshots. In this way, the audience learns even more about the film before watching it. On the one hand, this significantly reduces the number of viewers, eliminating all random people. On the other hand, the "quality" of recipients and the degree of influence on the audience, which will review products purposefully and evaluate intellectually, are growing.

The most controversial issue today is the settlement of copyright and related rights. Owners are worried about losing control of the use of original products in the digital environment and fear a decline in their income. On the other hand, users call for freedom of speech and free use of content. The most pressing issue is the right to freely reproduce copyright and/or related rights for personal use, as with the development of digital technology it is possible to create copies of materials without compromising quality in a very short time.

Another serious problem that is at the same time a marker of the distinction between documentary and journalism is the "system of manipulative actions aimed at changing the behaviour of society" [30]. Through the lens of the debatability and ambivalence of the term "manipulation", it should be noted that we support the position of negative labelling, as the original meaning of the word referred to the complex movements performed by magicians, creating the illusion of reality. The Academic Explanatory Dictionary of the Ukrainian language gives among others the following meaning "the same as trick, fraud" (marking it as figurative) [30]. The negative connotation of the term in our case is due to the original meaning of the word that is actions that form unrealistic, illusory picture of the world in the minds of people and, as a result, are destructive. In the scientific community, this effect is also called inmutation. Thus, manipulation is a destructive psychological impact on the consciousness and subconscious of the communicator, who is not aware of it. Manipulation should be kept to a minimum in journalistic materials. In documentary filmmaking it is quite acceptable as an element of figurality of style and manifestation of individuality.

Manipulation has a structure similar to a common communicative act, and usually consists of four elements: the object, the subject, the channel of information transportation and the goal. The result of the influence is the confirmation, affirmation, contradiction or change of the image present in the consciousness of the recipient. According to O. Kholod, negative behavioural change restructures the system of personal values to the dissatisfaction of society and, as a result, harms the individual [11, p. 95]. In the work "Communication Technologies" the scientist singles out the technologies of disbalance, disintegration and destruction among the destructive manipulation technologies. He gives their detailed classification, which applies to all areas of cultural production.

Interpersonal researcher Inna Saitarly also considers manipulative style of communication as a socially unacceptable type of communicative behaviour, which negatively affects people's mental health [25, p. 117–121], and Natalia Ligachova, a practitioner and ex-leader of the online publication "Telekrytyka", singles out those that are used by television among the technologies of manipulation: 1. Use of stereotypes. Representation of a social object in a simplified schematic form. Over time, the stereotypical representation is fixed in the mind and is virtually untested by experience. 2. Name change, or "labelling". This is usually a negatively evaluated judgment. 3. Repetition of information. When the message is repeated with sufficient frequency to reinforce it in the mass consciousness. 4. The statement. Television often presents unproven "axioms" instead of discussing arguments, presenting only one opinion that is beneficial to someone. 5. Asking rhetorical questions. Television can ask the audience a simple question at first glance, but give it the appropriate context, which orients the viewer in the right direction for the manipulator. 6. Sub-truths. It consists in the objective and detailed coverage of minor details and, instead, the omission of important facts or a general misinterpretation of events. This presentation helps maintain the audience's trust in television. 7. "Spiral of cover-up", or manipulation of public opinion polls. The selection of comments should convince citizens that the majority of society supports one or another point of view or political position. This method is based on the laws of mass psychology, forcing people with other views to hide them so as not to find themselves in socio-psychological isolation. 8. Anonymous authority. References to it provide information of solidity and plausibility. 9. "Everyday story". Information about acute political events, social conflicts or tragic events is presented in a businesslike and calm tone, which contributes to the indifferent perception by population. 10. The effect of presence. It is achieved with the help of special techniques, simulating reality. 11. The effect of primacy. Attempts by television to transmit information first. The operability of disseminating information can be used as a manipulative technique that does not allow the audience to comprehend the information received, because it is immediately replaced by new, not related to the previous. 12. Statement of fact. The desired is presented as a fact that has already happened. 13. Distraction. It helps shift public attention from important events to less significant ones and reduce

psychological resistance. 14. Use of eyewitnesses to the event. Special selection of people and cross-cutting with the necessary semantic range. 15. The principle of contrast. It is used when it is necessary to provide negative information about political opponents, but the tactics of direct accusations seem very explicit. 16. Psychological shock. News of emergencies that cause psychological shock in society, destroys all levels of psychological protection and allows the introduction of inspired schemes. 17. Creating associations. The object of information messages in the eyes of the public is tied to the negative stereotypes of the mass consciousness. 18. Information blockade. Blocking "unfavourable" information, detaining it or presenting it in a favourable context [16, p. 1–260].

The most appropriate classification to our understanding is offered by O. Fedorov, the leading media critic and media educator of today, he thinks that manipulations are carried out using the following techniques: a) "men on the street" game, that is the deliberate simplification of information by presenting it through the prism of values, for example, universal, national, etc., using appropriate symbols (in this case, not accepting information means something like a failure to fulfill a civic duty); b) selection – falsification of facts/selective citation of the truth; c) "putting on rouge" (in situations where there are a lot of props, colours and jewellery, and they talk about nothing, but the spectacularity is attractive in itself); d) projection – artificial transfer of qualities, for example, provided that a serious and popular journalist/writer/politician misleads the recipients, but he is trusted only for the reason that it is a "proven" authority, or – a true communication media shows a false story, etc.; e) false testimony – references to false authorities; f) "sticking on labels" – improper and groundless facts and accusations [7, p. 81, 515].

We take the proposed classifications as a basis, but add some other techniques needed to define manipulations in documentary projects. "Overtures to viewers" – when a story from one story line is interrupted at an interesting /contradictory moment and the focus suddenly shifts to another. It works like in a TV series: the viewer is looking forward to the end of the broken storyline and does not think too much about new information. This technology is especially dangerous because the viewer unknowingly begins to sympathize with the object he/she has been waiting to see for so long. Another underestimated technique is "encouraging sympathy". Characters,

who we feel sorry for, automatically receive a positive label. And empathy and, as a consequence, guilt create an atmosphere of trust.

We also suggest paying attention to "tension" – a technique is mainly applied in feature played films, which is now often used in documentaries: with each frame the tension increases, until the moment when the viewer, without thinking, just empathizes.

3. Analysis of modern audiovisual products on the topic of the Holodomor in Ukraine of 1932–1933

Now let's look at real examples of the use of manipulative social and communication technologies and markers of opinion journalism and journalism in modern samples of documentaries. The object of analysis will be films about the Holodomor in Ukraine in 1932–1933, as it is the most headline national theme at the turn of the millennium. The problem was revealed differently in fiction, cinema and, in fact, documentaries.

Mykola Kulish disclosed the topic in the domain of art. However, his play "97" [13] describes the famine in in the Kherson region. And this can be seen as a warning and proof of all possible degradations of humanity provoked by hunger. The play did not contain documents, but showed an unsurpassed level of the author's imagery. The author paid heavy price: he was executed on November 3, 1933 in the forest massif Sandarmokh, the republic of Karelia, USSR.

The famine of 1933 was first voiced at the world level by the Ukrainian emigrant writer Vasyl Baka-Ocheret. He wrote a novel "The Yellow Prince", allusion to the Book of Revelation 6:8 it is based on memories of family and respondents from DPs (postwar special camps for forcibly displaced people in West Germany and Austria). The book had several film adaptations. The most significant is Oles Yanchuk's feature film "Hunger-33" [9] As the film takes full advantage of the dramatic aspect, the selectivity of citations and "labelling", it clearly does not claim to be journalistic, but it is a very interesting way to show the tragedy through the eyes of a child – such a vision has the right to imagery even in documentaries.

The film Zhivi/Living directed by Sergei Bukovsky is definitely a documentary. It tells about the Holodomor and the reaction of the world community to it. The film has several storylines. The first storyline is stories of people who survived the Great Famine of 1932–1933 and now

share memories. The next one is stories of Ukrainians in the East, "under Poland", who took in escapees from starvation. And the third storyline tells the story of British journalist Gareth Jones who witnessed the events (by the way, this journalist is mentioned in many feature and documentary films on the similar topic). The film begins with a series of titles for foreign viewers – it's about statistics: 17 people died in Ukraine every minute. 1,000 – every hour and 25,000 every day. (The "facts" are apparently based on the words of former President Viktor Yushchenko about 25 million victims). Interestingly, back in 2010, the Security Service of Ukraine SBU announced the final number of victims of the Great Famine in Ukraine – 10 063 000 people. More than 3 million are actually starvation deaths, and a little more than 6 million are unborn. There is a reference to the documents used by the authors neither in the director's film nor in its description. Thus, it is a case of "selected citation". Then the ex-president himself appears in the frame, talking about starvation deaths in his native village. Here, the technology of projection of the authority of the former head of state forces the viewer not to check the preliminary information, because "even if the President thinks so", then in the words of documentary filmmakers there can be no mistake. Eyewitnesses' recollections also arouse great sympathy in the audience (manipulative technology). However, this was hardly the main goal of the authors. Despite the evoked emotions, the characters share facts of the past that are extremely important for understanding history. Probably, emotions here are a "side effect". It is important that, in addition to the memories of the victims and the journalist's comments, the film also contains documented memories and opinions of foreign experts. This emphasizes the investigative nature of the film.

A special feature of the film is the unusual use of the "putting on rouge" technique: those who survived the Holodomor first say snippets of phrases like: "Mum has been milking ... she used to milk at 5, and now at 11 (says a son of the woman who survived the famine), – Tell them about the famine, not the cow (his mum replies him outside the camera view)". Such frames are usually not included in the final product, but are eliminated during montage. However, the author leaves it, and as if confirms the reality of everything that is happening. As a result, despite operating on unverified data, the film still offers extensive information about the tragedy of the Ukrainian people.

In contrast to Living, the video project of Radio Liberty "How many actually died from the Holodomor? And was it artificial?" makes a radically different impression [32]. It is reported at the beginning that "victims of famine have become a political tool" and data on mortality and localization of the problem are usually amorphous. Then the statistical expertise of agronomist-economist Stepan Sosnovy, who was one of the first to officially record the victims of the Holodomor, is announced, and to confirm that fact a copy of a real document from the Soviet archives is shown. Simultaneously, they also talk about the famine in other regions of the USSR, the tragic fate of purged Sosnov and a discussion about the data he voiced. During the broadcast, photo documents are shown, the voice-over of the commentator is heard. But since there is no "living" person in the frame, this is a very specific and quite journalistic, if I may say so, project, the status of which can be disputed. The outlined visualization at least tends to be objective and minimizes the emotions and private judgments of witnesses and victims.

The Russian-language film by Ruslan Tarasov and Natalia Nedelko, the chief director of the Kyiv bureau of Radio Liberty, "The Holodomor. The world knew but was silent" also makes an expert impression. It is mainly about "what stories Ukrainian emigrants brought to the world". The film contains all the markers of quality journalism: legally sound factual photo-documentary and living evidence, reasoned examinations, balance of opinions and more. The behind-the-scenes voice sounds unemotional and detached and additionally testifies to mediation and non-interference. This is especially noticeable against the background of propaganda show from modern historians, political scientists and journalists, reproduced "Ukrainer" and obviously aimed at schoolchildren [19], in which everything is based on accusations, labelling, outrageous testimony. And yet, it is a documentary film that contains real evidence and expertise in the form of live comments, paper documents, chronicles, specific off-screen broadcasting, and so on. Using the whole set of manipulations, the picture literally became in opposition to journalistic materials and, let's be honest, brilliantly performed the propaganda function. The imagery in it is also at a very high level, as in the documentary of the same producer "Save the whole farm yard during the Holodomor", which interviews only one exalted woman, who first reads Shevchenko's poetry, and later very emotionally shares memories. The material does not even reach the level of a bog-

standard interview, as it contains anachronisms, hate speech, and, of course, requires careful fact-checking.

An interview "Survived the Holodomor and saved a neighbour's boy" [18] (by the way, it is also production of the above analyzed channel "Ukrainer") and testimony "Children of the Great Famine" in the documentary made by "Suspilne/Public" (UA: Pershyi) make impressions absolutely polar to previous. In both media products, the characters share childhood memories, enter into discussions and, thus, seem to put together the puzzles of the overall picture. The advantage of these materials should be considered objectivity (although in some places the characters do not hold back tears, but it looks sincere and spontaneous). At the end of the documentary, one of the victims even says that he publicly forgives fellow villagers who committed violence together with the communists because he does not want to "take heavy charges to the grave". In addition to memoirs, the film "Children of the Great Famine" contains elements of reconstruction and experiment: women describe "recipes", demonstrate the preparation of "dishes" that saved them in difficult times; the man shows the contents of the refrigerator and the pit where the food was buried, and so on. The thematic chronicle is appropriately built into the plot.

The last film that shook the world in 2019 was *The Price of Truth* by Agnieszka Holland [10] (joint production of Ukraine, Britain and Poland). Cinema sites indicate its genre as biography, drama, history, and thriller. Thus, at least on two parameters (biography and history) the picture can be identified as documentary, although the stated fact mainly concerns the person of British journalist Gareth Jones and the world political situation at the times of European fascism and the cult of Stalin personality in the Soviet Union. The role of a journalist was perfectly played by one of the most popular actors of our time – James Norton. And everything that concerns English realities is obviously reconstructed flawlessly. However, not everything is as good with the Ukrainian part as one would like: the images of people and places are artificial, the scenes are fictional and pathetic and symbolic, and the markers of documentary are completely absent. Instead, the music sounds very well (universal and ethnographically stylized), and the chronic voice-over accurately makes sense of it; British landscapes are also impressive: the sea, seagulls and rocks; the elements and motives of madness and childish unconscious cruelty are effectively intertwined in

the plot... In short, everything is shown in the best Hollywood style. And although journalism in the film, literally and figuratively, balances on the border of allegory and symbolism, it uses all possible types of manipulation.

In this context, we think that Alexander Proshkin's Soviet-German feature film "Mykola Vavilov" [22], released in 1990, should be considered much more successful in terms of authenticity and coverage of the topic. Of course, the theme of famine in Ukraine appears there on occasion – as an illustration of the collapse of genetics and career of outstanding botanist, breeder, geographer, geneticist and chemist Mykola Vavilov, Academician of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR, Head of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, the All-Union Institute of Plant Breeding and the Institute of Genetics of the National Academy of Sciences of the USSR; a scientist of planetary level, a member of a huge number of international specialized and scientific organizations. However, despite the fragmentary nature, the Holodomor in the film is recorded both documentary and highly artistic: Academician Vavilov (which was masterfully played by Costas Smoriginas) comes to Ukraine to visit his opponent – politically motivated pseudo-scholar Trokhym Lysenko (which was no less talentedly created by Bohdan Stupka) and see with his own eyes what is going on. Unlike journalist Jones, the scientist Vavilov does not become a participant in tearful symbolic scenes, he just watches and the style of silent cinema reflects in the face of the protagonist all the horror of reality. This scene of silent contemplation, which is built on something much bigger than acting, cannot leave any human being indifferent. And this is exactly the embodiment of the quality journalism strategy – a frugal visual statement of facts with the marker "no comments".

Like *The Price of Truth*, miniseries *Mykola Vavilov* identifies fascist and socialist regimes and "reduces them to a common denominator" and testifies to the devaluation and destruction of man in the crucible of massification, famine, and political repression. However, *The Price of Truth* represents the search for truth through testimony (journalistic activity), and the miniseries shows that in a society of absurdity, even the most indisputable facts lose all weight and meaning; that's why the iconic Soviet scientist is destroyed, and an independent British journalist still tells the world the truth, although it also costs him almost his life. Both characters are real people, and this adds factualism to the films. Therefore, in terms

of the impact on the public consciousness, the films confidently compete with pure documentaries, as well as history, journalism and science. This is especially noticeable in contrast to documentaries by Ukrainian and Georgian producers ("Holodomor of 1932–1933. Postgenocidal syndrome", "Occupation Holodomor").

The Georgian media product *Occupation Holodomor*, created in 1918 [2], immediately warns that the film is worth watching for recipients under and individuals with unbalanced mentality. In the Ukrainian documentary (production by channel UA:PERSHYI) the preamble visualizes the war in Donbas in 2014–2015 (although the tragedy of the Holodomor occurred in 1932–1933). In this way, Georgians are preparing for the "worst", and Ukrainians are drawing a close analogy between the Holodomor and the current war in eastern Ukraine. Thus, in both cases, the manipulation of spectacularity and "quotes with the truth" is "switched on" from the first frames.

Then in "The Holodomor of 1932–1933..." three people appear in the frame, in the context of a selected chronicle: publicist Oleksandr Kramarenko, director of the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory Volodymyr Vyatrovych, doctor of historical sciences Viktor Korol. Oleksandr Kramarenko persistently installs the following messages in the minds of viewers: "faith in God, patriotism, national consciousness first die, and then – instincts, even as powerful as the mother's": "mothers began to eat their own children", "After surviving hunger, instincts are restored, but moral virtues are not", "fought against the Russian (though, in fact – Soviet) aggression of 1918–1920", "Francis Fukuyama argues that national revival must begin with an awareness of the disease of the nation – the Holodomor". Meanwhile, Volodymyr Vyatrovych introduces national tragedies that are not entirely related to the main: political repression ("to destroy the national consciousness – you need to destroy the elite"), the shooting of kobzars, settlement of Donbas by other nationalities, who, in his opinion, became "circulators of Soviet identity". In the end, Victor Korol ends the "suggestion session" by offering clearly unverified, sometimes even anecdotal, information about Postyshev, Budyonny, etc. and tells all this in an appropriate tone. In contrast to M. Romm's *Ordinary Fascism*, where the off-screen (also sometimes ironic) voice is superimposed on the chronicle, here it "exists" as if by itself. And it is this invisible substance that finally

explains why the people of Donbas "voted for Viktor Yanukovych". The film is so openly manipulative that instead of a scientific conclusion I want to emphasize: from the point of view of journalism, this "documentary" project is simply in the category "no comments".

In the Georgian version of Occupation the Holodomor a swastika mounted in a pentagonal star is constantly used as an interruption, and the phrases sound: "political eugenics", "creation of a completely different person", "worse than the Holocaust", etc. The experts are well-known politician Levko Lukyanenko, well-known Doctor of Historical Sciences Yuriy Shapoval and Stanislav Kulchytsky, witnesses of the Holodomor. A truly valuable chronicle is on display. It would seem that everything is balanced and factual. But it is not clear why experts and eyewitnesses speak broken Russian for show, if they are native speakers of the Ukrainian language, and why at the end of the film the speech of the incumbent President of the Russian Federation is turned on with phrases that are very indirectly related to the topic of conversation. As for the constant appeals to Stalin, they are quite clear. However, the host for some reason forgets to say that Stalin (Iosif Dzhugashvili) is not a Russian or a Jew by nationality, but a Georgian. In general, the manipulativeness of this film, is though not so ostentatious, but also quite obvious.

4. Conclusions

Thus, (despite attempts to move to another level of information quality and closer to journalism), in documentary filmmaking we still find non-compliance with journalistic standards, manipulation and influence on consciousness, excessive imagery, and so on. Obviously, documentary and journalism are very similar, but not identical in nature. And this, as we were able to see, is a non-historical fact.

The audience should be carefully prepared for such a statement, which should regulate the strategies of their own perception of information, depending on what is being viewed: a documentary or one of the genres of journalism.

The article proves that real historical events (the Holodomor of 1922–1923) and their media interpretations differ (obviously, it is based on the different interpretation of the basic concept "document"). First of all, it is due to the possibilities of manipulation: if the historical fact tends to be

accurate and irreversible, its "media reflection" uses stereotypes, refrains, technologies of "sticking labels", imaginary axiomatic system, half-truths, spirals of silence, pseudo-authority, distraction of attention, bogus eyewitnesses, elements of information blockade, "common folk's game", sham, escalation, etc.

It was also found out that, in contrast to traditional embodiments of history (articles, textbooks, chronicles, etc.), which are subject to content, filming emphasizes the form (genre) of information presentation. And among other genre blocks, fiction journalism (in particular, a documentary film) has the least claim to be accurate in reproduction of historical facts. Documentary filmmaking is figurative, allows fiction, influence on recipient's emotions, author's vision of history.

The conclusions of the research on the media coverage of the Holodomor can be used for further studies of the modern history of Ukraine and revision of already traditional forms of its reconstruction. The research is unique. The outlined view angle has been applied for the first time.

References:

1. Abonizio, H. Q., Morais, J. I., Tavares, G. M. et al. (2020). Language-Independent Fake News Detection: English, Portuguese, and Spanish Mutual Features. *Future internet*, 12, 87. Available at: <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/12/5/87>
2. Akhobadze, L. (2018). Okkupacyja Gholodomor. *Youtube*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QMks4QjFrjU>
3. Akvani, H., Zarifi, A., Fakhraei, H. (2020). A Critical Analysis of the Political Discourse of Exceptionalism in the American Sniper Movie. *Media studies*, 11(21): 24-43. Available at: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/245577>
4. Archetti, C. (2019). Mapping Transnational Journalism in the Age of Flows: Or How I Ditched "Foreign Correspondence" and the "Immigrant Press" and Started to Love Histoire Croisée. *Journalism Studies*, 20(15): 2150–2166. Available at: <https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/76220/Archetti+2019.+Mapping+Transnational+Journalism+in+the+Age+of+Flows.pdf?sequence=2>
5. Borum, Chattoo Caty, Jenkins, Will (2019). From reel life to real social change: the role of contemporary social-issue documentary in U.S. public policy. *Communication & Media Studies and Language & Linguistics. Media, Culture & Society*, 41(8): 1107–1124. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0163443718823145>
6. Cousins, M. (2014). Dear John Grierson: A Postscript to The Story of Film (rough cut). *Youtube*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YamlocxI7uc>

7. Fjodorov, A. (2001). Mediaobrazovanie, teoriya i metodika. Rostov n/D: Izd-vo OOO "CVVR", 708 p.
8. Ghonghadze, G. (1993). Tini vijny. Dokumental'nyj fil'm. *Youtube*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2MVQHlJ-onQ>
9. Janchuk, O. (1991). Gholod-33. Dokumental'nyj fil'm. Za romanom Vasylja Barky "Zhovtyj knjazj". *Youtube*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cgXQCJ0XoDk>
10. Kholland, A. (2019). Cina Pravdy. Khudozhnij fil'm. *Kino-teatr*. Available at: <https://kino-teatr.ua/film/mr-jones-49212.phtml>
11. Kholod, O. (2013). Komunikacijni tekhnologhiji: [tekst] pidruchnyk. Kyiv: Centr uchbovoji literatury, 2013 p.
12. Kosiuk, O. (2021). Relevant interrelationships between science and mass communication. *Social capital: vectors of development of behavioral economics: collective monograph* / Editor: Mariana Petrova. Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria: ACCESS Press Publishing house, 184 p.
13. Kulish, M. (1924). 97. P'jesa. *Ukrlib*. Available at: <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printit.php?tid=1086>
14. Lebedev, N. A. (1965). Ocherk istorii kino SSSR: Nemoje kino. Moskva: Iskusstvo, 373 p. *Bibliotekar*. Available at: <http://www.bibliotekar.ru/kino/1.htm>
15. Levitskaya, A., Fedorov, A. (2021). Theoretical Model of Media Competence's Development of Teachers-to-be in the Process of the Analysis of Manipulative Media Influences. *Media Education (Mediaobrazovanie)*, 17(2): 323–332. Available at: http://ejournal53.com/journals_n/1623852601.pdf
16. Lighachova, N., Chernenko, S., Ivanov, V. (2003). Telebachennja specoperacij. Manipuljatyvni tekhnologhiji v informacijno-analitychnykh prohramakh ukrajins'kogho telebachennja: monitoryng, metody vyznachennja ta zasoby protydiji. Rekomendaciji shhodo pryncypiv vidkrytoji redakcijniji polityky telekanaliv. Kyiv: Telekrytyka, 266 p.
17. Maarit, J. (2020). Journalists as Media Educators: Journalistic Media Education as Inclusive Boundary Work. *Journalism Practice*, 11.09: 1–21. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/17512786.2020.1844040?needAccess=true>
18. Nosok, M. (2020). 1932–1933. Gholodomor. Ghenocyd. Dokumental'nyj fil'm. *Youtube*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gvk3Vss7jzc>
19. Nosok, M. (2020). Shho take Gholodomor? Dokumental'nyj fil'm. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LbPq0lzKjBk>
20. Palomo, Bella, Sedano, Jon (2021). Cross-Media Alliances to Stop Disinformation: A Real Solution? *Media and Communication*, 9(1): 239–250. Available at: <https://www.cogitatiopress.com/mediaandcommunication/article/view/3535>
21. Prager, A., Hameleers, M. (2018). Disseminating information or advocating peace? Journalists' role perceptions in the face of conflict. *Journalism*, August 13: 395–413. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1464884918791788>
22. Proshkin, A. (1990). Nikolaj Vavilov. Vtoraya seriya / Hudozhestvennyj fil'm. *Youtube*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2IoamtSxh->

8Q&ab_channel=%D0%9A%D0%BB%D0%B0%D1%81%D1%81%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0%D0%B6%D0%B0%D0%BD%D1%80%D0%B0

23. Romm, M. (1965). Obyknovennyj fashizm. Dokumental'nyj fil'm. *Youtube*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vIAFJ7QIU7k>

24. Sajid, E. V. (2001). Orientalizm / Per. z angl. V. Shovkun. Kyiv: Vydavnytvo Solomiji Pavlychko "Osnovy", 511 p.

25. Sajtarly, I. (2007). Kuljtura mizhosobystisnykh stosunkiv: navch. posib. Kyiv: Akademydav, 240 p.

26. Satti, Mohamed A. (2020). Al Jazeera Arabic and Al Jazeera English Websites: Agenda-Setting as a Means to Comparatively Analyze Online News Stories January. *Comunicacion y Sociedad*, 33(1): 1–13. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338139988_Al_Jazeera_Arabic_and_Al_Jazeera_English_Websites_Agenda-Setting_as_a_Means_to_Comparatively_Analyze_Online_News_Stories

27. Shub, Esfir'. Podborka po zaprosu "Jesfir' Shub" (1927–1929). Available at: https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=%D0%B5%D1%81%D1%84%D0%B8%D1%80+%D1%88%D1%83%D0%B1

28. Slobodjan, M. I. (1972). Suchasnyj ukrajinsjkyj dokumental'nyj fil'm. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 120 p.

29. Slovar' krylatyh slov i vyrazhenij (2021). Available at: https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/dic_wingwords/1056/%D0%98%D0%B7

30. Slovyk ukrajinsjkoji movy: khronika (1970–1980). Available at: <http://sum.in.ua/s/khronika>

31. Slugan, M., Terrone, E. (2021). Documentary Studies and Analytic Aesthetics in Conversation. *Studies in Documentary Film*, vol. 15, issue 2, pp. 114–126. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/17503280.2021.1923142>

32. Vbyti gholodomorom (2018). Dokumental'nyj fil'm. *Youtube*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WCE2CPocslM>

33. Vertov, D. (1922). Kino-Pravda. Oktjabr'skaja. Dokumental'nyj fil'm. *Youtube*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lcDERlBMq7U>

34. Zheltukhina, M., Slyshkin, G., Gumovskaya, G. et al. (2020). Verbal Features of Film Reviews in the Modern American Media Discourse. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 10(3): 1–16. Available at: <https://www.ojcmr.net/download/verbal-features-of-film-reviews-in-the-modern-american-media-discourse-8386.pdf>