

## EDITORS' NOTE

On December 5, 2018, an international scientific conference titled *Documentation Space: the Modes of Existence of Cinematic Evidence* was organized in Ekaterinburg by Ural Humanitarian Institute (part of the Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia Boris Yeltsin), namely the Departments of History of Philosophy, Philosophical Anthropology, and Aesthetics and Theory of Culture. The conference took place as part of the XV International Festival-Workshop of Film Schools *Kinoproba*. This collection includes the best speaker papers of the conference. The idea of the conference organizers and editors of this collection is motivated by the desire to discover the critical points of growth of world cinema in connection with the problems of representation of reality, which have become the subject of reflection of modern humanitarian thought: of film experts, media theorists, philosophers, sociologists, cultural anthropologists, and of course cinema practitioners. One of the main thought-provoking phenomena in the current film process are the films by Sergei Loznitsa: fiction film *Donbass*, documentary *Victory Day*, compilation film *Process*. In those films, the director recorded the indiscernibility of truth and fiction that is fundamental to our time. The phenomenon of Loznitsa is indicative, but not the only one in the modern world cinema. In 2016, the Oxford Dictionary named “post-truth” the most frequently used word that year.

The concept of “post-truth” creates a situation of challenge not only for the cinema community, but also for humanitarian thought in general, as it requires the search for new theoretical tools for analysis and research angles. After the famous works of Walter Benjamin, much has changed in the world of “technical reproduction,” “social mythology,” “historical memory”. But such concepts as “document” and “evidence” have not lost their significance, although the modes of their existence have transformed: to understand the past and present, it is not enough to know the facts and what is considered to be an objective state of affairs. It is necessary to find the keys to socially and culturally anthropological representations of time, taking into account the radically changed means of mediation, digital technologies, and the volatile status of the real.

Another equally important motivator for organizing the conference and publishing this collection was the request of young humanities scholars, the backbone of which were students, undergraduates and graduate students of the Department of Philosophy. The conference was held thanks to their initiative and active participation in the organization. They were united by the search for answers to very complex questions: What is documentary and historical cinema today? How does the digital turn affect the boundaries between evidence and the author’s construction of reality? What are the new ethical and aesthetic rules of the author’s interaction with his characters and objects? They found their young colleagues from other cities and invited them to discuss these issues, and this indicates that they are developing their own circle of like-minded people in scientific field. However, the main point is that young scientists presented the results of their own research, demonstrating fluency in the language of modern humanities, broad outlook, the skillset to analyze material, often very exotic, and knowledge of not only the modern film process, but also the history of cinema.

The collection also includes a transcript of the meeting of students and teachers of the Ural Federal University with director Andrey Zvyagintsev, guest of the XV International Festival-Workshop of Film Schools *Kinoproba*. We decided to include it, since the artist’s films and thoughts directly act as documentary evidence of the life of modern Russia.

*Tatyana Kruglova, Liliya Nemchenko*