Violence on the Russian & American Media Screen and Youth Audience

Alexander Fedorov

Violence on the Russian & American Media Screen and Youth Audience

Alexander Fedorov

Kuchma Publisher House.
Taganrog, 2003

Contents

Preface

Violence is an increasing problem in modern society. "If in the USSR in 1989 639 crimes were committed per 1000 residents, then in 1999 more than 2000 crimes were committed" (Ovsyannikov, 2001, p.17). "Murder Rates in Russia (1995) were 3.1 times higher than in United States" (Ovsyannikov, 2001, p.18). The increase of violence among Russian youngsters is extremely dangerous (about 32,000 of Russian teenagers commit a violent crime every year). Most Western research concerning violence in the media suggests that there is a connection between presentation of violence in the media and violence in society (Federman, 1997; Cantor, 2000; Potter, 1999; 2003; Slaby, 2002 and others).

The report of the "National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence" noted the "weakness of the network codes, particularly the lack of effective sanctions and the absence of control over the number of violent programs. Legislative hearing in the Congress and Senate of the United States Government heard repeated demand for the reduction of televised violence" (Gerbner, 1988, p.9). American Psychological Association (APA) concluded: "there is absolutely no doubt that those who are heavy viewers of this violence demonstrate increased acceptance of aggressive attitudes and increased aggressive behavior" (Wilson, B.J. and others, 1998, p.16). "There certainly appear to be correlation between the rise of violence depicted in media and the rise of violent acts and crimes committed by juveniles in this country. The United States has the most violent adolescent population out of all 20 developed nations on Earth" (Cantor, 2000, p. 91). "We uncovered a dramatic correlation between media violence and crime. When asked what their favorite movie was, the same fifty one percent (51%) of adolescents who committed violent crimes claimed that their favorite movie contained violence" (Cantor, 2000, p. 91).

It is clear that the problem exists in Russian and American society as well. "Today youth may be regularly exposed to:
-violent programming on broadcast TV, cable TV, and satellite TV;
-violent programming in motion pictures and on videocassettes, digital video disks, and Internet websites;
-violent audio programming delivered through traditional radios, Walkman radios, compact disk players, and Internet websites;
-violent interactive video games delivered through television monitors, computer monitors, portable devices, Internet web sites, and arcade games;
-violent toys, games, and other devices directly related to violent media programming" (Slaby, 2002, p.311).

I agree with J.Goldstein's definition of media violence production: "We regard violent entertainment as descriptions or images of fighting, bloodshed, war, and gunplay produced for the purpose of entertainment, recreation, or leisure. Violent entertainment includes murder and horror stories; comic books, television

programs, films, and cartoons depicting war or fighting; video games with martial-arts and military themes; toy weapons and military materiel; and aggressive spectator sports, like boxing and wrestling" (Goldstein, 1998, p.2).

The scientists concluded:
"-media violence can teach adolescents social scripts (approaches to solving social problems) about violence;
-it can create and maintain attitudes is society that condone violence;
-constant exposure to media violence can lead to emotional desensitization in regard to violence in real life;
-the social, political, and economic roots of violence are rarely explored, giving the impression that violence is mainly an interpersonal issue" (Slaby, 2002, p.310).

P.David (Secretary of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights) writes: The theme of the child and media is typically a challenging one as it closely combines three major aspects of children's rights: access to provision, protection and participation. This multidimensional nature of the right to information is generously recognized by the Convention on the Rights of the Child in its article 17, which explicitly refers to many other provisions recognized by this human rights treaty. Therefore, a decade after the adoption of the Convention by the UN General Assembly, the child's right to information remains one of the most complex provisions to be implemented by states (David, 1999, p. 31)

Article 17 of The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child aspires to encourage the mass media to disseminate information and material of social and cultural benefit to the child; encourage the development of appropriate guidelines for the protection of the child from information and material injurious to his or her well-being. The convention states the right of children *for* information, but also for protection *from* information that might threaten their well-being and personal development. In societies that heavily expose children to media, the healthy development of democratic institutions and civil society can be greatly influenced by the impact of media violence on children's behavior and perception of society. An emphasis on this particular aspect of societal regulation of children's media viewing is strongly recommended by UN and UNESCO.

Unfortunately, The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child has not succeeded in modern Russian society with regard to the media-screen (television, cinema, video, PC-games) because scenes of hard violence persist on all Russian cinema and television screens. The infringement of the Rights of the Child on the Russian screen is a very important problem and Russian pedagogues should not only attract societal and governmental attention to it, but should also provide training and education about children and violence on the screen.

Western scientists have researched the theme "Children and Violence on the Screen" but this theme is new and original to the modern Russian sociocultural situation. Consequently, Russian science currently conducts little research on this theme. For example, we do have sociological research results from Dr. K.Tarasov (Moscow) who tested Russian pupils on the subject of "Violence on the Screen".

He writes that: "a questionnaire survey, conducted by the Research Institute of Cinema Art among 510 students from 9th to 11th grades (14-17 years old) of 30 Moscow schools (52 classes) in late 1995, showed that with respect to violent films the young viewers formed three groups. The first (55%) comprises "hyperactive" consumers of violent fare. Half or more of the films they had seen in theatres or on television and video during four weeks prior to the survey contained violence. The second group (11%) includes "active" adherents to aggressive films. Violence is included in one-third of their chosen film repertoire. The third group (24%) constitutes young people with "moderate" attachment to movie mayhem" (Tarasov, 2000, p.5).

The Russian situation is different from that of the West because throughout Russian media history scenes of violence on the screen have existed without strict censorship.   My content analysis of all features films produced in Russia during the 1990s (1,041 films) shows that 43% contain violent scenes. Completed content analysis of violence on Russian television during one week indicates that serious and graphic violence in news and so-called reality-programs (about murder, crime, and accidents) is aired around the clock. The analysis also shows that fiction series and films with serious and graphic violence are most often broadcast after 10 p.m., but also relatively frequently during prime time when children are watching.

I created the test "Russian Teenagers and Violence on the Screen" and have surveyed 430 Russian students (age from 16 to 17). The information I obtained helped me:
-take into consideration the real preferences of teenagers;
-pay attention to concrete films, television programs, genres, and themes that are popular and thus have maximum moral and psychological influence;
-quantify the students who are attracted and repulsed by scenes of violence on the screen;
-reveal main factors attracting teenagers to scenes of violence on the screen (entertaining function, function of identification, compensatory function, function of recreation, professional directorship, outstanding acting, outstanding special effects, etc.). The results are necessary for comparison with written papers and discussions in order to state the self-evaluation of the audience's preferences and real motives as revealed in the course of the full research;
-reveal main reasons to dislike scenes of violence on the screen;
-learn about teenage enthusiasm for acting in a violent scene in the media. The results confirmed the students' answers concerning their positive or negative attitudes towards violence on the screen; and
-determine the opinion of teenagers concerning reasons for violence and aggression in society, the influence of violence on the screen upon the increase of crime, and the prohibition of violent scenes from the screen (with reference to their future children).

To sum up the analysis of this test one may conclude that the influence of violence on the screen on Russian teenagers is rather perceptible. About a half of the teenagers are positive about its demonstration. They like films, television shows,

and computer games containing scenes of violence, and they like violent characters (including "bad guys"). One-third of the teenagers claimed that they are not attracted by the violence on the screen. Only 18% of teenagers discuss and share their opinions with their parents. Teenagers practically never include teachers as interlocutors for their screen preferences. Therefore the influence of Russian schools upon the relationship between teenagers and violence on the screen is, unfortunately, zero.

This cannot help but evoke alarm, since violence on the screen penetrates into Russian society more and more since 1990. It can be safely said that in Russia the Convention of Child's Rights concerning mass media is not working. There is no effective system of age ratings for watching and selling cinema, video, or PC-game productions. In spite of the efforts of some teacher-enthusiasts, the media education at schools, colleges, and universities remains relatively poor. Russian students have developed very little understanding of the impact of violence upon themselves.

Of course, "there will still be violence in the media, as in life, because there is evil in the world and human nature has its shadow side" (Thoman, 1995, p.127). But I hope the dissemination of my research's results to broad groups (state policymakers, TV/filmmakers, teachers, students and parents, press readers, members of associations for media education/literacy, etc.) will spark an interest in this topic and contribute new sources of information and fresh approaches. I believe that the comparison of the Russian and American experience regarding media violence, standards for rating Russian media programs, and a course of study on media violence for students will have a significant impact upon Russian society, will raise Russian societal and governmental attention to the infringement of the Rights of the Child on the Russian screen, will help to mobilize Russian society against unnecessary violence in the media, will raise the level of responsibility expected of those who disseminate violence on the television, cinema, video, PC-games, etc., and will decrease the atmosphere of Russian social indifference to this problem.

References

- Cantor, J. (2000). Mommy, I'm Scared: Protecting children from Frightening Mass Media. In: Stoughton, C. *Media Violence Alert.* Zionsvill, IN: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., pp. 69-85.
- David, P. (1999). Children's Rights and Media: Conciliating Protection and Participation. In: Feilitzen, C. von and Carlsson, U. (Eds.) (1999). *Children and Media: Image, Education, Participation.* Goteborg: UNESCO International Clearing House on Children and Violence on the Screen, p.31.
- Federman, J. (Ed.) (1997) National Television Violence Study, Volume 2. Santa Barbara: University of California, Center for Communication and Social Policy, 53 pp.
- Gerbner, G. (1988). *Violence and Terror in the Mass Media.* Paris: UNESCO, 46 pp.
- Goldstein, J. (Ed.) (1998). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, 270 pp.
- Ovsyannikov, A.A. (2001). Declaration of Humanitarian Value in Contemporary Russian Society. In: Teaching Social-Humanitarian Disciplines in Russian higher Education: Conditions, Problems, and Perspectives. Moscow: Logos, p.17.
- Potter, W.J. (1999). *On Media Violence.* Thousand Oaks, CA – London: Sage Publication, Inc., 304 pp.
- Potter, W.J. (2003). *The 11 Myths of Media Violence.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc., 259 pp.
- Slaby, R.G. (2002). Media Violence: Effects and Potential Remedies. Katzemann, C.S. (Ed.). *Securing Our Children's Future.* Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, pp. 305-337.

- Tarasov, K. (2000). Film Violence: Attraction and Repulsion. In: News from The UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen. N 2, p. 5.
- Thoman, E. (1995). Media Literacy Education Can Effectively Combat Media Violence. In Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 127-129.
- Wilson, B.J., Smith, S.L. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: The 1994-95 Results. In Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.105-147.

1. Russian Cinematography and the Theme of Violence

Russian society and state censorship has historically treated violence on the screen more tolerantly than erotic or pornographic scenes. Violence on the Russian screen first frequently appeared in detective, mystery, and criminal dramas and melodramas in the 1910s. Since the 1920s screen violence in Russia has been concentrated in war films and so-called "historical and revolutionary" drama and adventure films. Mystery and horror films were completely excluded from the Russian screen. This pattern continued until the middle of the 1980s.

Since the beginning of "perestroika", Russian censorship has gradually lost power. Russian filmmakers are beginning to address genres and themes that were previously forbidden. The number of films containing violent episodes is growing steadily, as is the degree of realism in its representation. In the beginning of the 1990s, in the epoch of "reforms", violence became a basic attraction in Russian thrillers, criminal dramas, and horror and detective films.

I conducted a content analysis of the Russian film repertoire of the 1990s. The purpose of the analysis was to measure the number of Russian films from the 1990s that included scenes of violence (fights, beatings, murders, executions, shots of dead people, accidents, etc.). The data from this content analysis follow below:

Tab.1   VIOLENCE IN RUSSIAN FEATURE FILMS IN THE 1990s

Year:	Number of Russian films:	Number of Russian Films with scenes Of violence:
1990	300	88 (29.3 %)
1991	213	102 (47.9 %)
1992	172	79 (45.9 %)
1993	152	65 (42.8 %)
1994	68	28 (41.2 %)
1995	46	29 (63.0 %)
1996	28	9 (32.1 %)
1997	32	14 (43.7 %)
1998	35	18 (51.4 %)
1999	41	14 (34.1 %)
Total :	1041	446 (42.8 %)

My calculations show that as many films including the word "death" in their titles were produced from 1990 to 2000 as were produced from 1919 to 1989! Many aggressive words, such as "murder", "kill ", "war", "enemy", or "shoot" appear in the titles of Russian films of the 1990s. The amount of violence is impressive: on the average 42.8% percent of Russian productions contain scenes of violence.

Of course, violence episodes do exist in such artistic films as *The Inner Circle* by A.Konchalovsky, *Krustalev, the Car!* by A.German, and others. If violence, alas, is an integral part of Russian life, then art has the indisputable right to reflect this on the screen. In fact, Russian "high art" not only represents but also condemns violence. However, my content analysis of the Russian film repertoire of the 1990s and begin of XXI century shows that the bulk of "film violence" has a low artistic level (and low commercial potential): *The Wolves in the Zone, Hunting the Souteneur, Charged by Death*, etc.

The majority of the hundreds of Russian films of the 1990s did not reached the "big screen", but nearly all were broadcast on television and many were shown in prime time (8 to 10 p.m.). Prime time is the most accessible viewing period for children. So while erotic *1/2 Weeks* was shown at midnight in Russia, many channels still played violent films in both the morning and evening.

For example, the very popular Russian television series *Cops (Menty: The Street of the Broken Lanterns)* contains some very real murders, fights, and close-ups of dead bodies. This serial is broadcast during prime time. Of course, this is an accessible time for Russian children.

The genre spectrum of the Russian films containing episodes of violence was rather wide in the 1990s and begin of XXI century: dramas, detective films, thrillers, horrors, melodramas, parables, parodies and even comedies. Content analysis has shown that the basic plots of violent Russian films are the following:

1.Terror in the army and prisons. A common man of the second half of the 20th century enlists in the army (variant: is thrown in a prison, an asylum, etc.), where he sees severe violence (*Cane Paradise, Ivin A, Do - One!, 100 Days till the Demobilization, etc.*).

The action of these films, as a rule, takes place in unattractive interiors, such as dirty cells, half-destroyed buildings, and flooded cellars. The Russian army is shown as a typical model of the state, where violence is the main instrument of power. This is very good material not only for realistic dramas, but also for gloomy parables, pathological visions, and shock visual images.

2. War terror. People at war in a "trouble spot", where violence becomes their livelihood (*Caravan of Death, Afghani Break, To Survive, The War*, etc.).

3. Criminal terror & the revenge of good guys. A man with big muscles returning home from the army (Afghanistan, Chechnya, etc.). He discovers that gangsters/mafia run the whole city/village. These "bad guys" kill/rape his friend/sister/girlfriend/relative. The brave "good guy" fights the bad guys. Violence (murders, explosions, etc.) ensues.

Variant: Gangsters hijacking a ship (bus, plane, train), terrorizing the passengers and the crew (*A Mad Bus, Gangsters at the Ocean,* etc.). But the hero takes his revenge on the serial maniacs, gangsters, killers, aggressive drug addicts, and other "bad guys".

4.Criminal terror and bad/good cops. A dangerous gang or murderer devastating a city in which the police are powerless (*Satan, Snake Spring, The Contract with Death* etc.). Alternatively, rather than an "independent" murderer, the killer may be

a hired hitman (*Dead Line, Brother,* etc.). Occasionally we encounter a revival of the traditional detective plot: a criminal vs. an honest policeman (*Kamenskaya*).

5.Holocost terror (*From a Hell to a Hell*, etc.)

6. Sexual violence as a part of Russian life. In these films, the protagonist's sexual relationships of are on the verge of sexual violence. Some very talented people have produced Russian movies of this sort, including N.Hubov's *The Body*. He reproduces an atmosphere of provincial Russia with great accuracy. He describes a poor and hopeless life: A "normal" love between a young girl and her boyfriend transforms into crime. The boy rapes his girlfriend together with his friend, and the girl subsequently takes her revenge.

7. Mystical terror. Vampires attacking defenseless people (*Drinking Blood, Family of Vampires*, etc.).

8. Violence as humor (such as exists in Quentin Tarantino's films). The problems of morals are rejected as ridiculous and old-fashioned (*The Sky in Diamonds, The Body will be in the Ground...*, *Mom, don't cry!*, etc.).

9. Communist terror. The heroes of the film endure executions and violence in concentration camps and prisons. The styles of communist terror films are rather diverse: traditional realistic, grotesque, ironic, etc. Some of these films produce a very shocking impression upon the audience (*Khrustalev, the Car!*).

The prevailing models of the contents are:

-Mass terror during war, such as communist terror: the communist regime deforms and transforms people into hangmen and victims. This is especially evident in pictures about mass terror of Caucasians in the 1940s (*Cold, The Road on the Edge of Life, etc.*);

-A common man trying to avoid politics and to stay impartial becomes a victim of terror, only then the "enemies of the Soviet state" and realize that everything they believed in was nothing but a understanding the anti-human essence of the communist authority; (variant: people, sincerely believing in communist ideas and Stalin, experience the horrors of being lie (*The Inner Circle, Burnt by the Sun, Khrustalev, the Car!*);

-"Revolutionary terror". The "ideological terror" attracts people with aggressive thirsts for power and people with mental diseases who desire to leave a bloody trace through history (*The Killer of the Emperor, Trotsky, Romanov: The Tsar's Family*).

10. Violence in relation to children. Having received freedom, the Russian cinema has produced many hard and violent films about children. The action in these films often takes place at school or in prison. Such films are filled with scenes of dark restrooms, violence, drug addiction, and cruelty. In one of these films a tutor in an orphanage, aware of the unofficial laws, chooses not to notice fresh blood on a mirror in a children's bedroom. In another a strong bully terrorizes a weak child. Twenty years ago, Russian movie-goers enjoyed sentimental stories about thoughtful and tender tutors. But nearly every other film about children and youth made in the 1990s was an indictment. On the Russian screen there are terrible images of hostile state houses, where the teachers are only additional tools for the violence.

Of course, other genre of films may contain violence. But these pictures are not intended for preschoolers and children under 10 years of age with sensitive psyches. Therefore it would be better to show these films on television after 10 p.m.

2. Russia's Violent Television Programs

Just how frequently is violence shown on Russian television? At what time is it shown? Is screen violence accessible to the child audience? I have tried to answer these questions through an analysis of the repertoire of a week's television programming. Except for STS, all television channels include television news programs (3-8 times per day) containing scenes of violence (murder victims, accidents, military actions, terrorism, etc.). There are also special programs specializing in criminal topics: violence and victims of violence, bloody details of accidents etc. Some night programs are replayed in the morning. These include *The Police Station*, *Crime*, *Crime: Frank Confession*, *Road Patrol*, and *Petrovka, 38*.

Programs average 15-20 minutes in length, but in total approximately six hours are dedicated to special "criminal programs" on Russian television channels! These are some examples of "criminal programs" that Russian children watch in the morning and daytime.

Monday: Close-ups of children's corpses.

Tuesday: Again, strangled and murdered corpses are shown on the screen. This time four dead bodies are shown, including a close-up of a murdered gangster.

Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday...more dead people.

I monitored special Russian television programs dedicated to criminal themes over seven days (from Monday, January 10th, 2000 to Sunday, January 16th, 2000). My recorded data are presented in the tables below.

Table 1. PERIODICITY OF VIOLENT SPECIAL TELEVISION PROGRAMS IN RUSSIA

Violent TV-Program	Channel	Day of Week	Time of Violence Programs			
			6am-12pm	12pm – 6pm	6pm–11pm	After 11pm
The Police Station	RTR	Mon-Sun	Yes	Yes	No	No
Crime	NTV	Mon-Sun	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Road Patrol	TV-6	Mon-Sun	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Petrovka, 38	TV-Center	Mon-Fri	Yes	No	Yes	No

As one can see from Table 1, different Russian channels broadcast special criminal programs - including documentary films of victims of violence and accidents - practically all week long. They do this not only in the evening, but also in the morning and afternoon. These programming periods are quite open to the junior audience.

Table 2. VIOLENT IMAGES AND VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE ON RUSSIAN SCREEN IN SPECIAL "CRIMINAL PROGRAMS"

TV Program of a Violence Theme	Channel	Day(s) of Week	Realistic images of violence and victims of violence (corpses, wounds, including close ups of the victims of crimes, human blood, etc.)
The Police Station	RTR	Thurs, Fri	Yes
Crime	NTV	Mon, Thu, Thurs, Fri	Yes
Road Patrol	TV-6	Mon- Sat	Yes
Petrovka, 38	TV-Center	Mon-Fri	Yes

The analysis of Table 2 shows that almost every day a special "criminal" television program broadcasts shots of real corpses, victims of accidents, and murdered people. For example, in *Crime* (NTV) on January 10th and 13th, 2000, close-ups of bloody corpses were shown. Two dead bodies in pools of blood were shown in *The Police Station* in the program January 13th, 2000, as well as close-ups of more corpses in a program from January 14th, 2000. Similar documentary shots were shown on *Road Patrol* (TV-6) on January 1[st,] 10th, 11th, and 13th, 2000.

I emphasize that it would be perfectly acceptable if criminal television programs were shown to adults and after 10p.m. or 11pm. Adults should have independent choice. But I have already argued, they are accessible to young children in the morning and afternoon as well.

Certainly, some scenes of violence are shown in usual television news in Russia. But these are not so frequently or aggressively shown as in special "crime-programs".

3. Television, Film Repertoire, and the Problem of Violence on the Screen

The third part of my research is dedicated to monitoring violence in Russian television's film repertoire. There are dozens of films and serials each week (mainly from the US, France, and Latin America) containing all kinds of violence.
"Violence dominates U.S. exports. We compared 250 U.S. programs exported to ten countries with 111 programs shown in the U.S. during the same year. Violence was the main theme of 40% of home-shown and 49% of exported programs. Crime/action series comprised 17% of home-shown and 46% of exported programs" (Gerbner, 2001, p.135).

The majority of films containing realistic images of violence are shown after 10 p.m., thus avoiding the child audience. However, similar productions often occur during "children's time". The following is the television film repertoire between January 10th and 16th, 2000 between the hours of 6 a.m. and 11 p.m.

Monday: On the whole the repertoire of leading Russian television companies did not contain serials and films with excessive violence. If violence occurred in the course of a plot, it was represented in an unrealistic manner (for example, in the serial *Murder, She Wrote*). The famous hit *Highlander* (ORT, 7 – 11 p.m.) is almost completely composed of violence. Certainly, violence in *Highlander* lacks horrifying realism - it is violence from fairy tales and legends. Also, the protagonist

personifying Good wins the battle over Evil. Nevertheless, in the US this film was rated "R" (Restricted). Similarly, the "fantasy" serial *The Legend of William Tell* was shown from Monday till Friday on TV-6 during "children's time" (5 till 5:40 p.m.). In this serial there was a great deal of violence (battles, duels, fights, murders), but it lacked realistic detail.

Tuesday: At 9:45 p.m., RTR showed a Hong Kong martial arts film. There were many fights and much violence, but without realistic detail.

Wednesday: RTR broadcast another Hong Kong martial arts film from 9:45 p.m. till 11:45 p.m. This film contained scenes of violence, but without much realism.

Thursday: From 8:45 p.m. till 10:00 p.m., NTV showed a thriller of Richard Donner's *Assassins* (1995) with Sylvester Stallone. This film presented many murders, but also portrayed a killer as the "good guy". Many Stallone action films are "R" rated, but the Russian NTV presented them openly to small children.

Friday: Each Friday at 9:45 p.m., ORT ran the American detective story serial *Colombo*. The serial contained scenes of violence.

Saturday: At 7:50 p.m., NTV showed the first part of "Bondiana": *Dr. No*. In America, Bond films are generally rated "PG" (Parental Guidance).

Sunday: From 12:05 till 2 pm, ORT ran a Russian film about the Civil War: *Winner* (1976). This is a traditionally Soviet picture, and its violence against "public enemies" is portrayed as a "dictatorship of the proletariat". From 7 till 9 p.m. ORT played author Luc Besson's cut of *The Professional*, a thriller with great violence. This film ran with age restrictions in America and Europe, but ORT broadcast the picture in "children's time". It should be also noted that the leading female character is a young girl. In the morning (8:15 – 9 a.m.), NTV replayed the previous night's presentation of the Canadian television serial *Nikita*. The same channel from 8:50 to 9:50 p.m. ran the Russian criminal serial *Cops-2*. A close-up of a dead woman and man is included in the opening credits of each part of this popular television serial.

Certainly, relative to the violence in crime documentaries, the violence in feature films does not seem as horrifying or shocking. That is, we can always say to a child: "Don't be afraid, it's not real - it's cinema! He's not a gangster, and he's not a policeman - he's an actor".

However, the negative influence on the psychology and mentality of minors is significant. Recent Russian research has shown that:

*"The video and the television menus of school age children are rather monotonous: every third film is an action or a thriller, and every fifth is erotic. (...) The characters' purposes and motives are rather different from that of the "home and family". These purposes and motives include satisfaction of the libido (41%), murder (17%), and self-defense (17%) (...) Such values as friendship, law, and honor are represented by only 3%. (...) The abundance of violence suggests that violence is the only way to solve conflicts. The authors observed the reaction of children during a showing of the violent film **Art of Death**. This film contains various sorts of murders. (...) Younger children watching experienced shock. I think it is clear that scenes of violence have a harmful influence on children. One*

feature of a child's mentality is that information received from the screen is perceived as a real. Both in games and in reality, children frequently imitate what they have seen, including violence "acquired" with help from the media screen. As a result they may perceive violence as an acceptable social model of behavior and as a means to solve problems. One may or may not agree with these conclusions, but one cannot deny the horrifying statistics of child and teenage cruelty and criminality, nor the fact that an overwhelming majority of criminal minors cited "screen examples or analogies" among the motives for their crimes. (...) In Germany, Sweden and other countries of Europe, special laws protecting children from violence on the screen have appeared. In Russia there are still no protective measures of this kind" (Abramenkova, 1999, p.7).

My content analysis of one week's television programming is quite representative of the present situation. Many Russian sociologists, film historians, and journalists share my point of view.

A. Vartanov writes:

*"Realistic details not only have a depressing impact on millions of viewers - they quite often provoke a thirst for revenge. (...) In one release of **Today** (a news program on the Russian private television channel NTV – A.F.), journalist V. Grunsky emotionlessly describes the terrible scenes from Chechnya. In one shot, a Chechen soldier shoots the hand of a hostage. In the next shot the man pleads for help. In the third, the Chechen terrorist chops off the man's head. I must confess, it is terrifying for me even to retell it - not to mention to watch it. Yet still a civilized and diligent television company such as NTV shows this hard violence"* (Vartanov, 1999, p.12).

I. Naidenov writes:

*"The corpse of a Chechen soldier - a close-up on his body - crushed under a concrete wall. A victim of an explosion in Moscow... Programs such as **Road Patrol, Accidents of The Week, Criminal Russia** and others fill domestic television channels and enjoy high ratings. They speculate on a phenomenon of human sub-consciousness - attracting the viewer to the violent plots. The interactive interrogations show that the viewer would prefer to watch a collision of trains in India to an artist's exhibition (...). Television programs like Road Patrol show details of murders, transport accidents and so on, such as you cannot see on a European channel"* (Naidenov, 1999, p.1).

E. Ivanova writes, "*Our television channels, mildly speaking, at any time demonstrate programs, commercials, feature films that distort or hurt the gentle mentality of a child and create a cold, aggressive man*" (Ivanova, 1997, p.28).

K. Tarasov writes:

"As a biological creature, man is extremely sensitive to real violence. Therefore many viewers are excited by episodes of violence, and in them an almost instinctual fascination arises (Tarasov, 1997, p.77). *Teenage crime in Russia is becoming a national crisis and many lawyers label low-standard action films as the catalyst* (Tarasov, 1997, p.78). *Young viewers can be conventionally divided*

into three typological groups. "Highly-active" consumers of media violence constitute the first group, which accounts for 55% of Russian youth. Of the films this group watched during four weeks, half or even a majority contained scenes of violence. The second group is characterized by an "aggressive film-diet" and is made up by 11% of young viewers. In the third group, young men and women who watch a "moderate" proportion of screen violence constitute 24% of the whole. (...) The percentage of "highly active" consumers of screen violence is 62 among boys and 50 among girls" (Tarasov, 1997, p.78-79).

Should we react by banning television programs and films with criminal themes, and at the same time proscribe the sale of video-CD, DVD, and CD-ROM disks with games based on violence? Certainly not. An adult audience has a right to know what the state of crime is in Russia and abroad. But violence on the screen should be not open to children under 10-12 year ages with gentle and sensitive mentalities. Hence, films and television programs that include violence, accidents, and wars should be shown at nighttime and should not be replayed in the morning and daytime.

Russia today experiences many problems, but it is necessary to spare more effort in order to protect childhood's peaceful illusions and to not destroy its fragile well-being. Thankfully, our children under ten are usually indifferent to our political and economic crises. They deserve to watch animated cartoons and cheerful comedies in "children's time" - not of criminal horrors.

References

- Abramenkova V. (1999). Mom, Daddy, and Video. In: *Trud.* May 28, p.7.
- Gerbner, G. (2001). Communities Should Have More Control over the Content of Mass Media. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.129-137.
- Ivanova E. (1997). Kid at the Screen. In: *Trud.* Oct. 17, p.28.
- Naidenov I. (1999). Operation "Provocation". In: *Kultura.* N 35, p.1.
- Tarasov K. (1997). Violence in Cinema: An Attraction and Pushing Away. In: *Test by Competition.* Moscow: Scientific Institute of Cinema Publishing House, pp.74-97.
- Vartanov A. (1999). The People and Anti-People. In: *Trud.* Sept. 16, p.12.

4. Russian Teenagers and Violence on the Screen
4.1.Description of the Test

This is one of the first studies of violence on media screen in modern Russia. A public debate about Youth and Violence on the Screen exists because Russian television channels frequently show violent films and television programs. I compiled survey data from 430 sixteen and seventeen year old students of Taganrog's high schools and of the first course of Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute.

I used a multiple choice ("closed") form of survey because most teens, as a rule, are not able to state their points of view concerning media preferences precisely or quickly. Also, a "closed" form test is easier and takes less time to complete. The test was conditionally divided into 3 parts:

1.Violence on the Screen: Teenage Orientations and Preferences;

2.Teenage Attitude toward Violence on the Screen: Reasons and Results; and

3.Teenagers and Violence on the Screen: Situational Tests.

Part 1. Violence on the Screen: Teenage Orientations and Preferences:

1. Teenagers were given a list of forty Russian and foreign films, about half of them popular comedies and melodramas containing no violence. In the other half (thrillers, horror films, criminal and war epics), violence often played a major role. Since these films are often shown on television and are available on video, we can suggest that teenagers who are attracted to violence will prefer this latter, more violent half;

2. By analogy to this, I compiled a list of popular computer games among youth. I assumed that a teenager who favored games filled with fights and shooting (*Doom*) would not mind seeing violence on the screen;

3. After an indirect clarification of teenage attitude towards violence on the screen, I proceeded to the direct questions 3, 4, and 5. Through these questions it was possible to learn which films, television shows, and computer games of which countries, genres, and themes contained the most violence. From a sample of forty countries, many African, Asian, and South American countries were absent because their film or television industries did not reach the Russian market.

4. Having learned the audience's knowledge of which genre-theme components most often accompany scenes of violence, I continued with questions 6, 7, and 8 concerning the most popular movie characters among teenagers. For that purpose, the film list was solely violent productions. Were a teenager to prefer American thrillers and horror films, then among his favorite characters would be such heroes as the Terminator or Rambo;

5. By knowing a teenager's favorite characters, we supposed that among the most likable character traits were strength, courage, and self-confidence (n 7). A number of students who made such a choice would like to resemble their hero in behavior and world outlook (n 8).

Part 2. Teenage Attitude toward Violence on the Screen: Reasons and Results

1. Through direct questioning we quantified the students who were attracted and not attracted to scenes of violence on the screen. If in the first part of the test teenagers preferred violent films, violent computer/video games, and violent protagonists (such as the Terminator or Rambo), then the test-taker's answer to this question would be positive.

2. With reference to the preceding query's answer, teenagers chose factors that attracted or repelled them to the scenes of violence. One may presume that the entertainment value of a show or recreation would attract, and that fear of blood, violence, and crime would repel.

3. Proceeding from numerous observations in cinema theaters, we assumed that teenagers attracted to violence on the screen would frequent cinemas together with friends (three or more).

4. We then asked questions concerning motives for watching violence on the screen and concerning the psychological state afterwards. Given the psychology of teenagers (aspiration to self-affirmation, appearing mature, etc.) one could not expect a majority of the teenage audience to confess that

they become sad or bitter upon witnessing violence on the screen. More often, teenagers emphasized that it does not influence them.

5. It is natural that teenagers claim to not remember scenes of violence nor to discuss them, but if they do discuss them they prefer to do so among friends. The psychology of a teenager does not allow him to consider his parents as interlocutors.

Part 3. Teenagers and Violence on the Screen: Situational Tests

In this part of the test, teenagers faced hypothetical game situations. Some of the questions may seem trivial - for instance, a question about naming pets. Yet these were purposefully included so as to relax the teenagers between more serious questions.

1. The first question asked which videotape a teenager would take with him to a desert island. This question to some extent duplicated the question n 1, Part 1. A teenager who has, even only in his imagination, just one film at his disposal for a long period of time may may somehow change his preferences. That is, a person who prefers watching violent films would not necessarily choose to keep *Rambo* on a desert island.

2. The second question concerned a comic situation with choosing names for pets. This question provided an opportunity to indirectly explore the degree of popularity of movie characters among teenagers.

3. The third question directly asked teenagers' reactions to scenes of violence on the screen. This question intentionally repeated a question in Part 2 because it was presumed that teenagers who liked scenes of violence on the screen would not switch off the television when violence was shown.

4. Such is the case with the fourth question, in which a teenager was asked about his interest in acting in scenes of violence on the screen. It was presumed that a teenager who disapproved of violence on the screen would not act in a violent film production.

5. The fifth question generated a discussion of reasons for and influence of aggression and violence in society, as well as and the prohibition of violence on the screen. This question was also aimed to affirm the answers to previous parts of the test: a person who enjoyed watching scenes of violence on the screen, probably would not point at such violence as the reason for increasing crime in real-life, nor would be pay attention to its influence nor wouldn't demand censorship).

6. The last question asked the age at which children should be allowed to watch scenes of violence on the screen. Teenagers who enjoy violence on the screen chose the lowest age possible or were against any prohibitions whatever.

4.2. The Main Aims of the Test
(Violence on the Screen: Teenage Orientations and Preferences)

1. To determine the degree of popularity of violent screen productions (films, television shows, and computer games). The obtained information helped me to take into consideration the real preferences of teenagers and to pay

attention to the films, genres, and themes that are popular and thus have a maximum moral and psychological influence.

2. To determine to what extent teenagers associate productions of different genres, countries, and themes with violence on the screen. The results I obtained explained the teenage approach to mass media culture and the ability to distinguish between different genres and themes.

3. To reveal the primary traits of popular movie characters - including those whom they would like to resemble. I was careful to take into consideration new fashions and trends and to pay attention to popular films and heroes.

(Part 2. Teenage Attitude toward Violence on the Screen: Reasons and Results)

4. To quantify the students who are attracted to scenes of violence on the screen. This number should coincide with the number of students who prefer heroes of bloody thrillers and horror films.

5. To reveal the main factors attracting teenagers to scenes of violence on the screen, such as entertaining function, function of identification, compensatory function, function of recreation, professional directorship, outstanding acting, and outstanding special effects. The results are necessary to compare with written papers and discussions in order to know the audience's self-evaluation of its preferences and real motives.

6. To establish the motives for disliking of scenes of violence on the screen. (This is also important for the special student course.)

7. To find out with whom teenagers prefer to watch scenes of violence on the screen, and to ascertain the communicative results and consequences of such shows. This is important for a comparison of the audience's self-evaluation with the results of the test on the whole.

(Part 3. Teenagers and Violence on the Screen: Situational Tests)

8. To find out to how stable students' current media preferences regarding violence are.

9. To find out the type of teenage reaction to scenes of violence on the screen. The results confirmed students' answers to the main question of Part 2 of the test concerning their attitudes towards on-screen violence.

10. To learn about the imaginary readiness of teenagers to act in a violent scene in a film. The results confirmed students' answers concerning their attitudes towards on-screen violence.

11. To determine teenage opinion of the reasons for violence and aggression in society, of the influence of violence on the screen upon the increase of crimes, and of prohibition of scenes of violence on the screen (including with regard to their future children). The analysis of the results will also confirmed tendencies revealed in the first two parts of the test.

4.3. Results of the Test "Russian Teenagers and Violence on the Screen"

(430 people were questioned, aged 16 to 17 years)

Part 1. Violence on the screen: teenage orientations and preferences

Made clear by the data in Table 1, just 4 of 10 popular films contained violence (*From Dusk Till Dawn, Speed, Basic Instinct, Twin Peaks*), while the top

three most watched were melodramas (*Pretty Woman*) and comedies (*Diamond Hand*, *Gentlemen of Good Luck*). The proportion of teenagers who were fans of Robert Rodriguez' film *From Dusk Till Down* – a parody of tough gangster dramas and horror films – did not exceed 17%, while *Pretty Woman* was favored by 26% of teenagers. Therefore we may conclude that on-screen violence is not so popular (for students) as screen comedies.   Bu the way, the Russian comedies *Diamond Hand* and *Gentlemen of Good Luck* were included in the hit-film list, and placed third (76.7 million) and twelfth (65 million) in number of tickets sold...

The same situation took place concerning teenage attitude toward violent computer games (Table 2). *Tetris* took first place (44.65% picked it) and didn't contain any violent scenes. *Doom*, on the other hand, was based on violence and enjoyed half *Tetris'* popularity (25.11%). (We must point out that in Russia not every family has a computer, so teenage access to computer games is still rather limited.)

An analysis of Table 4 suggested that teenagers know which countries produce the most violent screen productions. The United State and Hong Kong were the primary production centers. Teenagers pointed out that violence on the screen in the 1990's also became common in Russian media. It is notable that no European country (except Italy, which placed 5th with 11.39% of the votes) was identified by teenagers as a leader in on-screen violence. This may be explained not only by the "peaceful" character of European screen production, but also by the absence of Russian contact with productions from European countries (except Italy and France).

Tables 4 and 5 suggest that Russian teenagers distinguish well the genres and themes of screen violence: action, drama, horror, criminal, war, science-fiction, psychological, etc. An analysis of Table 6 produces even more interesting results: Russian teenagers liked "good" characters in such films as *Twin Peaks* and *The Silence of the Lambs*, as well as "evil" characters of films containing violent scenes – *The Godfather* (31.86%), *From Dusk Till Dawn* (26.27%), *The Terminator* (24.41%), *Natural Born Killers* (11.39%). Among the character traits teenagers admired were "firmness" (41.62%), "intellect" (40.23%), "power" (36.27%), and "cruelty" (19.53%). "Kindness" only gathered 10.46% of teenagers' votes. To my mind, this supports the idea of a negative influence of on-screen violence upon the young audience.

A comparative analysis of Tables 1 and 6 showed that there was some difference between teenagers' favorite films and their protagonists. 16.97% of students liked *From Dusk Till Dawn* while its main characters – murderers - were popular with 26.27% of the audience. The same situation was true with the television series *Twin Peaks*: 37.67% like the hero, and 12.32% liked only the movie itself. Teenagers would like to emulate the movie characters mentioned above in world outlook (19.76%), behavior (12.32%), attire (9.69%), job (8.60%), and attitude (7.99%). A low percentage of teenagers chose to answer this question because many teenagers considered this question to be childish and "just for kids". On the margins of some tests was written, "I'm too old to imitate anyone".

Part 2. Teenage attitude to on-screen violence: reasons and results

The data listed in Table 9 show that 48.14% of the teenagers were attracted to violence on the screen, 28.84% had a negative attitude toward the violence, and 23.02% were not sure. A comparative analysis of Tables 1, 2, 6, and 9 proves that the self-evaluation of teenagers corresponds to their real screen preferences. None of the violent films or computer games couldn't overcomes the limit of 40% popularity, that is screen production of such kind was chosen by 48% of teenagers who are supporters of screen violence according to the statistics of the table 9.

The test I made in Table 10 revealed factors that influence teenage perception and estimation of on-screen violence. Among the factors that attracted teenagers were: entertaining function, acting, direction, recreation, informative function, special effects, and action dynamics. We must also bear in mind that a high rating of the actor's and director's skill does not demonstrate that all teenagers who made such a choice are good judges of a film's artistic value. Quite often a teenager who were entertained by a film also claimed that the performance and directors' work was good.

Table 10 also shows that the majority of those teenagers (28,84%) who were "not attracted" by on-screen violence in Table 9, actually make quite another choice. In Table 10 just 5.34% of teenagers asserted that nothing in on-screen violence appeals to them, and the rest said some factors (e.g. acting or special effects) draw them to the television set. Their reasons for disliking on-screen violence are shown in Table 11. First among the most common reasons was the influence on the increase of crimes. The second was disgust towards bloody details of violence, hatred, fear of violence, and unwillingness to experience unpleasant emotions. The percent data of Table 11 on the whole corresponds to the figures of Table 9 (the number of students who not attracted by the violence is about 30% only), so the correctness of the test's results is confirmed.

Tables 12 and 17 confirm a known truth: teenagers prefer to watch television and discuss together with their friends. According to Table 16 – 22.79% of the audience discuss it regularly. Such is the case with on-screen violence. Parents acted as interlocutors in both cases with 17% of the teenagers. Among the reasons for watching on-screen violence (Table 13) teenagers rated "nothing else to do" as an "ok" (62.32%), "good" (26.27%) and "bad" (11.39%) mood. Table 14 reflects the main types of psychological states in which teenagers find themselves after they watched on-screen violence. The majority of them claimed that their psychological states did not change, and only a small number of the students (4%-5%) confessed that they became aggressive or bitter. The majority of the audience (65%) while assuring that their psychological states remained the same, were not inclined to remember the on-screen violence (Table 15), and just 6.27% of teenagers pointed out that screen violence stayed in their memories for a long time.

Part 3. Teenagers and violence on the screen. the results of the situations' tests.

Table 18 suggests that despite liking on-screen violence, not all of the 48.14% teenagers would to go to a desert island with only a videotape of *Basic Instinct* or *The Silence of the Lambs*. As in Table 1, first place in screen preferences was taken

again by the American comedy *Pretty Woman* (it was particularly favored by girls) and the Russian comedies *Diamond Hand* and *Gentlemen of Good Luck*. As for the violent films, the highest number of votes was received by *From Dusk Till Dawn* (3.95%), which was four times less than *Pretty Woman's* rating. In Table 19 the data of a comic situation are given. This comic situation was included to relax students. The results of Table 20 are important because they checked the data of Tables 9 and 11. The number of teenagers who continue to watch a film despite on-screen violence should correspond to the number of students who answered "yes" to the question of attraction to violence in Table 9. Likewise, the number of teenagers who avoid on-screen violence should correspond to the number of teenagers who answered "no" to the questions of Tables 9 and 20. This is precisely what occurred. As in Tables 9, 11, and 20, the amount of teenagers who dislike on-screen violence is 30%.

Table 21 shows the data reflecting teenage attitude toward acting in on-screen violence. The data shows that more than half the students (59.53%) would disregard their aversions to on-screen violence were they to be generously compensated. Only 7.67% (out of 28.84% from Table 9) of the students remained negative about on-screen violence and absolutely would not act in violent scenes. It is my opinion that to a large degree the economic situation in Russia explains these results.

As for the reasons behind violence and aggression in society, teenagers claimed in Table 22 that violence is in the nature of all humans and also mentioned psychological diseases. On-screen violence was mentioned as a cause of real-life violence only by 3.25% of teenagers. The data in Table 23 confirm this orientation of the audience: 33.58% believed that only psychologically sick people can possibly be influenced by on-screen violence. 33.02% considered this influence unimportant, and 14.18% of teenagers think that showing on-screen violence leads to an increase in real-life violence. Such a scattered spectrum of view points can be explained perhaps by the fact that the attitude of teenagers toward on-screen violence is not yet final, and that this is why some of them sometimes answer differently to similar questions.

The data of Table 24 are also comparable with the results of Tables 9, 11, 20, 21 and 23. Teenagers who, according to Table 9, were attracted to on-screen violence no doubt wanted zero restrictions concerning on-screen violence: 48.14% (Table 9), 56.97% (Table 20) and 48.60% (Table 24). 12.79% of teenagers wanted violence to be proscribed from the screen and 20.23% thought that only the most cruel films and television shows should be banned. According to the data in Table 24, 33.02% of teenagers wanted some kind of restriction for on-screen violence. This number corresponds to the data in Table 9 (28.84%), Table 11 (30.46%) and Table 20 (28.83%). Just 3.02% of teenagers desired more on-screen violence in Russia. A comparison between Tables 24 and 25 showed that there was a great disparity of opinion concerning age restrictions for watching on-screen violence generally (Table 9) and age restrictions for future children (Table 25).

Assuming the role of a censor, teenagers considered it possible to ban on-screen violence for all children (11.16%), to not let children under 10 watch it

(5.11%), and to not let children under 15 watch on-screen violence (3.95%). Acting as parents they became much stricter: 38.37% did not want their children to watch violence until they were 10, and 25.34% did not want their children to watch violence until they were 15. 35.58% of teenagers were ready to let their children watch on-screen violence at any age. The latter figures correspond to the results of Tables 9, 10, 20 and 23.

From an analysis of the test *Russian Teenagers and On-Screen Violence* one may conclude that the influence of on-screen violence upon Russian teenagers is rather significant. About half the teenagers were positive about its demonstration: they enjoyed films, television shows, and computer games containing on-screen violence and they admired the characters - including "bad guys". A third of the teenagers were not sure about their opinion of on-screen violence, although they claimed to not be attracted by it. Just 18% of teenagers discuss and share their opinions with their parents. The influence of Russian schools upon the teenage relationship with on-screen violence is minimal. All this can't but evoke alarm, because since the 1980s on-screen violence has begun to penetrate into Russian society more and more. It can be safely said that in Russia the *Convention of Child's Rights* concerning mass media is not working. There is no effective system of ratings for watching and selling videos or PC-games. In spite of the efforts of some teacher-enthusiasts, the media education at schools, colleges and universities remains relatively poor.

4.4.Results of the Test "Russian Teenagers and On-Screen"
(A survey of 430 16 and 17 year-old students)

PART 1. On-screen violence: teenage orientations and preferences

TABLE 1. Cinema preferences of Russian teenagers

1. *Pretty Woman* (USA, 1990). 26.04%
2. *Diamond Hand* (Russia, 1969). 23.02%
3. *Gentlemen of Good Luck* (Russia, 1974). 22.09%
4. *Back to the Future* (USA, 1985). 18.13%
5. *From Dusk Till Dawn* (USA, 1995). 16.97%
6. *Speed* (USA, 1994). 16.27%
7. *Irony of the Fortune* (Russia, 1975). 14.88%
8. *Basic Instinct* (USA, 1992). 13.25%
9. *Twin Peaks* (USA, 1989). 12.32%
10. *White Sun of the Desert* (Russia, 1970). 11.86%

TABLE 2. Favorite PC-games of Russian teenagers

1. *Tetris*. 44.65%
2. *Doom*. 25.11%
3. *Sport Games*. 15.81%
4. *Aladdin*. 7.20%
5. *Mortal Combat*. 3.02%
6. No opportunity to play PC-games. 25.11%

TABLE 3. Russian teenage estimation of countries that produce the most films, television shows, and PC-games containing on-screen violence

1. USA. 90.93%
2. China (Hong Kong). 52.79%
3. Japan. 30.69%
4. Russia. 28.83%
5. Italy. 11.39%

TABLE 4. Films, television shows, and PC-game genres that, according to Russian teenagers, most frequently accompany on-screen violence

1. Action. 90.23%
2. Thriller. 76.27%
3. Horror. 43.72%
4. Fantasy. 23.72%
5. Detective. 22.09%

TABLE 5. Films, television shows, and PC-game themes that, according to Russian teenagers, most frequently accompany on-screen violence

1. Criminal. 54.88%
2. Military. 49.53%
3. Science-fiction. 29.76%
4. Psychological. 25.34%
5. Erotic. 22.79%

TABLE 6. Violent films whose protagonists are admired by Russian teenagers

1. *Twin Peaks* (1989). 37.67%
2. *The Silence of the Lambs* (1991). 32.79%
3. *The Godfather* (1972). 31.86%
4. *From Dusk Till Dawn* (1995). 26.27%
5. *The Terminator* (1984). 24.41%
6. *Basic Instinct* (1992). 19.53%
7. *Nikita* (1990). 18.83%
8. *Bram Stoker's Dracula* (1992). 17.90%
9. *Rambo* (1981). 17.44%
10. *Nightmare on Elm Street* (1984). 12.09%
11. *Natural Born Killers* (1993). 11.39%
12. *The Professional* (1995). 10.23%
13. *Pulp Fiction* (1994). 9.06%
14. *Once Upon a Time in America* (1984). 6.04%
15. *Friday the 13th* (1980). 4.41%

TABLE 7. Character traits that Russian teenagers admire in heroes of violent films

1. Firmness. 41.62%
2. Intellect. 40.23%
3. Beauty. 36.51%
4. Power. 36.27%
5. Courage. 27.44%
6. Fascination. 22.55%
7. Cruelty. 19.53%

8. Resourcefulness. 16.51%

9. Purpose. 15.34%

10.Cunning. 13.48%

11.Optimism. 12.09%

12.Kindness. 10.46%

TABLE 8. Ways in which Russian teenagers would most like to resemble the heroes of violent films

1. World Outlook. 19.76%

2. Behavior. 12.32%

3. Attire. 9.69%

4. Job. 8.60%

5. Attitude toward people. 7.44%

PART 2. Teenage attitude toward on-screen violence: reasons and results

TABLE 9. Russian teenage attitude toward on-screen violence

1. Attracted by the violence. 48.14%

2. Not attracted by the violence. 28.84%

3. No definite opinion about the problem. 23.02%

TABLE 10. Factors attracting Russian teenagers to on-screen violence

1. Entertaining function. 33.02%

2. Outstanding acting. 28.37%

3. Professional directing. 22.09%

4. Function of recreation. 15.81%

5. Information function. 11.86%

6. Outstanding special effects. 8.37%

7. Dynamics / speed of action. 7.90%

8. Function of identification. 6.74%

9. No attractive factors. 5.34%

10. Compensatory function. 3.95%

TABLE 11. Motivations for not liking on-screen violence

1. Violence on the screen increases violence in real life. 30.46%

2. Disgust towards seeing blood and crippled people. 14.65%

3. Hatred toward violence of any kind. 8.60%

4. Fear of violence of any kind. 8.13%

5. Not wanting to experience negative emotions. 3.95%

TABLE 12. The type of company with whom Russian teenagers prefer to watch on-screen violence

1. Friends. 54.88%

2. Girlfriend, boyfriend. 22.79%

3. Alone. 21.16%

4. Parents. 17.44%

5. Anyone. 14.88%

TABLE 13. Motivations for watching on-screen violence

1. Nothing else to do. 62.32%

2. Good mood. 26.27%

3. Low spirits. 11.39%

4. Disagreement with parents. 5.81%

TABLE 14. Psychological states in which Russian teenagers find themselves after watching on-screen violence.

1. Psychological state doesn't change. 65.81%

2. Excitement. 29.76%

3. Disorder. 13.72%

4. Depression. 6.27%

5. Aggression. 5.58%

6. Bitterness. 4.88%

7. Reticence. 2.32%

8. Agitation. 2.09%

9. Joy. 1.62%

10. Indifference 1.16%

TABLE 15. How long Russian teenagers remember on-screen violence

1. On-screen violence are remembered for a short time only. 65.58%

2. On-screen violence are forgotten immediately. 33.95%

3. On-screen violence are remembered for a long time. 6.27%

TABLE 16. Russian teenage attitude towards discussing on-screen violence

1. On-screen violence is discussed sometimes. 63.48%

2. On-screen violence is discussed regularly. 22.79%

3. On-screen violence is never discussed. 13.73%

TABLE 17. The type of company with whom Russian teenagers prefer to discuss on-screen violence

1. Friends. 64.18%

2. Parents. 17.90%

3. Anyone. 12.09%

4. Boyfriend/Girlfriend. 5.81%

PART 3. Teenagers and on-screen violence: situational tests

TABLE 18. Films that Russian teenagers would take to a desert island

1. *Pretty Woman* (USA, 1990). 16.04%

2. *Gentlemen of Good Luck* (Russia, 1974). 10.23%

3. *Diamond Hand* (Russia, 1969). 9.06%

4. *Irony of the Fortune* (Russia, 1975). 4.18%

5. *From Dusk Till Dawn* (USA, 1995). 3.95%

TABLE 19. Favorite names of pets, named after movie characters

1. Fantomas. 19.59%

2. Batman. 12.79%

3. Dracula. 9.53%

4. Angeliques. 9.06%

5. Superman. 7.67%

TABLE 20. Russian teenage reaction to on-screen violence

1. Calmly continuing watching. 36.51%

2. Food in front of the television. 20.46%

3. Turning away from the television. 18.37%

4. Turning down the volume. 16.51%

5. Turning off the television. 10.46%

TABLE 21. Russian teenage attitude toward acting in violent films

1. Would participate on the condition of high pay. 59.53%

2. Would participate to show off. 20.23%

3. Would not participate because of a lack of acting talent. 14.41%

4. Would not participate because of a preference for erotic scenes. 9.30%

5. Would not participate because of a disgust for on-screen violence. 7.67%

TABLE 22. Reasons for violence and aggression in society

1. Inherent to the human nature. 45.11%

2. Psychological deviants. 38.60%

3. Material inequality. 18.37%

4. On-screen violence. 3.25%

TABLE 23. Russian teenage opinion on the influence of on-screen violence upon the increase of the crime in society

1. On-screen violence leads to an increase in crime among those with psychotic behavior. 35.58%

2. On-screen violence leads to a small increase in crime. 33.02%

3. On-screen violence does not lead to an increase in crime because crimes existed before the invention of cinema and television. 16.04%

4. On-screen violence undoubtedly leads to an increase in crime. 14.18%

5. On-screen violence does not lead to an increase in crime because it disgusts people. 4.18%

TABLE 24. Russian teenage attitude towards prohibition of on-screen violence

1. The current levels of on-screen violence are acceptable. 48.60%

2. Only the most violent scenes should be proscribed. 20.23%

3. On-screen violence should be proscribed because it makes people aggressive. 12.79%

4. Children should not be allowed to watch on-screen violence because it is for adults only. 11.16%

5. Children under the age of 10 should not be allowed to watch on-screen violence. 5.11%

6. Children under the age of 15 should not be allowed to watch on-screen violence. 3.95%

7. Further on-screen violence won't do any harm. 3.02%

TABLE 25. The age at which Russian teenagers would allow their children to watch on-screen violence

1. 10 years. 38.37%

2. From birth. 35.58%

3. 15 years. 25.34%

5. Computer/Video Games: Media Violence and Russian Teenager Audience

Based on unpublished research of J.L.Sherry, L.Bensley & J.Van Eenwyk created the conclusion about the main video games/children theories:

-"First, psychological social learning theory suggest that at least some aggression is learned by observing and then imitating a model who acts aggressively. Aggressive video game characters, similar to TV characters, might serve as models for aggressive behavior. (…) according to this theory, observing and then producing violence in a video game would be expected to increase aggression.

-Second, an arousal theory predicts that if the video game player has an aggressive disposition or is angered, then playing an arousing video game might cause increased aggression due to a generalized increase in energy and intensity. According to this theory, violent video games would be expected to increase aggression only in the presence of anger from some other cause.

-Third, a cognitive theory of priming suggests that violent video games will activate related cognitive structures, making it more likely that other incoming information would be processed in an "aggression" framework, possibly increasing aggressive behavior. For example, according to this theory, someone for whom thoughts of aggression have been evoked might be more likely to interpret an ambiguous behavior as aggressive and respond accordingly.

-Fourth, catharsis theory suggest that violent video games can provide a safe outlet for aggressive thoughts and feelings. Fifth, drive-reduction theory suggest, similar to catharsis theory, that violent video games may be useful in managing aggression. According to this theory, highly stressed or frustrated individuals may play violent video games in order to re-establish emotional equilibrium, thus reducing "real-life" aggressive behavior.

Integrative model based on the notion that a combination of priming and arousal effect best account for greater aggression effects in the short term, which weaken as initial arousal wears off (Bensley, Van Eenwyk, 2000, p.4).

Video games are relatively recent invention, being first introduced in the 1970s. But "in a 1996 survey of teenagers, 68% of boys and 30% of girls included "playing video games" among their non-school activities (…) both boys and girls favor games with violent content, with boys preferring games involving human violence, and girls prefeting fantasy or cartoon violence"(Bensley, Van Eenwyk, 2000, p.3). We can find the same conclusion in the work of E.F.Provenzo (Provenzo, 1991): 40 of 47 most popular video games in 1988 included violence as a major theme.

The research of American scientists "established that for pre-school and early elementary school aged children, playing video games that have aggressive themes leads to increased aggression or aggressive play during free play immediately following the video game. We did not find consistent evidence that video games increased aggressive behaviors of teenagers or young adults" (Bensley, L., Van Eenwyk, J., 2000, p.27). However I agree with J.Goldstein – some "players who like video games with action/adventure or martial-arts themes, for example, are not necessarily attracted by the violence. These games have other features that appeal to players – their engaging fantasy, challenge, and simulation, scorekeeping, feedback, graphics, and sound effects" (Goldstein, 1998, p.213).

J.Goldstein presents the   reasons for play with war/violence toys:

*Biological/Physiological (*to discharge energy; to achieve a desired level of arousal/simulation/excitement; "hard-wired" tendency to practice adult skills and roles); *Psychological* (to engage in fantasy/imaginative play; to experience "flow"; in response to priming/salience of violence; to come to terms with violence, war, death; to achieve a desired emotional state; to experience and express intense emotions; to see justice enacted; to control and resolve conflict satisfactorily; to practice strategic planning; to set goals and determine effective means for accomplishing them; to gain a sense of mastery; to experience intimacy;
Social/Cultural (direct modeling by peers or family; indirect modeling: influences of media, marketing; to belong to a group; to exclude oneself from a (negative reference) group (e.g. parents, girls, boys who disapprove of these games); rewards and encouragement for such play; salience within a culture of war, violence; to wield power; to affect others; to elicit a predictable reaction from parents/teachers; to sample a variety of adult roles; as a reflection of cultural values – dominance, aggression, and assertion (Goldstein, 1998, p.61).

Of course all these tendencies are very typical and for Russian children audience.

Ten years ago, Russian children spent much of their time with VCRs. They watched American blockbusters from pirated videocassettes of terrible quality. There are no deficit American films in modern Russia. The different television channels show from morning to night show dozens of foreign thrillers, melodramas, comedies and horrors. Today, Russian children from low-paid families spend many hours in computer clubs, where they play video games for a relatively small charge. Children from richer families play these games at home.
But what games do they play?

I undertook a special content analysis of 87 video games which circulate in Russian computer clubs. These are the results of the analysis:
1) practically all video games available for visitors to computer clubs (the visitors are nearly all teenagers) contain interactive criminal, military, fantastic and sporting (for instance, car races) subjects;
2) only 17.24% (15 of 87) of video games did not contain any scenes of violence;
3) 55.17% (48 of 87) of video games contained episodes of various murders (*Doom, Young Blood, Final Doom* and others);
4) 39.08% (34 of 87) of video games contained many elements of fights and different degrees of cruelty (*Kensei, Hercules* and others);
5) 35.63% (31 of 87) of video games included images of catastrophes (*X-COM, Resident Evil 1* and others);
6) As a whole, 82.75% (72 of 87) of video games contained at least one type of screen violence (murders, fights, or catastrophes). Many games presented the violence in several types and combinations of fights, murders, tortures, catastrophes, etc.;
7) The primitive video games ("shoot"-"fire") are the basic repertoire of computer clubs. The more complex games - so-called "strategies" and "quests" - are less common.

Next, I organized the questionnaires for the 76 visitors to Taganrog's computer - schoolboys aged from 7 to 17 years old. The results confirmed my preliminary observation that vast majority of visitors are boys (73 persons). The amount of schoolgirls playing video games in computer clubs was only 3.94% (3 persons). However, the girls' video game preferences did not differ from the boys' preferences.

Tab.1. The age range of schoolchildren who play video games in the computer clubs

№	Age of computer/video game users	Number of schoolchildren of this age	Percent of schoolchildren of this age
1	17 years	3	3.94%
2	16 years	8	10.52%
3	15 years	10	13.15%
4	14 years	10	13.15%
5	13 years	11	14.47%
6	12 years	10	13.15%
7	11 years	6	7.89%
8	10 years	9	11.84%
9	9 years	4	5.26%
10	8 years	4	5.26%
11	7 years	1	1.31%

An analysis of Table 1 shows that the teenagers from 12 to 15 years of age are the main visitors to computer clubs. The younger children (from 7 to 9 years of age), usually living under more parental supervision, form the minority (from 1 to 5 percent). Practically all visitors to computer clubs play games containing scenes of violence (83%).

Tab.2. Themes of video games attractive to schoolchildren

№	Age of video game users:	Number of schoolchildren this age and percent schoolchildren this age:	Number of popular video games containing elements of violence:	Number of popular video games *not* containing without elements of violence:
1	17 years	3 (3.94%)	5	3
2	16 years	8 (10.52%)	11	8
3	15 years	10 (13.15%)	13	11
4	14 years	10 (13.15%)	16	6
5	13 years	11 (14.47%)	17	10
6	12 years	10 (13.15%)	14	7
7	11 years	6 (7.89%)	10	3
8	10 years	9 (11.84%)	14	9

9	9 years	4 (5.26%)	7	4
10	8 years	4 (5.26%)	4	4
11	7 years	1 (1.31%)	2	1
Total:		76	113	66

An analysis of Table 2 shows that the number of popular video games containing elements of violence, is higher than the number of the video games not containing elements of violence in all age groups. Moreover, children from 11 to 14 years of age prefer video games with murders, fights and other hard elements of violence (*Doom, Final Doom, Resident Evil,* and *Mortal Kombat).*

Undoubtedly, the problem of violent computer games' influence on shaping teenage consciousness can be not considered simple. To play violent video games and to understand real-life violence are quite different.

References

- Bensley, L., Van Eenwyk, J. (2000). *Video Games and Real-Life Aggression: A Review of the Literature.* Olimpia, WA, 47 pp.
- Provenzo, E.F. (1991). *Video Kids.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. *Renewing the Mind of the Media* (1998). Washington D.C.: United State Catholic Conference, 36 pp.
- Goldstein, J. (Ed.) (1998). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, 270 pp.

6. Media Violence & Youth Audience in the USA
6.1. American Screen Media & Violence

The system of the American TV essentially differs from Russian where free-of-charge (for an audience) ordinary (non-cable & non-satellite) channels have the greatest distribution and influence. Certainly, the channels like this too exist in the USA, but they are, as a rule, belong to the information types. Films and TV series are basically shown here on paid cable/satellite channels. From the beginning of the XXI century almost all American television programs going on the paid channels, are accompanied by age ratings. However these channels have no time restrictions for violence's demonstration. Media violence can not only be seen in the late evening/night, but also in the morning/day: "Turn on your TV virtually any time of any day and you can bring a carnival of murder, mayhem and bloodshed right into your living room. (…) but step back and look at this kaleidoscope of killing through the eyes of a child – and consider what role it's played for America's new generation of ultra-violent killers – and you see what a menace TV violence really is. Televised mayhem is seen as a leading cause of America's epidemic of violent crime. (…) Typically, prime-time programming has average 8 to 12 violent acts per hour. A recent study by the Annenberg School of Communications found violence in children's programming at an historic high – 32 violent acts per hour. And TV Guide study counted 1,845 acts of violence in 18 hours of viewing time, an average of 100 violent acts per hour, or one every 36 seconds. (…) 80% of all television programs contain violent acts. But the violence is like a drug: viewers develop a tolerance for it, so media "pushers" give them steadily more" (Lamson, 1995, pp.25-26).

American "National Television Violence Study" has examined the amount

and way in which violence is portrayed across 23 channels in the USA. The proportion of violent programs increased overall from 58% in 1994/95 to 61% in 1995/96. Premium cable channels showed the highest number of violent programs at prime-time (85%). Concerning the way in which violence is portrayed, note that 75% of violent scenes contained no remorse, criticism or penalty for the aggression and 55% no form of injuries. Note also that strong anti-violence themes only appeared in 4% of shows and the long-term consequences of violence only appeared in 15%. The conclusion after 6,000 hours of programs from 23 channels between 6 a.m. and 11 p.m. hrs was: "TV violence as portrayed poses a serious risk of harm to children" (Basta, 2000, p.227).

American researchers studied Commercial Broadcast (ABC, CBS, FOX, NBC), Basic Cable (A&E, AMC, BET, Cartoon Network, Disney, Family Channel, Lifetime, Nickelodeon, TNT, USA, VH-1, MTV), Premium Cable (Cinemax, HBO, Showtime). All programs listed in a TV Guide from 6 a.m. until 11 p.m. were eligible for inclusion in the sample (a total of 17 hours per day) for 20 weeks (Potter, J. and others, 1998, p.67).

Thus, as one would expect, the most part of the TV-programs and films containing episodes of violence, was registered on premium cable channels: "As for distribution, public broadcast exhibits the smallest range of violent interactions per program (from 1 to 29), followed by the broadcast networks (from 1 to 35), basic cable (from 1 to 64), independent broadcast (from 1 to 69), and premium cable (from 1 to 88)" (Wilson, B.J., Smith, S.L. and others 1998, p.110).

The violence episodes (the same as in Russia) exist most frequently in plots of movies (90%). Further go: drama series (72%), children series (66%), music video (31%), reality based (30%), comedy series (27%) (Wilson, B.J., Smith, S.L. and others 1998, p.111).

Certainly, to some extent it is possible to console oneself by the fact, that findings reveal that almost half of violent programs can be classified as fantasy (49%) and fiction (43%). And only 4% of violent programs involve actual reality and only 4% depict re-creations of reality (Wilson, B.J., Smith, S.L. and others 1998, p.127). However, in my opinion, this consolation is rather an illusion because fantasy and fiction quite often contain scenes of the most naturalistic and severe violence represented in close-up bloody format.

The percentage of fantastic and realistic violence in the American TV is submitted on Tab.1 in more detail.

Tab.1. Percentage of violent programs, by channel:

Types:	Percentage of violent programs, by channel:				
	Basic Cable	Premium Cable	Independent Broadcast	Broadcast Networks	Public Broadcast (KCET)
Fantastic	55%	21%	61%	40%	8%
Realistic	45%	79%	39%	60%	92%

(Wilson, B.J., Smith, S.L. and others 1998, p.128).

Research of the American scientists has shown: though the maximal presence of television violence episodes (on the average - 27-28%) attacks from 8 pm, the media violence is also stable (5%-20%) in the morning and at a day time (as - according to my researches - on Russian TV too) in TV-programs of basic American channels (see. Tab.2).

Tab.2. Percentage of violent scenes with blood and gore, by day-part

	Percentage of violent scenes with blood and gore, by day-part:				
	6am – 9 am	9am-3 pm	3pm-6pm	6pm-8pm	8pm-11pm
Weekend	9%	14%	20%	19%	27%
Weekday	5%	15%	9%	12%	28%

(Wilson, B.J., Smith, S.L. and others 1998, p.127).

On the whole researches have shown, "57 percent of coded programs contain some violence. (…) Movies and drama series are more likely to contain violence, whereas comedy series, reality-based programs, and music videos are less likely. (…) The vast majority of violence is not punished at the time that it occurs within a scene. Punishments more typically occur toward the end of the program, but only for bad characters. (…) 39 percent of all violent scenes contain humor. (…) Only 4 percent of all programs with violence feature a strong antiviolence theme" (Wilson, B.J., Smith, S.L. and others 1998, p.143-145).

So, the results of long-term researches of the American scientists convincingly prove, that episodes of violence occupy a significant part of modern television programs. Many researchers are alarmed and concerned about that. At the same time there are also opponents of limitations of violence in audiovisual media. We will consider their basic argument below.

References

- Basta, S.S. (2000). Culture, Conflict, and Children: *Transmission of Violence to Children.* Lauham – N.Y. – Oxford: University Press of America. 256 pp.
- Lamson, S.R. (1995). Media Violence Has Increased the Murder Rate. In: Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 25-27.
- Potter, J. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: New Methodological Development. In: Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.55-103.
- Wilson, B.J., Smith, S.L. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: The 1994-95 Results. In: Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.105-147.

6.2. The main arguments of opponents and supporters of studying of influence of media violence on children and youth

To begin with, I will tell some statistics, proving that the children & youth audience is extremely active consumer of audiovisual media texts. "Children begin actively watching television at about age two, and the typical American child spends about 30 percent of his or her waking hours in front of a TV. The average child will have watched 5,000 hours of TV by the time he or she starts first grade and 19,000 hours by the end of high school" (Dodrill, 1993, p.51).

"By 6 years of age, more than 90% of American children watch television as

steady habit. The typical child between the age of two and eighteen currently consumes an average of 5.5 hours of media daily outside of school. Television (2 hours, 46 minutes) is the clear favorite, followed by computer games and other computer uses (49 minutes), recorded music (48 minutes), reading (44 minutes) and radio (39 minutes) (Slaby, 2002, p.314). As the results before finishing elementary school, the average US child is said to have watched 8,000 murders and 100,000 acts of violence on screen. By the age of 18, the American child will have watched 40,000 murders and 200,000 acts of violence, according to the American Medical Association (Basta, 2000, p.222-223).

The research of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry has revealed the similar picture of overactive media consumption: "The average American child spends as much as 28 hours a week watching television, and typically at least an hour a day playing video games or surfing the Internet. Several more hours each week are spent watching movies and videos, and listening to music" (American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 2002, p.10).

The majority of researches of the American scientists (Cantor, 2000; Potter, 1999; 2003; Slaby, 2002 and others) about media violence & young audience contain conclusions about negative influence of the violence image on children and youth. "Throughout the last several decades, many professional organizations, including the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the National Association for the Education of Young Children, and the National Parent Teachers Association, have reviewed the large body of research evidence on the effect of media violence, adopted resolutions, and presented recommendations for policymakers, practitioners, and the general public. (…). A half-century of research evidence on television violence has conclusively documented its potential harm" (Slaby, 2002, pp.310, 311).

However on occasion there are also other points of view:
-"a direct cause-and-effect relationship between media violence and violence in society has not been demonstrated (…) I took the position that the evidence does nor support a casual relationship between television violence and aggression. (…) We do not know the true causes of aggression and crime, but almost everyone who studies this agrees that poverty and racial conflict, discrepancy between what people want and their hopes, the availability of guns, and drug use, and so on, are major causes; probably family breakup, poor child rearing, all of those thing are major causes of violence. We do not really know. But no one seriously suggests that television violence is one of the major causes. It is, at best, a very minor cause" (Freedman, 1999, pp.49-51);
-"they have laid to rest many of the speculations regarding violent entertainment. For example, they could find no evidence to support the position that people experience a catharsis of deep-seated fears, such as fear of the dark, or fear of aging, death, AIDS, technology, or the unknown. Likewise, there is little evidence to support the claim that viewers identify with the aggressor" (Goldstein, 1998, p.215).
-"there is less violence on network TV then there used to be. (…) No evidence for TV's links to violence. (…) We were a violent culture before TV" (Leonard, 1995,

pp. 32-33, 35).

However similar statements are frequently not based on practical experimental researches, and their authors are quite often somehow connected to the activity of these or that media agencies which, undoubtedly, are interested in absence of any restrictions for distribution of media texts, including subjects of violence. The results of the comparative analysis of C.Cannon are good confirmation to that: "of the eighty-five major studies, the only one that failed to find a causal relationship between television violence and actual violence was paid for by NBC" (Cannon, 1995, p. 19).

Undoubtedly, "there are some in the entertainment industry who maintain that 1)violent programming is harmless because no studies exist that prove a connection between violent entertainment and aggressive behavior in children, and 2)young people know that television, movies, and video games are simply fantasy. Unfortunately, they are wrong on both counts. At this time, well over 1000 studies – including reports from the Surgeon General's office, the National Institute of Mental Health, and numerous studies conducted by leading figures within our medical and public health organizations – our own members – point overwhelmingly to a causal connection between media violence and aggressive behavior in some children. The conclusion of the public health community, based on over 30 years of research, is that viewing entertainment" (American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 2002, p.11).

American researcher J.T.Hamilton has revealed that media officials often defect criticisms of their programs with a standard set of responses, which he named the "Top 5 Reasons Why TV Violence Is Not s Problem":
1.*We use violence on television to tell, not sell, stories.*
2.*Violence on television is a reflection of violence in society.*
(but in the reality J.T.Hamilton found that the percentage of stories devoted to crime and the percentage of lead stories dealing with crime were not related to crime rate in a city (Hamilton, 2002, p.20).
3.*Images on television do not influence behavior.*
4.*Television is less violent today.*
(of course, in 1984 51% of primetime American network series were in violent genres, a figure that declined to 23% in 1993. But J.T.Hamilton convincingly writes: violence has simply migrated to basic and premium cable channels).
5.*What about "Schindler's List"? Violence is used in high-quality films. Yet these types of movies are only a small percentage of those shown on television.*
This statement is false again: in a sample of 5,000 violent movies on broadcast, basic cable, and premium channels, J.T.Hamilton found that only 3% were given four stars (the highest rating) by critics (Hamilton, 2002, pp.19-20). I agree with him: basically violent films on American TV are not top or art house pictures. Ordinary the television mainstream is B-class movies…

American researcher S.Bok presents the following 8 rationales that serve the double function of offering both a "simplistic reason for not entering into serious debate" and "rationalizations for ignoring or shielding ongoing practices from

outside scrutiny or interference":

1.America has always been a violent nation and always will be: violence is as American as cherry pie.

2.Why focus the policy debate on TV violence when there are other more important factors that contribute to violence?

3.How can you definitively pinpoint, and thus prove, the link between viewing TV violence and acts of real violence?

4.Television programs reflect existing violence in the "real world". It would be unrealistic and a disservice to viewers as well as to society to attempt to wipe violence off the screen.

5.People can't even agree on how to define "violence". How, then, can they go to discuss what to do about it?

6.It is too late to take action against violence on television, considering the plethora of video channels by which entertainment violence will soon be available in homes.

7.It should be up to parents, not to the television industry, to monitor the programs that their children watch.

8.Any public policy to decrease TV violence constitutes censorship and represents an intolerable interference with free speech (Bok, 1994, pp.201-224).

The majority of the given arguments seem demagogical to me. I will try to explain, why. Certainly, the problem of violence in a society has arisen for some millenniums before media occurrence and, of course there are the factors much more influencing real violence in society than media texts. However it does not mean at all, that media must ignore the public and scientific debate of the case. Scientists study any illness and try to struggle with it not waiting for the total epidemic...

Certain disagreement in the wordings of such concepts as "violence", "screen violence", etc. is not an obstacle for the denying of scientific discussions. We have many rigorous supporters of various philosophical and aesthetic key concepts, but that does not prevent us from scientific discussions.

Really, media texts do reflect the "real world", including violence in this world. But it does not mean, that naturalistic details of this real world should fall from TV, for example, upon children till 7-10 years – in the morning, day time and early evening - without any age rating systems and the control. It is never late to reflect on it and to try to protect the sensitive mentality of a preschool child from media violence...

I agree, parents should adjust contacts of their minor children with media violence, but it does not mean, that media agencies can deliver on the market more and more bloody production without any limitations. "Media violence is not a result of public choice. (…) The usual rationalization is that media violence "give the public what it wants". This is disingenuous" (Gerbner, 2001, p.134). The freedom of speech will not suffer at all from regulation (time of display, age ratings and so on) of media violence because the adult audience, for example, can watch telecasts after 10-11p.m., and some elements of the control are inherent in any society, even in the most democratic country. Moreover, in some cases the American corporations

show concern of the given problem: the 1980 Television Code of the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB), states that "Violence… may only be projected in responsibly handed contexts, not used exploitatively". The 1986 National Broadcasting Company (NBC) code declares that violence "must be necessary to the development of time, plot or characterization… May not be used to stimulate the audience or to invite imitation… May not be shown or offered as an acceptable solution to human problems… and may not show "excessive gore, pain, or physical suffering" (Gerbner, 1988, p.9).

The connection between consumption of media violence and real violence, aggression in a society was proved. in hundreds American researches (American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and many others). "Much research has been generated by fears that violence and terror in the media brutalize children and undetermined the social order. The evidence shows that consistent exposure to stories and scenes of violence and terror can mobilize aggressive tendencies, desensitize some and isolate others" (Gerbner, 1988, p.9). In a recent Gallup Poll, 62 percent of adults said violent entertainment was one of the major causes of violence among young people. In a CNN/USA Today poll, 76 percent said that television violence were a negative influence on children (Slaby, 2002, p.307). Many prestigious professional organizations as the American Psychological Association, American Medical Association, National Academy of Science, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention "have all concluded that television violence contributes to learning aggressive attitudes and behaviors, to emotional desensitization, and to fear about becoming a victim of violence in viewers" (Kunkel, D., Wilson, B.J. and others, 1998, p.150).

The researches of J.Cantor and her colleagues uncovered a "correlation between media violence and crime. When asked what their favorite movie was, the same fifty one percent (51%) of adolescents who committed violent crimes claimed that their favorite movie contained violence" (Cantor and others, 2000, p. 91). "Twenty-two percent (22%) of these juvenile offenders play violent video games. These were also all violent crime offenders. When asked if they had ever done anything they had seen or heard in a movie, television show or song, sixteen percent (16%) said that when they committed their crime, they were coping something from media" (Cantor and others, 2000, p. 93-94). "There is a dramatic correlation between the rise of violence depicted in the media and the rise of violent acts and crimes committed by juveniles in this country" (Cantor, 2000, p. 95).

However I am convinced, that the problem is not only that media violence can promote the increase of crimes in the society (the basic source of modern criminality, certainly, is not the media). The main thing, that fragile mentality of children under 7-10 years age receive the essential harm (fear, the stutter, the oppressed emotional condition, etc.) from perception of the naturalistic images of screen violence. I studied such cases in Russia…

Besides frequently authors of media texts intentionally aspire to create an

image of aesthetically attractive violence. For example, attractive actors are cast for the parts of gangsters and their girlfriends, 'bad gays' enjoy 'dolce vita', etc. Violence can be presented, as something rather fanny or glamorous. For example, Q.Tarantino's *Pulp Fiction* (1994) presented violence "in a cool, hip way, provoking mixed reactions from filmgoers" (Edgar, 2000, p.21). Something similar easily can be found out and in the modern Russian films (*Antikiller, 24 Hours* and others), and TV film serials (The *Brigade*) where gangsters and mafia-men are shown like "normal" and even nice people who do their job and make good money, who are loyal friends, etc.

"There has been a great deal of public discussion of the link between media violence and children's aggressive behavior. Research has made it very clear that repeated exposure to glamorized and trivialized media violence contributes to children's adoption of violence-prone attitudes, to their emotional desensitization, and sometimes to their violent actions. (…) The desensitization and brutalization of children through media tends to be a slow, cumulative process, and most children whose parents are actively involved in teaching them right from wrong do not become violent" (Cantor, 2000, p.69).

References

- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (2002). Media Violence Harms Children. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Is Media Violence a Problem?* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.10-11.
- Basta, S.S. (2000). Culture, Conflict, and Children: *Transmission of Violence to Children.* Lauham – N.Y. – Oxford: University Press of America. 256 pp.
- Bok, S. (1994). *TV Violence, Children, and the Press.* Discussion Paper D-16. Harvard University, pp.201-224.
- Cannon, C. (1995). Media Violence Increases Violence in Society. In: Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 17-24.
- Cantor, J. (2000). Mommy, I'm Scared: Protecting children from Frightening Mass Media. In: *Media Violence Alert.* Zionsvill, IN: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., pp. 69-85.
- Cantor, J. and others (2000). *Media Violence Alert.* Zionsville, In: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., 120 pp.
- Dodrill, R. (1993). *Violence, Values & the Media.* Sacramento, CA: Foundation for Change, 156 pp.
- Edgar, K.J. (2000). *Everything You Need to Know About Media Violence.* N.Y.: The Rosen Publ. Group, 64 pp.
- Freedman, J. (1999). Studies Have Not Established a Link Between Media Violence and Violence. In: *Media Violence: Opposing Viewpoints.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 49-53.
- Gerbner, G. (1988). *Violence and Terror in the Mass Media.* Paris: UNESCO, 46 pp.
- Gerbner, G. (2001). Communities Should Have More Control over the Content of Mass Media. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.129-137.
- Goldstein, J. (Ed.) (1998). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, 270 pp.
- Hamilton, J.T. Violence on Television Is a Serious Problem (2002). In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Is Media Violence a Problem?* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.18-21.

- Kunkel, D., Wilson, D.J. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: Implication for Public Policy. In: Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.149-162.
- Leonard, J. The Negative Impact of Media Violence on Society is Exaggerated. In: Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media*. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 31-37.
- Potter, W.J. (1999). *On Media Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA – London: Sage Publication, Inc., 304 pp.
- Potter, W.J. (2003). *The 11 Myths of Media Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc., 259 pp.
- Slaby, R.G. (2002). Media Violence: Effects and Potential Remedies. In: Katzemann, C.S. (Ed.). *Securing Our Children's Future*. Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, pp. 305-337.

6.3. Effects of Media Violence

The problem of the influence of media violence on a minor audience has been studied by the western scientists for already about 50-60 years. For example, J.Goldstein writes that a macro-level of theory about attractions of violent media "would focus on society's changing definitions and wavering opinion of violence and violent entertainment, as well as the relationship between violent imagery and social institutions, like religion, politics, business, and the military" (Goldstein, 1998, p.224). A micro-level has the focus on psychological relationships between violent media texts and personality.

As it has already been marked, "numerous studies point to a casual connection between violent entertainment and aggressive behavior in children. Media violence can harm children in several ways: 1)by conditioning them to accept violence as a way of setting conflicts, 2)by desensitizing them toward real-life violence, 3)by making them more afraid that they will become victims of violence, and 4)by causing them to commit real-life violence" (American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 2002, p.10). Besides "heavy viewing may lead to aggression, but for some individuals it will lead to fear and apprehension about being victimized by aggression" (Wilson, and others, 1998, p.16). "Children are taught that society is normally violent. They become disproportionately frightened of being victimized and become less likely to help victims of crime. They also grow more aggressive and violent themselves" (Lamson, 1995, p.25).

In this sense I completely agree with the well-known American specialist J.Cantor - "violent culture exposes children to a vast array of alarming and disturbing images, most of which they would probably never encounter in person in their entire lives. And the traumatization of children is not necessarily a slow, incremental process. Even a brief exposure to a single disturbing television program or movie can instill intense fear in a child, producing severe anxieties and often long lasting psychological scars" (Cantor, 2000, p.70).

Similar conclusions can be found in the research of G.M.Gedatus:
-"children may develop aggressive behavior and attitudes;
-media violence can create fearful or negative attitudes in children about the real world. Children may believe that violence is more common than it really is. Fear or

being a victim is its own type of violence;

-media violence can desensitize children to real-world violence. They may often see violence as an acceptable way to handle a problem. The emotional regret of being violent tends to lessen;

-media violence teaches that there are no nonviolent ways to solve problems" (Gedatus, 2000, p.17).

American researchers allocate a number of typical influences which media violence can perform on an audience: aggression effect, fear effect, callousness effect, appetite for violence effect (Slaby, 2002, pp.312-313). The most vulnerable audience in this respect are children under 5-7 years of age, psychologically, intellectually and morally still almost not adapted to life in a modern society. "Psychologists agree that up to age 3 and 4, children can't distinguish fact from fantasy on TV. For them, TV is a reflection of the world, and it's not friendly place. (…) Children average nearly 4 hours of TV per day, and in the inner cities that increases to as many as 11 hours. Which means that in many cases, TV *is* the reality" (Lamson, 1995, p.26).

And if this reality is submitted for children as infinite turns of fights, murders and other kinds of violence, it, undoubtedly, can have a negative effect on their psychological condition. J.Cantor's research is convincing confirmation to that. She conducted a "random phone survey of parents of elementary school children, 43 percent said their child had a fright reaction that endured beyond the time of viewing a television program or movie. Of these parents, almost half said their child could not get to sleep, refused to sleep alone, or was beset by nightmares as a result" (Cantor, 2000, p.71).

As a result of long-term researches J.Cantor in detail classified of 7 possible reasons children choose to view media violence:

1) To be aroused

"One prominent explanation is that children view violence on television because it is arousing; that is, the viewing of violence increases the child's emotional arousal. There is good deal of evidence that the viewing of either violence or the threat of violence reliably increases sympathetic activation, particularly increasing heart rate and blood pressure in adults" (Cantor, 1998, p.96). "The impact of media violence on children's arousal level has been documented in studies that measured heart rate and skin temperature" (Cantor, 1998, 97). Thus "viewing horror was termed "thrill watching" (e.g. "I watch because I like to be scared") (Cantor, 1998, p.98).

2) To experience aggression vicariously (empathy effect)

"Another possible reason for children to be attracted to programs depicting violence is that children enjoy vicariously participating in aggressive behaviors. (…) "In Bruce's Milwaukee survey (…) 48 percent of students responded that they ever empathized with the victim, and 45 percent reported ever empathizing with the violent person. Slightly more (59 percent) said that they ever pretended to be the "good guy". (…) A sizable minority (39 percent) agreed with the item "I enjoy watching people fight and hurt each other on violent television shows", and this item was strongly correlated with interest in viewing violence. (…) these data suggest

that enjoyment of highly violent shows is related to the enjoyment of violence per se and empathy with the aggressor rather than to empathic response toward the hero or victim" (Cantor, 1998, p.98-99).

3) To defy restrictions ("forbidden fruit" effect)

This explanation for children's attraction to media violence "is that because parents often restrict access to violent TV shows, the shows come to appear more valuable. (…) It was possible to distinguish between parents who restricted their children from viewing violent shows (44 percent) and parent who did not (56 percent). The results indicated that children of parents who restricted violent programs were no more interested in any of the four aggressive program genres asked about than were children on nonrestrictive parents"(Cantor, 1998, p.99).

4) To witness violent/aggressive behavior like their own

"Violent people are attracted to programs depicting behavior that is characteristic of themselves. (…) television violence does not increase aggression but that children who are already aggressive like to witness other people behaving violently" (Cantor, 1998, p.102). "Research finds that individuals high on personality measures of aggressiveness, or those who have just engaged in tasks involving aggression, choose to view more aggressive programming and enjoy it more" (Cantor, 1998, p.103).

5) To learn about their violent environment

"Children for whom violence is a significant part of their environment are more interested in viewing violence. There are a variety of reasons that such an interest might exist. One possibility is that children enjoy entertainment programs that are related to their lives and that "resonate", so to speak, with their experience. Another reason could be that children have an instrumental approach to media viewing, and try to expose themselves to media from which they can learn important lessons relevant to their own problems. These rationales lead to the expectation that children who have a good deal of experience with violence in their lives will be more attracted to media violence" (Cantor, 1998, p.104).

Confirming these conclusions J.Cantor gives the statements of children cites the childrens' judgments of the media violence effect on them. For example: "violent shows make me think about things in my own life", "I can learn to protect myself by watching television violence", "I enjoy watching people on violent shows fight and hurt each other" (Cantor, 1998, p.105). I shall add from myself, that I have more than once heard similar words in Russia, said by the children, whose environment involves violence and criminal cases…

6)To Calm Themselves (apprehension effect)

"People expose themselves to violence to help them their apprehensions and fears about violence in their own lives" (Cantor, 1998, p.105). "The typical plot of such televised fare involves the successful restoration of order and justice at the end of the program. (…) On the other hand, the opposite relationship could reasonably be expected – children who are easily frightened or highly anxious about violence might come to selectively avoid violent programs to avoid experiencing the negative emotions associated with exposure" (Cantor, 1998, p.106).

7) Gender effect (role of violence in gender-role socialization)
Certainly, there are gender differences in relations to perception of media violence in a children's and youth audience. "When boys and girls view the same program, boys may show an aggression effect because they identify with a typically aggressive male character, while girls may show a fear effect because they identify with a typically victimized female character" (Slaby, 2002, p.316). I absolutely agree with J.Cantor: "Male children and adult are readily seen to engage in more violence than females, (…) boys are more interesting than girls in violent television" (Cantor, 1998, p.100).

A more complex structure of the reasons for attractiveness of media violence for an audience has been offered (as a result of long-term researches) by J.Goldstein:

1) Subject characteristics. Those most attracted to violent imagery are: males; more aggressive than average; moderate to high in need for sensation or arousal; in search of social identity, or a way to bond with friends; curious about the forbidden, or interested because of their scarcity; have a need to see justice portrayed or restored; able to maintain emotional distance to prevent images from being too disturbing.

2)Violent images are used: For mood management; to regulate excitement or arousal; as an opportunity to express emotion.

3)Characteristics of violent images that increase their appeal: They contain clues to their unreality (music, editing, setting); they are exaggerated or distorted; portray an engaging fantasy; have a predictable outcome; contain a just resolution.

4) Context. Violent images are more attractive: in a safe, familiar environment; when war or crime are salient (Goldstein, 1998, p.223).

Comparing a substantiation of the reasons of the appeal of the image of violence in media texts, put forward by J.Cantor and J.Goldstein, it is possible to find out many similar positions (*arousal, empathy, scarcity, apprehension, forbidden fruit*, and other effects). And "arguably more pervasive and often underemphasized are the other two risks associated with television violence: fear and desensitization" (Kunkel, Wilson, and others, 1998, pp.155-156). My research experience also shows, that many of these effects are especially vivid in children's audience.

It is important to see the difference in perception of media violence in the young audiences of various ethnic groups (especially in the polyethnic structure of American society): "minority and nonminority children appear to be equally susceptible to the effects of media violence. However, the manifestation of the effects may differ because of different level of viewing, different media portrayals of minority and nonminority characters, and children's developing tendency to identify with characters of their own ethnic group. African American children commonly have been found to watch more television than white children (…) When African American, Hispanic, Asian American, or Native American characters appear, they are often stereotyped as either dangerous aggressors or victims of violence. Thus, when minority children identify with media characters of similar race and ethnicity, as they begin to do during the preschool and elementary school years" (Slaby, 2002,

p.316).

This gender/polyethnic difference was confirmed in G.Gerbner's researches: "For every 10 male characters on prime time network television who commit violence, there were 11 who fell victim to it. But for every 10 female perpetrators of violence, there were 16 female victims. (…) Foreign women and women from minority groups pay the highest price" (Gerbner, 1988, p.17).

J.Goldstein also marks the aspiration to perception of media violence in a group: "Violent entertainment appeals primarily to males, and it appeals to them mostly in groups. People rarely attend horror films or boxing matches alone, and boys do not play war games by themselves" (Goldstein, 1998, p.215). Thus "adolescent boys like violent entertainment more than any other group does, although this does not mean that they like only violent entertainment or that they are the only audience for it" (Goldstein, 1998, p.214).

American scientists from the team of National Television Violence Study drew the conclusion that "most violent media content poses a substantial risk of harm to many in the audience, particularly children. However, as we have demonstrated, certain types of violent portrayals may pose a much greater risk of negative psychological effects than others (Kunkel, D., Wilson, B.J. and others, 1998, p.150).

For example, J.Cantor has found out, that media violence has a strong and long negative influence on many people. "In one study, college students at two Midwest universities were asked whether they had ever been so frightened by TV program or movie that the fear had lasted beyond the time of viewing. The results were astonishing. Of 153 students, 90 percent had such a story to tell. (…) Among these students, over half reported disturbances in eating or sleeping and 35 percent said they subsequently avoided or dreaded the situation depicted in the program or movie. For example, many reported refusing to swim in the ocean after seeing *Jaws* (some reported giving up swimming altogether!), or fearing dogs, cats, or bugs after seeing a variety of movies featuring these creatures in scary contexts. Even more remarkably, more than one-fourth of these students said the effects had lasted more than a year and that they were still bothered by that program or movie – even though they had seen it an average of six years earlier!" (Cantor, 2000, pp.72-73).

More over, "Leonard Eron and Rowell Huesmann, followed the viewing habits of a group of children for twenty-two years. They found that watching violence on television is the single best predictor of violent or aggressive behavior later in life, ahead of such commonly accepted factors as parents' behavior, poverty, and race" (Cannon, 1995, p. 19). But the individual differences are very strong here: "not every boy and man find images of violence enjoyable, and not every female find them repugnant" (Goldstein, 1998, p.214). The scientists from American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry came to the same conclusion: "The effect of entertainment violence on children is complex and variable. Some children will be affected more than others" (American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 2002, p.11).

I completely share the point of view of J.Goldstein: "Not only the viewing

situation but also the larger social world influences the attractiveness of violence. Interest in violent imagery changes with the times. There are also historical shifts in what violent images are regarded as acceptable or excessive" (Goldstein, 1998, p.221).

At the same time, scientists mark the certain contradictions which arise between approaches of psychologists, politicians, teachers and parents to a problem of media violence influence on the today's children generation. "While parents, teachers, politicians, and social scientists often bemoan the violence in entertainment, they neglect to ask why a significant market for violent literature, films, cartoons, video games, toys, and sports exists in the first place. Politicians and others who debate violent entertainment focus only on its *production* while ignoring its public *reception*. Psychologists, too, have ignored the appeal of violent entertainment, focusing untiringly on its *effects*" (Goldstein, 1998, p.1).

By the way, bear in mind that the sociological researches as a whole show that media violence is (yet?) not the most appealing theme for an audience. "Despite the public controversy over violent entertainment, it is worth noting that nonviolent entertainment, especially film and TV comedies, and nonviolent toys and video games, are far more popular than violent fare" (Goldstein, 1998, p.3). For example, "it is worth remembering that violent entertainment is the preferred form of entertainment only for a minority of the general audience. Most viewers appears to prefer comedies and sitcoms to violent entertainment. These attract large audiences of all ages and of both sexes" (Goldstein, 1998, p.225).

References

- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (2002). Media Violence Harms Children. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Is Media Violence a Problem?* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.10-11.
- Cannon, C. (1995). Media Violence Increases Violence in Society. In: Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 17-24.
- Cantor, J. (1998). Children's Attraction to Violent Television Programming. In: Goldstein, J. (Ed.). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, pp. 88-115.
- Cantor, J. (2000). Mommy, I'm Scared: Protecting children from Frightening Mass Media. In: *Media Violence Alert.* Zionsvill: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., pp. 69-85.
- Gedatus, G.M. (2000). *Violence in the Media.* Mankato, Minnesota: Life Matters, 64 pp.
- Gerbner, G. (1988). *Violence and Terror in the Mass Media.* Paris: UNESCO, 46 pp.
- Goldstein, J. (1998). Why We Watch. In: Goldstein, J. (Ed.). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, pp. 212-226.
- Goldstein, J. (Ed.) (1998). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, 270 pp.
- Kunkel, D., Wilson, D.J. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: Implication for Public Policy. In: Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.149-162.
- Lamson, S.R. (1995). Media Violence Has Increased the Murder Rate. In Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 25-27.
- Slaby, R.G. (2002). Media Violence: Effects and Potential Remedies. In: Katzemann, C.S. (Ed.). *Securing Our Children's Future.* Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, pp. 305-337.

- Wilson, B.J. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: The Importance of Context. In: Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.13-53.

6.4. Recommendation & Acts

American researchers offer a number of the measures, capable to counteract negative influence of media violence in a society. In my opinion, the recommendations offered by scientific group of *National Television Violence Study* (Kunkel, Wilson, and others, 1998, p.151-157), can as well become a serious basis for the same actions in the Russian conditions.

This is what they recommend for the Television Industry:

1.Produce more programs that avoid violence; if a program does contain violence, keep the number of violent incidents low.

2.Be creative in showing more violent acts being punished; more negative consequences – both short and long term – for violent acts; more alternatives to the use of violence in solving problems; and less justification for violent actions.

3.When violence is presented, consider greater emphasis on strong antiviolence theme.

4.Make more effective use of program advisories or content codes to identify violent programming.

For Public Policymakers:

1.Recognize that context is an essential aspect of television violence.

2.Continue to monitor the nature and extent of violence on television.

For parents:

1.Be aware of the three potential risks associated with viewing television violence.

2.Consider the context of violent depictions in making viewing decisions for children.

3.Consider a child's developmental level when making viewing decisions.

"Very young children do not typically distinguish reality from fantasy on television. Thus, for preschoolers and younger elementary school children, animated violence, cartoon violence, and fantasy violence cannot be dismissed or exonerated merely because it is unrealistic. Indeed, many younger children identify strongly with superheroes and fantastic cartoon characters who regularly engage in violence" (Kunkel, Wilson, and others, 1998, p.156).

4.Recognize that different program genres and channel types pose different risks for children.

5.Watch television with your child and encourage evaluation of the content.

"Parents can help a child to understand that violence in the real world may result in more serious injury and may have more long-term repercussions than what is shown on television. Parents also can help children to recognize that nonviolent strategies exist for solving problem in society" (Kunkel, Wilson, and others, 1998, p.157).

It is necessary to note, that similar recommendations became the basis for the Hearings and Acts in the U.S. Congress and the Senate. For example, the special *Children's Television Act* was approved in 1990. And *Telecommunication Act* - in 1996. This Act confirmed: "studies have shown that children exposed to violent

video programming at a young age have a higher tendency for violent and aggressive behavior later in life than children not so exposed, and that children exposed to violent video programming are prone to assume that acts of violence are acceptable behavior. Children in the United States are, on average, exposed to an estimated 8,000 murders and 100,000 acts of violence on television by the time the child completes elementary school". This led up to the arousal of the "governmental interest in empowering parents to limit the negative influence of video programming that is harmful to children. (…) "established voluntary rules for rating video programming that contains sexual, violent, or other indecent material about which parents should be informed before it is displayed to children, and such rules are acceptable to the Commission; and agreed voluntarily to broadcast signals that contain ratings such programming". (…) "establish and promote effective procedures, standards, systems, advisories, or other mechanisms for ensuring that users have easy and complete access to the information necessary to effectively utilize blocking technology and to encourage the availability thereof to low income parents".

The 2003 was the year of presentation of new project of important document - *Protect Children from Video Game Sex and Violence Act*, In which is paid attention that "the use and observation of video games that contain sexual or violent content can be harmful to minors and reasonable restrictions will significantly decrease the number of minors using these games. (…) Viewing entertainment violence can lead to increases in aggressive attitudes, behaviors, and values, particularly in children". Here measures of counteraction to these negative phenomena are planned. The similar phenomena are touched upon in *Children's Protection from Violent Programming Act* (Introduced in Senate, Jan. 14, 2003): "There is empirical evidence that children exposed to violent video programming at a young age have a higher tendency to engage in violent and aggressive behavior later in life than those children not so exposed. There is empirical evidence that children exposed to violent video programming have a greater tendency to assume that acts of violence are acceptable behavior and therefore to imitate such behavior. There is empirical evidence that children exposed to violent video programming have an increased fear of becoming a victim of violence, resulting in increased self-protective behaviors and increased mistrust of others". That is why "there is compelling governmental interest in limiting the negative influences of violent video programming on children". There is compelling governmental interest in channeling programming with violent content to periods of the day when children are not likely to comprise a substantial portion of the television audience", especially as "the most recent study of television rating system by the Kaiser Family foundation concludes that 79 percent of violent programming is not specifically rated for violence".

The Act also concerned the television microprocessor (V-Chip), capable at the request of parents to block media violence in TV-set: "technology-based solutions, such as the V-chip, may be helpful in protecting some children, but cannot achieve the compelling governmental interest in protecting all children from violent programming when parents are only able to block programming that has, in fact,

been rated for violence".

Another way of protection from media violence is a rating system. This is the modern American film/TV classification:

Movie Ratings System

G. General audiences. The movie is suitable for all ages.

PG. Parental guidance suggested. Some materials may not be suitable for children.

PG-13. Parental guidance suggested for children under 13. Some materials may not be suitable for children younger than 13.

R. Restricted. A parent or adult guardian must accompany anyone younger than 17.

NS-17. No one children under 17.

(Gedatus, 2000, p.9).

TV Rating System (since Oct. 1997)

TV-Y. Children of all ages.

TV-Y7. Children seven and older. Program may contain mild violence.

TV-G. General audiences. Program may contain little or no sex, violence, and profanity.

TV-PG. Parental guidance advised for children. Program has some mild sex, violence, and profanity.

TV-14. Parental guidance advised for children under fourteen. Program has a higher degree of sex, violence, and profanity.

TV-M. Mature audiences. Programs may contain graphic violence, sex, and profanity, and may not be appropriate for teens under seventeen.

Also included are the following labels: D (suggestive dialogue), L (coarse language), S (sexual situation), V (violence), FV (fantasy violence).

(Hamilton, 1998, p.4), (Slaby, 2002, p.324-325).

But American congressmen & senators very well understand that content-based ratings and blocking technology do not effectively protect children from the harm of violent video programming without other efforts, for example, media education.

References

- *Children's Protection from Violent Programming Act 2003.*
- Gedatus, G.M. (2000). *Violence in the Media.* Mankato, Minnesota: Life Matters, 64 pp.
- Hamilton, J.T. (1998) Media Violence and Public Policy. In: Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.1-12.
- Kunkel, D., Wilson, D.J. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: Implication for Public Policy. In: Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.149-162.
- *Protect Children from Video Game Sex and Violence Act 2003.*
- Slaby, R.G. (2002). Media Violence: Effects and Potential Remedies. In: Katzemann, C.S. (Ed.). *Securing Our Children's Future.* Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, pp. 305-337.
- *Telecommunication Act 1996.*

6.5. Media Violence & Media Literacy

One of the major ways for a society, trying to lower negative influence of media violence on children, in my opinion, is the development of media education/literacy practice. "Media literacy is a strategy which can be implemented immediately to change the way children are affected by violent television" (Kipping, 2001, pp.126).

I completely agree that "media literate people understand that:

-television is constructed to convey ideas, information, and news from someone else's perspective;

-specific techniques are used to create emotional effects. They can identify those techniques and their intended and actual effects;

-all media benefit some people and leave others out. They can pose and sometimes answer questions about who are the beneficiaries, who is left out and why;

Media literate people:

-seek alternative sources of information and entertainment;

-use television for their own advantage and enjoyment;

-are not used by television for someone else's advantage;

-know how to act. They are not acted on. In that way, media literate people are better citizens" (Kipping, 2001, p. 127).

E.Thoman writes on this topic: "I believe that media-literacy education must be a component of any effective effort at violence prevention, for both individuals and society as a whole" (Thoman, 1995, pp. 127-128). As a result of her long-term researches she managed to develop "five ways that effective media-literacy education can contribute to lessening the impact of violence in our lives:

-reduce exposure, by educating parents and caregivers. (…) Parents organizations, churches, libraries and community groups can sponsor media literacy programs to help parents develop and enforce age-appropriate viewing limits;

-change the impact of violent images that are seen. This can be done by deconstructing the techniques used to stage violent scenes and decoding the various depictions of violence in news, cartoons, drama, sports and music. It is important for children to learn early on the difference between reality and fantasy and to know costumes, camera angles and special effects can fool them. Media literacy activities need to be integrated into every learning environment – schools, churches and temples, after-school groups and clubs;

-explore alternatives to stories that focus on violence as the solution to interpersonal conflict ("Gandhi");

-uncover and challenge the cultural, economic and political supports for media violence as well as the personal ways we may each be contributing to it;

-promote informed and rational public debate in schools, community and civic gatherings, religious groups and in media" (Thoman, 1995, pp.128-129).

I believe that such approaches would be rather useful for Russian conditions (Fedorov, 2001). But, undoubtedly, the joint efforts (on the part of the state, public organizations, educational institutions and parents) are necessary to achieve media education goals.

References

- Kipping, P. (2001). Teaching Media Literacy Can Help Address the Problem of Media Violence. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.126-128.
- Thoman, E. (1995). Media Literacy Education Can Effectively Combat Media Violence. In: Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 127-129.

7. *The short Comparative Analysis of American and Russian Studies about Media Violence and Children/Youth*
Table1. Comparative Analysis of American and Russian Studies about Media Violence and Children/Youth

COUNTRY	Authors of Research/ Books/ Articles	Year(s) of publication	Ages and Numbers of Participants (Children/ Youth)	Study Methods	Research's Findings
U.S.	Eron, L. & Huesman, R.	1984, 1986	875 boys and girls from age 8-30	Experimental	Boys who viewed high levels of television were four to five times more likely to become violent criminals, and children who watched more violent television were likely as adults to use violence to punish their own children.
U.S.	Freedman, J.	1995, 1999	No	Analysis of Scientific Literature	A direct cause-and-effect relationship between media violence and violence in society has not been demonstrated
U.S.	Bok, S.	1994	No	Analysis of Scientific Literature	8 rationales that serve the double function of offering both a "simplistic reason for not entering into serious debate" and "rationalizations for ignoring or shielding ongoing practices from outside scrutiny or interference": 1.America has always been a violent nation and always will be: violence is as American as cherry pie. 2.Why focus the policy debate on TV violence when there are other more important factors that contribute to violence? 3.How can you definitively pinpoint, and thus prove, the link between viewing TV violence and acts of real violence? 4.Television programs reflect existing violence in the "real world". It would be unrealistic and a disservice to viewers as well as to society to attempt to wipe violence off the screen. 5.People can't even agree on how to define "violence". How, then, can they go to discuss what to do about it? 6.It is too late to take action against violence on television, considering the plethora of video channels by which entertainment violence will soon be available in homes. 7.It should be up to parents, not to the television industry, to monitor the programs that their children watch. 8.Any public policy to decrease TV violence constitutes censorship and represents an intolerable interference with free speech (Bok, 1994,pp.201-224).
U.S.	National Television Violence Study	1994-1995		Experimental	57% of all programs in the 23-channel sample contained violence. The conclusion: TV violence as portrayed poses a serious risk of harm to children.
U.S.	J.Cantor	2000		Experimental	There is a dramatic correlation between the rise of violence depicted in the media and the rise of violent acts and crimes committed by juveniles (Cantor, 2000, p.95).
U.S.	American Academy of Child and Adolescent	2002	All ages	Experimental	-Children who see a lot of violence are more likely to view violence as an effective way of setting conflicts; -Viewing violence can lead to emotional desensitization towards violence in

	Psychiatry				real life. It can decrease the likelihood that one will take action on behalf of victim when violence occurs; -Entertainment violence feeds a perception that the world is a violent and mean place. Viewing violence increase fear of becoming a victim of violence; Viewing violence may lead to real life violence (American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 2002, p.11).
U.S.	J.Payne	1999	268 teenagers,	Experimental	-There is a dramatic correlation between the rise of violence depicted in the media and the rise of violent acts and crimes committed by juveniles in this country. The youth that commit violent crimes are the same youth who enjoy watching violent movies. -In a survey of youths sentenced for crimes, a significant percentage indicated that they watched violent TV programs, listened to music with explicitly violent lyrics and played violent video games. Sixteen percent (16%) admitted acting out things they had seen of heard in the media (Payne, J. (2000). Surveying the Effects of Media Violence. In: Cantor, J. and others. Media Violence Alert, p. 95).
Russia	A.Fedorov	2000	430 teenagers, 16-17 year old	Experimental	48% of the teenagers are attracted to violence on the screen
Russia	K.Tarasov	1995	510 teenagers, 14-17 year old	Experimental	55% of students are hyperactive consumers of media violence (Tarasov, 2000, p.5).

As you can see from table 1, the majority of researches in the USA and in Russia converge in opinion, that media violence renders negative influence on children and youth which are active consumers of this production. The similar conclusion too arises from the comparison of the "Russian" and "American" parts of the given edition. Thus, certainly, it is necessary to note, that in Russia serious researches of the media violence influence on a minor audience have only begun to appear recently, whereas U.S. has the long tradition of this.

References

- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (2002). Media Violence Harms Children. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Is Media Violence a Problem?* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.10-11.
- Bok, S. (1994). *TV Violence, Children, and the Press.* Discussion Paper D-16. Harvard University, pp.201-224.
- Cantor, J. and others (2000). *Media Violence Alert.* Zionsville: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., 120 pp.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Violence on the TV and Russian Youth. *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities,* N 1, pp.131-145.
- Freedman, J. (1999). Studies Have Not Established a Link Between Media Violence and Violence. In: *Media Violence: Opposing Viewpoints.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 49-53.
- Payne, J. (2000). Surveying the Effects of Media Violence. In: *Media Violence Alert.* Zionsvill: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., pp.89-94.
- Tarasov, K. (2000). Film Violence: Attraction and Repulsion. In: *News from The UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen.* N 2, p. 5).
- Wilson, B.J., Kunkel, D. and others (1997). *National Television Violence Study.* Thousand Oaks – London: Sage Publications, 1997, 568 p.

8. Appendices
8.1. Short U.S. Media Violence History
1954. The first congressional hearings into the effects of television violence.

1956. The research conclusion: television could potentially be harmful to young children. "Two-third to three-quarters of all television plays in the 1950s showed violence at the rate of between 6 and 10 incidents per hours in prime time – and have remained at about the same level" (Gerbner, 1988, p.15).

1961. The new research conclusion: amount of media violence had increased.

1965. The research conclusion: televised crime and violence was related to antisocial behavior among teenagers.

1969. The research conclusion: young viewers learned from televised violence how to engage in violent behavior. "A multi-media study by Greenberg (1969) found that large circulation newspapers and magazines contained about 10 per cent violence-related materials (crime and accidents) (Gerbner, 1988, p.15).

1972. The report of the Surgeon General (50 scientists-researchers, 5 volumes published) wrote about the link between media violence and aggressive behavior and the negative impact on viewers of watching television violence.

1980. "Greenberg (1980) analyzed television drama series for three seasons and found violence (defined as "physical aggression") accruing more than 9 times per hour between 8 and 9 p.m., more than 12 times per hour between 9 and 11 p.m., and more than 21 times per hour on Saturday morning children's programs" (Gerbner, 1988, p.17).

1982. The report of The National Institute of Mental Health. This institute reviewed 2,500 worldwide studies and reports. The conclusion: there is the link between media violence and teenagers' aggressive behavior.

1984. The scientists Eron and Huesmann, in a 22-year study following 875 boys and girls from age 8-30, found that boys who were TV-violence's fans were 4-5 times more likely to become violent criminals.

1985. The American Psychological Association (APA) recommended: to encourage parents to monitor and control of children's viewing; to request industry representative to reduce television violence; to encourage the research activities in the area of media violence (Slaby, 2002, p.309). "The index of violence reached its highest level since 1967 (when the study began) in the 1984-85 television season. Eight out of every ten prime time programs contained violence. The rate of violent incidents was nearly eight per hours. The 19 years average was six per hour. (...) Children's programs on American television have always been saturated with violence. Children in 1984-85 were entertained with 27 violent incidents per hour (the third highest on record). The 19-year average for children's programs was 21 violent acts per hour" (…). "Baxter et al. (1985) found violence and crime appearing in more than half of music videos but more as a suggestion that as a completed act. Caplan (1985) observed violence in half of a sample of 139 music videos aired in 1983" (Gerbner, 1988, p.17).

1990. U.S. Congress. Hearing "Children's Television Act of 1990".

1992. The report of American Psychological Association. Conclusions: 40 years of research about violence, media and children states that the "scientific debate is over", America needs federal policy to protect children from media violence.

1995. One more research conclusion is: "criminals imitate violence in TV, movies"

(Cannon, 1995, p.18).

1996. Telecommunication Act of 1996. U.S. President Clinton signed the Telecommunication Act. "Part of this law called for the manufacture of V-Chip, a computer microprocessor. Parents and other concerned adults can use this computer processor to screen TV programs" (Gedatus, 2000, p.54).

1997. Creation of The UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen. The overall point of departure for the Clearinghouse's efforts with respect to children, youth and media is the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. American scientists joined in cooperation with this organization.

1997. New Age Rating System for American TV Programs.

1998. The report of The National Television Violence Study. Conclusions: about 60% of all TV programs are violent and "there are substantial risks of harmful effects from viewing violence throughout the television environment".

1999. "Senator Joseph Lieberman introduced new legislation designed to protect children from the threat of media violence and encourage greater responsibility in the entertainment industry. (…) The legislation also called on the various entertainment media to collaborate on developing stronger industry codes to improve content standards and to better shield children from harmful product" (Slaby, 2002, pp.326-327).

2000. Four national health associations - American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry have together issued a statement that: "the conclusion of the public health community, based on over 30 years of research, is that viewing entertainment violence can lead to increases in aggressive attitudes, values and behaviors, particularly in children".

2000. All television sets thirteen inches or larger are required to carry the V-Chip. Starting in January 2000, all new TVs with screen larger than 13 inches will have the V-Chip. Many TV sets produced in 1999 already contained V-Chip.

2000. U.S. Congress. Hearing "Violence in the Media".

2001. "In Saturday morning children's programs, scenes of violence occur between 20 and 25 times per hour" (Gerbner, 2001, p.133). The comparison "the ratings of over 100 violent and 100 non-violent shows aired at the same time on network television. The average Nielsen rating of the violent sample was 11.1; the rating for the non-violent sample was 13.8. The share of viewing households in the violent and non-violent samples, respectively, was 18.9 and 22.5. The non-violent sample was more highly rated than the violent sample for each of the five seasons studied" (Gerbner, 2001, p.134).

2002. Research conclusion of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry:

-"Children who see a lot of violence are more likely to view violence as an effective way of setting conflicts. Children exposed to violence are more likely to assume that acts of violence are acceptable behavior.

-Viewing violence can lead to emotional desensitization towards violence in real life. It can decrease the likelihood that one will take action on behalf of victim when

violence occurs.

-Entertainment violence feeds a perception that the world is a violent and mean place. Viewing violence increases fear of becoming a victim of violence…

-Viewing violence may lead to real life violence" (American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 2002, p.11).

2003. U.S. Congress. Hearing "Children's Protection from Violent Programming Act" (Introduced in Senate, Jan. 14, 2003)

2003. U.S. Congress. Hearing "Protect Children from Video Game Sex and Violence Act of 2003" (Introduced in House, Feb. 11, 2003).

References

- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (2002). Media Violence Harms Children. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Is Media Violence a Problem?* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.10-11.
- Cannon, C. (1995). Media Violence Increases Violence in Society. In: Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 17-24.
- Gedatus, G.M. (2000). *Violence in the Media.* Mankato, Minnesota: Life Matters, 64 pp.
- Gerbner, G. (1988). *Violence and Terror in the Mass Media.* Paris: UNESCO, 46 pp.
- Gerbner, G. (2001). Communities Should Have More Control over the Content of Mass Media. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.129-137.
- Slaby, R.G. (2002). Media Violence: Effects and Potential Remedies. In: Katzemann, C.S. (Ed.). *Securing Our Children's Future.* Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, pp. 305-337.

8.2.The Special Course "The Mass and Individual Terror and Terrorism in the Mirror of the Russian Cinema (The Feature Films of the Sound Period)"

I. Introduction

a) Location of the course content within the discipline

This special course is connected with the disciplines of *Political Science, World Art Culture, World History, History of Russia, Aesthetics, History of Film Art, History of Media Culture, Media & Film Education/Literacy.*

Proceeding from research devoted to various aspects of theory and history of cinema, as one branch of the theory and history of art, we may conclude that the analysis of terror & terrorism in Russian film remains uncharted. No existing schoolbook, monograph, or thesis contains a chapter devoted to this vital question.

At present, the theory and history of art and cinema lacks research devoted to mass and individual terrorism in Russian films of the Sound Period (1930s through the present). The research of Russian specialists in the theory and history of art has been until now devoted to more traditional themes such as "historical-revolutionary", "heroic-patriotic", "war", etc. In this context, films of 1930s and 1940s were reviewed by I.Dolinsky, S.Ginsbourg, N.Lebedev, A.Groshev, V.Zhdan, N.Tumanova, and L.Belova. The theme of terrorism as a separate theme

was not regarded in the published works analyzing films of the 1950s through the 1990s either (N.Zorkaja, L.Annensky, Y.Bogomolov, V.Demin, I.Waisfeld, G.Kapralov, M.Turovskaja, K.Razlogov, etc.). No Russian research has claimed to have a special analysis on the theme of mass and individual terror & terrorism in Russian film.

The course will take into consideration social, cultural, political, and ideological contexts; types of plot lines and characters; artistic style; and the authors' basic concepts of mass and individual terrorism. The examination will focus on the Sound Period of Russian film from 1931 to the present.

The social and cultural context follows as such: mass and individual terror is one of the most dreadful crimes of the twentieth century. During the peak of its existence, the Russian cinema only touched upon the theme of terror & terrorism. In other years, interpretations of terrorists' actions have been rather opposite. For instance, between the early 1930s and 1980 the Russian Communist Special police (V.C.K.) was interpreted positively, while by the end of 1980s the V.C.K. was accused of propagating the mass terror. In films made in the 1960s (e.g. *Sofia Petrovskaya* by L.Arnshtam) about individual revolutionary terrorism, protagonists were portrayed with sympathy. Yet in 1990s films (e.g. Boris Savinkov novel adaptations), individual terrorism was unequivocally rejected.

Terror & terrorism has never been a primary theme in Russian film, despite the fact that in modern Russian society terror has begun to increase threateningly. Cinema of different genres (drama, thriller, mystery, and comedy) have begun to turn to the topic of terror & terrorism more and more often.

b) Locating the course within the curriculum

This special advanced course is connected with the curriculum of the Pedagogical University. This curriculum includes other art and history disciplines such as *Political Science*, *World Art Culture*, *World History and History of Russia*, *Aesthetics*, *History of Cinema and Screen Arts* and *Media Education*.

c) Prerequisite study for course participation

    a. General World History;
    b. General Russian History;
    c. General World Art History;
    d. General conceptions of aesthetics;
    e. General World Screen-Art History; and
    f. General History of the Russian Cinema

II. Course Objectives

a) Intradisciplinary Academic Aims

- To define the place and role of mass and individual terror in the Russian cinema during the Sound Period;

- To study, within a social, cultural, political, and ideological context, the evolution of the Russian cinema with regard to mass and individual terror;

- To analyze and classify the model of contents, genre modifications, and stylistic aspects of the Russian cinema of the Sound Period that deals with terror &

terrorism. For example, the classics in the history of Russian cinema (F.Ermler, M.Romm, L.Arnshtam) and contemporary films.

- To develop the aesthetic and creative personality of the students, to expand their faculty for critical analysis, perception, interpretation, and to appraise the author's position in a film. On this basis, future teachers' eagerness for their students' education with the help of the screen-arts shall develop.

b) Learning Outcomes

The course "Mass and Individual Terror & Terrorism in the Mirror of the Russian Cinema – the Feature Films of the Sound Period" is important for Russian students because Russian society needs an objective history of modern visual art. Through an analysis of scientific literature about terror & terrorism and the Russian cinema between 1930-1990 and begin of XXth century, students will learn the motivations (political, ideological, moral, aesthetic, etc.), plots, genres, concepts, and interpretations associated with this theme. Upon completing their study at the Pedagogic University, Russian students will teach an objective history of the Russian cinema with regard to mass and individual terror & terrorism.

III. *Course Detail*

A thematic plan for the course:

Theme	Hours for Lectures	Hours for Seminars
Mass and individual terror & terrorism in the mirror of the Russian cinema: *The 1930s*	2	2
Mass and individual terror & terrorism in the mirror of the Russian cinema: *The 1940s*	1	1
Mass and individual terror & terrorism in the mirror of the Russian cinema: *1950 - the early 1980s*	3	3
Mass and individual terror & terrorism in the mirror of the Russian cinema: *The late 1980s – Present*	4	4
Total (of 20 hours)	10	10

A) Lecture Synopses

1. Terror & terrorism in the mirror of the Russian cinema: The 1930s

The aims of the lecture are:

-Studying the social, cultural, political, ideological contexts;

-Noting the directions, aims and tasks of the development of the theme; and

-Understanding the contents of the relevant films with respect to their genre modifications, viewpoints, and styles.

The 1930s is one of the most complicated and contradictory periods in the history of the Russian film industry (Urenev, 1997, p.5). "*Directors - socialist realists... had to bless and sometimes glorify mass repression of 'public enemies', (...) in a word aid adoption of the ideological myths of Stalinism into mass consciousness*" (Urenev, 1997, p.34). The totalitarian system realized the political and ideological importance of terror & terrorism. Though it didn't occupy the leading place in the Russian cinema, its propaganda role was extraordinary. With the help of the screen, the necessity of the "revolutionary terror" towards "class

enemies" and "alien elements" was put into the heads of millions of Russians. Such films became the basis for adopting Stalinism.

The general social, cultural, political, and ideological contexts of the 1930s were represented by:

-peasants terrorized by the totalitarian regime, leading to famine in the early 1930s;

-the total abolition of private property (revitalized during the New Economic Policy of the 1920s);

-intensive industrialization (mainly of heavy and military industries) at enormous cost to the people;

-mass repression of millions of Russians - from the lowest to the highest strata of society;

-intensive adoption of communism with intensive repression of Christian ideology; and

-intensive militarization and military conflict.

The film industry that used terror's topic to support Stalin's regime set strict propaganda standards that served as the bases for screenwriters' conceptions. These standards were:

-asserting that the enemies of the Bolsheviks camouflaged themselves in society and were ready to commit of terrorism at any minute;

-showing that terror toward public enemies was justified and inevitable; and

-convincing viewers that any of their family, relatives, neighbors, and friends could be a "class enemy" who must be revealed and destroyed.

Genre modifications: On the whole the genre was that of a war epic or historical drama. The style of such films was determined by the strict rules of so-called "socialistic realism". For example, rather than the experimental film production of the 1920s, a style of ordinary, everyday life (in fact, often embellished) emerged with consistent plots and theatrical acting.

Primary plots: Bolshevic terror toward so-called "class enemies" and "public enemies" and vice versa (*The Great Citizen* by F.Ermler, *Aerograd* by A.Dovzhenko, *The Party Card* by I.Pyriev, *Lenin in 1918* M.Romm, etc.). M.Romm's film had a mission to justify mass repression (Urenev, 1997, p.50). In films about collectivization, a dramatic stereotype existed: poor peasants realize the advantages of collective farming, middle class peasants hesitate, "kulaks" (rich farmers) sabotage and murder with the help of White Guard officers, foreign spies, priests, and salesmen (Urenev, 1997, p.69).

Even children's films of Stalin's period were swarming with enemies. In the 1930s when Stalin destroyed the peasantry, enemies were usually 'kulaks' and White Guards who assisted spies and saboteurs. The clergy gave great support to the enemies of the Soviet regime because at that time thousands of Russian new martyrs were being killed by a godless power.

2. Terror & Terrorism in the mirror of the Russian cinema: The 1940s

The aims of lecture are:

-To define the place and role of mass and individual terror & terrorism in the Russian cinema of the 1940s; and

-Studying the social, cultural, political, ideological contexts. Noting the directions, aims and tasks of the development of the theme. Understanding the contents of the relevant films with respect to their genre modifications, viewpoints, and styles. Comparing the results with those of the 1930s.

Lecture Content:

At the beginning of World War II, Germany had visibly changed the social, cultural, and ideological contexts against which the Russian film industry had developed. Class and religious struggle were scaled back, there was no mass repression against farmers, and in these voids the struggle with fascists took center stage.

The general social, cultural, political, and ideological contexts of the 1940s were represented by:

-Hostilities on Russian territory from 1941 to 1944 and the war in the Eastern Europe and in the Far East in 1944-45;

-Mass Nazi terror toward Russians on occupied territories (concentration camps, mass shootings, etc.);

-Intense development of the war industry, re-equipment of plants to serve military purposes at a great human cost;

-Adoption of patriotic slogans by communist ideology;

-Establishment of totalitarian regimes that were totally dependent upon the Kremlin in nearly every Eastern European nation in the late 1940s;

-Intense reconstruction of the post-war economy in the late 1940s; and

-The return of mass repression in the late 1940s and early 1950s (struggles with cosmopolitanism, the anti-Semitic campaign, etc.);

The film industry that used terror's theme to support Stalin's regime set strict propaganda standards that served as the bases for screenwriters' conceptions. These standards were:

-Showing the Nazis terrorize Russians and forcing them into slavery;

-Convincing the audience that reciprocal terror was justified and necessary to win the war; and

-Telling the audience to be on alert for Nazi agents and saboteurs who might be nearby, and who must be revealed and destroyed;

Genre modifications: Generally war or historical drama. The style of these films did not greatly differ from those of the previous decade, although there was more realism thought showing war in everyday life. The primary plots were: Nazi terror toward Russians (shootings, executions, tortures, etc.) and reciprocal terror (partisan raids, spies, shootings, etc.) toward Nazis (*Rainbow* by M.Donskoy, *Zoya* by L.Arnshtam, *The Young Guard* by S.Gerasimov, etc.). In a typical plot, Nazis would destroy the Russian's peaceful life and while capturing a town would enact mass terror against the population - including women and children – and force the Russians away to Germany for hard labor. Then the people would begin to struggle with their enemies: in the army, in partisan groups, and in secret organizations. The only exception was S.Eisenstein's film *Ivan the Terrible* in which Eisenstein showed the workings of a merciless and bloody repressive state mechanism: the "Oprichnina" (The Tzar's Special Police), who terrorized Russia. All this was

actually an allegorical representation of the Russian reality of the 1930s and 1940s. For this the second half of the film - Eisenstein's protest against terror & terrorism and totalitarian power - was prohibited by Stalin's regime.

3. Terror & Terrorism in the mirror of the Russian cinema: 1950 through the Early 1980s

The aims of the lecture are:

-To define the place and role of mass and individual terror & terrorism in the Russian cinema from 1950 through the early 1980s; and

-Studying the social, cultural, political, ideological contexts. Noting the directions, aims and tasks of the development of the theme. Understanding the contents of the relevant films with respect to their genre modifications, viewpoints, and styles. Comparing the results with those of the 1940s and 1930s.

Lecture Content:

There are two periods described in this lecture: Khrushchev's "thaw" (mid-1950s through mid 1960s) and Brezhnev's "stagnation" (late 1960s through the early 1980s). Mass and individual terror & terrorism's topic in the cinema was similar during both periods: terrorism was condemned, yet the attitudes toward so-called "revolutionary terror" remained rather sympathetic.

The general social, cultural, political, and ideological contexts of the period from 1950 to the early 1980s were represented by:

-A rejection of the internal class struggle, a declaration of a United Soviet People having no national, ethnic, class, or race problems;

-An official rejection of the idea of global revolution and dictatorship by the proletariat; a declaration of a policy of "peaceful coexistence of socialistic and capitalistic systems", although keeping the so-called "ideological struggle";

-The liquidation of mass terror by the state against its own citizens, while preserving local persecution of outspoken Russians (B.Pasternak, A.Saharov, A.Solzhenitsyn and others);

-The continuation of industrialization (mainly of heavy and military industry). In fact, the rate of this development slowed down and took less effort from the people until the beginning of the 1980s when planning crises of state economics began to show up due of a drop in oil prices;

-A continuation of the intense adaptation of the communism ideology (in a new Lenin-orientated, post-Stalin style), while the struggle against Christian ideology is less intense; and

-A continuation of the intense militarization of the country, unleashing war conflicts (in Africa and Asia), intervention in Hungary (1956) Czechoslovakia (1968); and supporting militaries and communist regimes in third world countries.

The film industry that used terror & terrorism theme to support Stalin's regime set strict propaganda standards that served as the bases for screenwriters' conceptions. These standards were:

-Showing that terror during the Civil War was forced and led to sufferings;

-Ignoring or at least concealing the true scale of mass terror in the 1930s; concentrating mainly on the theme of war terror in the 1940s;

-Convincing the audience that so-called "revolutionary Bolshevik terror" had noble aims, and that terrorists themselves were true to noble ideals - protectors of oppressed people; and

-Condemning terrorists who highjacked planes, ships, and set off bombs.

Genre modifications: War or historical drama, western-style tragic comedy, and melodrama. Style was unaffected by the laws of socialistic realism. Among very traditional screen versions of *Quiet Flows the Don*, *The Road of Sorrows* and *Optimistic Tragedy*, such daring adventure films as *Elusive Avengers* and murderous Westerns by S.Gasparov appeared on the screen. In these films the action took place during the Russian Civil War and mutual hatred by combatants was the inevitable genre rule. Murders were shown without any sensitivity and with fountains of blood.

The appearance of milder interpretations of terror & terrorism, which lack the aggressive mercilessness of the interpretations of the 1930s and 1940s, in which terror toward the class enemies was still regarded positively.

Primary plots: Terror toward so-called "enemies" (both domestic and foreign) and reciprocal terror against the authorities and civilians.

A typical "historical-revolutionary" film would be thus: the poor are enthusiastic about the new Bolshevic rule while the middle and intellectual classes remain uncertain - terror, blood, and war frighten them. But in the long run they come to understand that the Bolsheviks took repressive actions unwillingly in the name of the future happiness of the proletariat (*The Road of Sorrows*).

Screenwriters of this period gave special gratitude to the Special Commission VCK (Special Police Service). The VCK was portrayed as an organization of men who, with "clean hands" and fire and sword burnt the "enemy infections" out of Russia (*The Operation, Trust, Peters, Born by the Revolution, The Failure, The Failure of the Operation "Terror", December, 20*, etc.). An attempt by A.Askoldov in his drama *Commissar* to disclose the true tragedy of the Civil War and antihuman nature of terror was mercilessly suppressed and the film was banned for twenty years. The same happened to A.German's attempt to show the work of the Special Policemen in the 1930s in his film *My Friend Ivan Lapshin*. Among the films that showed terrorism in its most dramatically were *Run* (based on the novel by Mikhail Bulgakov) and *The Slave of Love*.

The typical WWII films remained nearly the same as those of the 1940s but were more true-to-life. For example, in the film *Spiritually Strong*, terrorism against Nazis during WWII by the Russian secret agent N.Kuznetsov were absolutely justified while his terrorism acts against the Nazi officers had a reverse effect: for each Nazi officer that was killed by N.Kuznetsov, fascists shot one-hundred Russians.

In the films *Sofia Perovskaya* and *Executed at Dawn*, terrorists who attempted to kill the Tsar were shown sympathy. But in *The Sixth of July*, an act of terrorism by left-wing socialist-revolutionists was condemned. Even more condemned were terrorist activities of the famous leader of socialists-revolutionists Boris Savinkov in films, as *The Failure* and *Operation 'Trust'*. Of course, pure criminal terrorism (*The*

Pirates of the XX Century, The Fight in the Snow-Storm) was criticized also. In the film *A Story of a Stranger*, perhaps for the first time in the Russian film industry not only the expediency of revolutionary individual terrorism but also revolutionaries' moral qualities were brought into question (it goes without saying that the main character was not a Bolshevik).

In short, certain changes took place in the attitude toward terror & terrorism in the cinema. Films lacked the furious mercilessness of models from the 1930s through 1940s. Terror toward class enemies was still shown positively. However, the accent was on its forced and sometimes erroneous nature.

4. Terror & Terrorism in the mirror of the Russian cinema:
The Late 1980s - Present

The aims of the lecture are:

-To define the place and role of mass and individual terror & terrorism in the Russian cinema from 1950 through the late 1980s and 1990s; and

-Studying the social, cultural, political, ideological contexts. Noting the directions, aims and tasks of the development of the theme. Understanding the contents of the relevant films with respect to their genre modifications, viewpoints, and styles. Comparing the results with those of the 1930s and 1940s.

Lecture Content:

This stage may be divided into two main periods: Gorbachev's 'Perestroika' (1985 - 1991) and Yeltsin/Putin's reforms (1992 - present). These periods are different from each other in many ways. They are similar, however, in condemning all forms of terror & terrorism.

First Period

-Gorbachev's declaration of "Perestroika" and "Glasnost", implementing democracy, freedom of speech, and improvement of socialism;

-Officially taking blame for mass and individual terror & terrorism, and working to rehabilitate millions of victims;

-A rejection of the ideological struggle and a political and military withdrawal from Afghanistan.

-A gradual rejection of censorship of free exchange between the USSR and Western countries;

-An economic and ideological crisis that led to conservative upheaval in 1991; and

-The demise of the Soviet Union in 1991;

Second Period

-The beginning of economic reform, the revival of the private property, and economic "shock therapy". This led to a sudden division of the society between the few rich and many poor.

-An attempt of *coup-d'etat* in the autumn of 1993.

-The crisis of reforms, the war in Chechnya, an attempt to solve economic problems with money borrowed from the West, and the decay of Russian industry.

-The new way to economical stabilization.

As censorship was practically abolished, film producers took the opportunity to explore the most vital themes, which were previously banned.

Below is a set of concepts draw upon by screenwriters of this period:

-Terror during the civil war, as the fratricidal war itself was a tragedy for the Russian people;

-The mass terror of the 1920s though early 1950s was the consequence of the anti-human policy of Lenin and Stalin;

-Terror & terrorism, whatever form it takes, cannot be justified, nor can the ideology that gave way to terror & terrorism.

Genre modifications: War or historical drama, Western, tragic comedy, melodrama, comedy, and parable. The styles are also varied: besides traditional realism (*The Sign of Misfortune*, *The Law*, *Nikolai Vavilov*, etc.) some grotesque, ironical films are made (*The Feasts of Valtasar*, *10 Years without the Right of Correspondence*, etc.), and there is an exquisite stylization of the visual manner, as in the "late Stalinism" (*Moscow Parade*). Shocking films showing mass terror and violence appeared (*Go and Watch*, *From Hell to Hell*).

The Major Plot Models:

-Mass Nazi terror during the Second World War and terror of the Communism regime towards its own citizens destroys the human spirit and turns people to hangmen (*Go and Watch*, *From Hell to Hell*, *Advocate Sedov*, *Enemy of People - Bukharin*, etc.). This model is especially visible in films about mass deportations of Caucasian peoples in the 1940s (*A Golden Cloud Slept*, *Coldness*, *A Road to the Edge of a Life*);

-An ordinary man becomes a victim of Stalinist terror and is imprisoned in a concentration camp. Only there does he realize the anti-human character of the communist regime (*Coma*, *Lost in Siberia*, *What a Wonderful Game*, etc.). Alternatively, people who believe in communism experience the Stalinist terrorism themselves, yet they learn the truth only too late (*Tomorrow Was the War*, *Inner Circle*, *Burnt by the Sun*, *Khrustalev, The Car!*);

-"Revolutionary terror" and "ideological terror" attracts people with an aggressive desire of power and psychotic personalities who want to leave a bloody trace in history (*Tsar's Murderer*, *Trotsky*, *Romanov - the Tsar's Family*, *Plumbum, Special Police Officer*, *Made in the USSR*, etc.);

-A common man enlists in the army (or finds himself in a prison or work camp), where he comes across cruel terror not very different from that of the Nazis or Stalin (*No Limits*, *The Guard*, *The Reed Paradise*, *Do - one!*, etc.);

-Mobs terrorize civilians while the authorities do nothing. A hero alone fights against the thugs (*A Day of Love*, *Wild Beach*, etc.);

-Terrorists highjack planes, buses, or ships. Courageous and strong heroes disarm them (*Crazy Bus*, *Gangsters in the Ocean*, etc.).

In these films, terrorism is condemned no matter its results.

B) Seminar Synopses

1. The Stage of the 1930s and 1940s

The aims of the seminar are:

-To watch typical Russian terror & terrorism films of the 1930s and 1940s;

-To discuss these films with students in the context of the previous lectures;

-To develop creative critical skills in students, and to improve their faculties for perception, interpretation, analysis and the appraisal of film.

Seminar Content:

-An introductory speech about the historical, political and socio-cultural context in which a film was written and produced;

-Watching the film; and

-Discussing the films and considering their contents. Understanding the creativity behind the film and expressing students' personal attitudes to the film.

Typical Seminar Questions:

What is the culmination of the film? What is the major conflict in the film? What is the nature of the hero's character? What was the author's conception of this film? What was the author's position about mass or individual terror & terrorism?

Some Russian films of 1930s and 1940s:

Farmers. 1934.
Directed by Fridrih Ermler
Actors: E.Unger, B.Poslavsky, A.Petrov and others
Aerograd.1935.
Directed by Alexander Dovjenko
Actors: S.Shagaida, S.Stoliarov, E.Melnikov and others
The Party Card.1936.
Directed by Ivan Piriev
Actors: A.Voicik, A.Abrikosov, I.Maleev and others
The Great Citizen. 1937.
Directed by Fridrih Ermler
Actors: N.Bogolubov, O.Jakov, Z.Feodorova and others
Lenin in 1918. 1939.
Directed by Mikhail Romm.
Actors: B.Schukin, N.Bogolubov, N.Cherkasov and others
The Rainbow. 1943.
Directed by Mark Donskoy
Actors: N.Ujvy, N.Alisova E.Tiapkina and others
Zoja. 1944.
Directed by Leo Arnshtam
Actors: G.Vodianitska, K.Tarasova, N.Ryjov and others
Ivan the Terrible. 1944-1945.
Directed by Sergei Eisenstein
Actors: N.Cherkasov, M.Jarov, L.Celikovska and others
The Yang Guard S. 1948.
Directed by Sergei Gerasimov
Actors: I.Makarova, S.Gurso, N.Mordukova and others

2. The Stage beginning in 1950 and ending in the early 1980s

The aims of the seminar are:

-To watch typical Russian terror & terrorism films produced between 1950 and the early 1980s;

-To discuss these films with students in the context of the previous lectures;

-To develop creative critical skills in students, and to improve their faculties for perception, interpretation, analysis and the appraisal of film.

Seminar Content:

-An introductory speech about the historical, political and socio-cultural context in which a film was written and produced;

-Watching the film; and

-Discussing the films and considering their contents. Understanding the creativity behind the film and expressing students' personal attitudes to the film.

Typical Seminar Questions:

What is the culmination of the film? What is the major conflict in the film? What is the nature of the hero's character? What was the author's conception of this film? What was the author's position about mass or individual terror & terrorism? What are the differences between the interpretations mass and individual terror & terrorism by the Russian cinema in the 1930's and 1940s and the period from 1950 though the early 1980s?

Some Russian films of the period from 1950s to the early 1980s:

Quiet Flows the Don. 1958.
Directed by Sergei Gerasimov
Actors: P.Glebov, L.Hitiaeva, E.Bystritska and others
Motion on the Torments. 1958
Directed by George Roshal
Actors: R.Nifontova, V.Medvedev, N.Gritsenko and others
The Optimistic Tragedy. 1963.
Directed by Samson Samsonov
Actors: M.Volodina, B.Andreev, V.Tikhonov and others
Calling the Fire to Ourselves. 1964.
Directed by Sergei Kolosov
Actors: L.Kasatkina, I.Izvitska, O.Efremov and others
Executed at Sunrise. 1964.
Directed by Evgeny Andricanis
Actors: V.Ganshin, E.Solodova, T.Konuhova and others
The Extraordinary Mission. 1965.
Directed By Stepan Kevorkov & Erasm Karamizn
Actors: G.Tonunts, B.Chirkov, E.Lejdei and others
The Elusive Avengers. 1966.
Directed by Edmond Keosajan
Actors: V.Kosyh, M.Metelkin, V.Vasiliev and others
The Operation "Trust". 1967.
Directed by Sergei Kolosov
Actors: I.Gorbachev, D.Banionis, A.Djigarhanian and others
Sofia Perovskaja. 1967.
Directed by Leo Arnshtam
Actors: A.Nasarova, V.Tarasov, B.Hmelnitsky and others
Spiritually Strong. 1967.
Directed By Victor Georgiev
Actors: G.Cilinsky, I.Pereverzev, E.Vesnik and others.
Komissar. 1967.
Directed By Alexander Askoldov
Actors: N.Mordukova, R.Bykov and others.
The Failure. 1968.
Directed by Vladimir Chebotarev
Actors: V.Samoilov, U.Jakovlev, E.Kopelian and others
The Sixth of July. 1968.
Directed by July Karasik
Actors: U.Kaurov, V.Tatosov, V..Lanavoi, A.Demidova and others.
The Run. 1970
Directed by Alexander Alov, Vladimir Naumov
Actors: L.Savelieva, A.Batalov, M.Ulianov and others.
The Night's Chronicle. 1972.
Directed by Alexei Speshnev
Actors: A.Romashin, D.Firsova, E.Kopelian and others.
Peters. 1972.

Directed by Sergei Tarasov
Actors: G.Jacovlev, A.Falkovich, U.Kamorny and others
Until the Last Minute. 1973.
Directed Valery Isakov
Actors: V.Dvorjesky, T.Tkach, V.Zaklunna and others
The Slave of Love. 1975.
Directed by Nikita Mikchalkov
Actors: E.Solovei, A.Kaliagin, R.Nahapetov and others
Borne of Revolution. 1974-1977.
Directed by Grigory Kohan
Actors: E.Jarikov, N.Gvozdikova, V.Shulgin and others
On the Wolf's Scent. 1976.
Directed by Valery Gadjiu
Actors: E.Lasarev, A.Romashi, G.Seifulin and others
The Skirmish in the Snowstorm. 1977.
Directed by Alexander Gordon
Actors: L.Markov, V.Gaft, K.Zaharov and others
The Hatred. 1977.
Directed by Samvel Gasparov
Actors: E.Leonov-Gladyshev, E.Ciplakova, E.Burduli and others
The Ascent. 1977.
Directed by Larisa Shepitko
Actors: B.Plotnikov, V.Gostuhin, A.Solonitsin and others
Forget the Word Death. 1979.
Directed by Samvel Gasparov
Actors: B.Stupka, E.Leonov-Gladyshev, K.Stepankov and others
The Pirates of the XXth Century. 1979.
Directed by Boris Durov
Actors: N.Eremenko, P.Veliaminov, T.Nigmatulin and others
The Failure of the Operation "Terror". 1980.
Directed by Anatoly Bobrovsky
Actors: K.Hamec, S.Shakurov, E.Ciplakova and others
The Story of the Stranger. 1980.
Directed by Vitautas Jelakavichus
Actors: E.Simonova, A.Kaidanovsky, G.Taratorkin and others
Teheran-43. 1980.
Directed by Alexander Alov, Vladimir Naumov
Actors: I.Kostolevsky, N.Belohvostikova, A.Delon and others
The Sixth. 1981.
Directed by Samvel Gasparov
Actors: S.Nikonenko, M.Kosakov, M.Pugovkin and others
December 20th. 1981.
Directed by Grigiry Nikulin
Actors: K.Lavrov, M.Kosakov, S.Ursky and others
My Friend Ivan Lapshin. 1981.
Directed by Alexei German
Actors: A.Bolnev, A.Mironov, N.Ruslanova and others
Every Tenth. 1983.
Directed by Mikchail Ordovsky
Actors: R Zaitseva, L.Borisov, V.Eremin and others

3. *The Stage of the late 1980s to Present Days*

The aims of the seminar are:

-To watch typical Russian terror & terrorism films produced between late 1980s and the present days;

-To discuss these films with students in the context of the previous lectures;

-To develop creative critical skills in students, and to improve their faculties for perception, interpretation, analysis and the appraisal of film.

Seminar Content:

-An introductory speech about the historical, political and socio-cultural context in which a film was written and produced;

-Watching the film; and

-Discussing the films and considering their contents. Understanding the creativity behind the film and expressing students' personal attitudes to the film.

Typical Seminar Questions:

What is the culmination of the film? What is the major conflict in the film? What is the nature of the hero's character? What was the author's conception of this film? What was the author's position about mass or individual terror & terrorism? What are the differences between the interpretations mass and individual terror & terrorism by the Russian cinema in the 1930's and 1940s, the period from 1950 though the early 1980s, and the period of the late 1980s to present days?

Some Russian films of the period of the late 1980s to Present:

Go and Watch. 1985.
Directed by Elem Klimov
Actors: A. Kravchenko O. Mirinova, L. Laucavichus and others
The Counteraction. 1985.
Directed by Semen Aranovich.
Actors: O. Basilashvili, A. Boltnev, U. Kuznetsov and others
The Sign of the Misfortune. 1986.
Directed by Mikchail Ptashuk
Actors: N. Ruslanova, G. Garbuk, V. Gostuhin and others
Plumbum. 1986.
Directed by Vadim Abdrashitov
Actors: A. Androsov, E. Jakovleva, A. Feclistov and others
Tomorrow Was the War. 1987.
Directed by Ury Kara
Actors: S. Nikonenko N. Ruslanova, J. Tarhova and others
Good By, the Gays from Zamoskvoretsk. 1987
Directed by Alexander Pankratov
Actors: S. Makarov, L. Borodina, N. Dobrynin and others
The Advocate Sedov. 1988.
Directed by Eugeny Tsimbal
Actors: V. Ilin, A. Matveeva, I. Sukachev and others
Hell.1989
Directed by Gennagy Beglov
Actors: D. Komov, I. Komova, E. Tochenova and others
No Limits. 1989.
Directed by Igor Gostev
Actors: A. Tashkov, A. Androsov, L. Durov and others
The Paper Eyes of Prishvin. 1989.
Directed by Valery Ogorodnikov
Actors: A. Romantsov, P. Rudakov, O. Kovalov and others
The Low. 1989.
Directed by Vladimir Naumov
Actors: U. Shlykov, N. Belohvostikova, E. Majorova and others
The Reed Paradise. 1989.
Directed By Elena Ciplakova
Actors: N. Stotsky, A. Bureev, A. Kravchenko and others
The Guard. 1989.
Actors: A. Buldakov, S. Kuprianov, A. Polujan and others
Coma. 1989.
Directed by Niole Adomenaite and Boris Gorlov

Actors: N. Nikulenko, A. Bashirov, O. Krutikov and others
The Golden Cloud Slept. 1989.
Directed by Sulambek Mamilov
Actors: A. Bashkirova, V. Bashkirov, I. Bortnik and others
Our Good. 1989.
Directed by Boris Ermolaev
Actors: M. Terehova, V. Nikulin, V. Menshov and others
The Feasts of Valtasar, Or the Night with Stalin.1989.
Directed by Ury Kara
Actors: A. Petrnko, V. Gaft, A. Feklistov and others
In Russia There's Again Devil's Day.1990.
Directed by Vladimir Vasilkov
Actors: T. Ipatova, E. Belonogov, M. Ivanov and others
Enemy of the People - Bukharin. 1990.
Directed by Leonid Mariagin
Actors: A. Romantsov, S. Shakurov, E. Lasarev and others
Woman Tailor. 1990.
Directed by Leonid Gorovits
Actors: I. Smoktunovsky, T. Vasilieva, E. Koselkova and others
Do - One! 1990
Directed by Adrei Malukov
Actors: E. Mirinov, V. Mashkov, A. Domogarov and others
The Day of Love. 1990.
Directed by Alexander Polynnikov
Actors: A. Boltnev, S. Gasarov, A. Nasarieva and others
The Ten Years without the Right of Correspondence. 1990.
Directed by Vladimir Naumov
Actors: B. Scherbakov, N. Belohvostikova, A. Pankratov-Cherny and others
The Savage Bitch. 1990.
Directed by Natalia Kirakosova
Actors: A. Ponimarev, E. Vnukova, A. Guskov and others
Dina. 1990.
Directed by Fedor Petruhin
Actors: T. Skorohodova, I. Smoktunovsky, M. Bulgakova and others
Nikolai Vavilov. 1990.
Directed by Alexander Proshkin
Actors: K. Smorginas, A. Martianov, I. Kupchenko and others
The Funeral of Stalin. 1990.
Directed by Eugeny Evtushenko
Actors: D. Konstantinov, A. Batalov, E. Evtushenko and others
Made in the USSR. 1990.
Directed by Sviatoslav Tarahovsky & Vladimir Shamshurin
Actors: A. Djigarhanian, A. Kluka, L. Kuravlev and others
Crazy Bas. 1991.
Directed by Georgy Natanson
Actors: I. Calnynsh, I. Bochkin, A. Samohina and others
The Gangsters of the Ocean. 1991.
Directed by Stepan Puchinian
Actors: A. Samohina, A. Mikchailov, L. Durov and others
The Governor. 1991.
Directed by Vladimir Makeranets
Actors: B. Himichov, I. Krasko, S. Varchuk and others
Lost in Siberia. 1991.
Directed by Alexander Mitta.
Actors: A. Andrus, V. Iliin, E. Majorova and others
Go Away! 1991.
Directed by Dmitry Astrahan
Actors: O. Megvinetuhucici, E. Anisimova, T. Kusnetsova and others
The Creature of Hell. 1991.
Directed by Vasily Panin

Actors: G. Taratorkin, K. Lavrov, V. Samoilov and others
The Myth of Leonid.1991.
Directed by Dmitry Dolinin
Actors: S. Gamov, A. Nevolina, B. Birman and others
The Tsar's Murderer. 1991.
Directed by Karen Shahnazarov
Actors: Mcdowell, O. Jankovsky, A. Djigarhanian and others
Tsar Ivan the Terrible. 1991.
Directed by Gennady Vasiliev
Actors: I. Talkov, K. Kavsadze, S. Lubshin and others.
Special Police Officer. 1991.
Directed by Alexander Rogojkin
Actors: I. Seergeev, A. Polujan, N. Usatova and others
The Cold. 1991.
Directed by Husein Erkenov
Actors: N. Eremenko, O. Pototska, O. Vasiliev and others
Inner Circle. 1992.
Directed by Andrei Konchalovsky
Actors: T. Hals, L. Davidivich, B. Hoskins and others
Moscow Parade. 1992.
Directed by Ivan Dyhovichny
Actors: A. Feklistov, U. Lamper, S. Makovetsky and others
The White Horse. 1993.
Directed by Gely Riabov
Actors: A. Guzenko, G. Glagolev, V. Isotova and others
Trotsky. 1993.
Directed by Leonid Mariagin
Actors: I. Savina, V. Sergachev, E. Jarikov and others
The Plane Fly to Russia. 1994.
Directed by Alexei Kapilevich
Actors: A. Ankundinov, S. Losev, S. Parshin and others
Burnt by the Sun. 1994.
Directed By Nikita Mikchalkov
Actors: O. Menshikov, N. Mikchalkov, I. Dapkunaite and others
Wolf's Blood. 1995.
Directed by Nikolai Stambula
Actors: E. Sidihin, A. Kasakov, R. Adomaitis and others
The Time of Sadness Comes Not Yet. 1995.
Directed by Sergei Selianov
Actors: V. Priomyhov, P. Mamonov, M. Levtova and others
The Road to the Edge of Life. 1995.
Directed by Ruben Muredizn
Actors: N.Fateeva, A.Pashutin, V.Proslurin and others
What Wonderful Game! 1995.
Directed by Piotr Todorovsky
Actors: A. Iliin, G. Nazarov, L. Udovichenko and others
From Hell to Hell. 1996.
Directed By Dmitry Astrahan
Actors: V.Valeeva, A. Kling, A. Kluka and others
The Prisoner of the Mountain. 1996.
Directed by S.Bodrov
Actors: O. Menshikov, S. Bodrov-Jun., A. Jarkov and others
Two Moons, Three Suns. 1998.
Directed by Roman Balajan
Actors: V. Mashkov, E. Shevchenko, K. Stepankov and others
*Kh*rustalev, the Car!* 1998.
Directed by Alexei German
Actors: U. Tsurillo, N. Ruslanova, A. Zharkov, A. Bashirov and others
In the August, 1944. 2000.
Directed by Mikhail Ptashuk

Actors: E.Mironov, V.Galkin, A.Baluev, A.Petrenko and others.
Purgatory. 2000.
Directed by Alexander Nevzorov
Actors: D.Nagiev, V.Stepanov and others.
Romanov: The Tsar's Family. 2000.
Directed by Gleb Panfilov
Actors: A. Galibin, L. Belinhem, K. Kachalina and others
Kamenskaya. 1, 2. 1999-2002.
Directed by Yury Moroz
Actors: E.Yakovleva, S.Garmashm S.Nikonenko and others.
The Empire Under Impact. 2000-2001.
Directed by Andrey Malukov, Sergei Snejkin, Sergei Gazzarov and others.
Actors: I.Livanov, B.Plotnikov, Y.Mitrophanov, E.Safonova and others.
The Border: The Taiga romance. 2001
Directed by Alexander Mitta
Actors: A.Guskov, V.Simonov, A.Basharov, M.Efremov and others.
The Lions' Part. 2001
Directed by Alexander Muratov
Actors: N.Karachentsev, D.Pevtsov, C.Khamatova and others.
Cobra. 2001-2003.
Directed by Igor Apasyan, Yury Klimenko
Actors: A.Samoilenko, A.Tereshko, A.Filozov and others.
Men's Job. 1, 2. 2001-2002.
Directed by Tigran Keosayan
Actors: F.Bondarchuk, A.Mokhov, S.Veksler and others.
Antikiller. 2002.
Directed by Egor Konchalovsky
Actors: G.Kutsenko, M.Ulianov, S.Shakurov and others.
Brigade. 2002
Directed by Alexei Sidorov
Actors: S.Bezrukov, A.Panin, E.Guseva and others.
Caucasus's Roulette. 2002
Directed by Fedor Popov, Victor Merezhko
Actors: N.Usatova, T.Mesherkina, S.Garmash and others.
I Am the Doll. 2002.
Directed Yury Kara
Actors: A.Domogarov, O.Sumskaya, S.Nikonenko and others.
Heated Saturday. 2002
Directed by Alexander Mitta
Actors: A.guskov, V.Tolstoganova, V.Simonov and others.
The House of Fools. 2002
Directed by Andrei Konchalovsky
Actors: U.Visotskaya, E.Mironov, B.Adams and others.
The Special Case. 2002.
Directed by Igor Talpa
Actors: I.Malysheva, D.Shevchenko and others.
The Star. 2002.
Directed by Nikolai Lebedev
Actors: I.Petrenko, A.Panin, A.Kravchenko and others.
The War. 2002.
Directed by Alexei Balabanov
Actors: A.Chadov, I.Dapkunaite, S.Bodrov and othets.

IV. Assessment

An Outline of Student Assessment:

-Sensory criterion: frequency of association with the cinema; the skill to select their favorite genres and themes;

-Comprehension criterion: knowledge of Russian cinema history, including films about mass and individual terrorism;

-Motivational criterion: emotional, compensatory, and aesthetic motives for contact with the cinema;

-Appraisal and interpretative criterion: perception for audiovisual thinking; independent critical analysis, including identifying the hero with the author and understanding the author's conception;

-Creative criterion: the level of creative basis in different aspects of the activity: perceptional, aesthetic, and analytical.

Based on different standards of aesthetic perception suggested in research and connected with the problems of media education, I came to the following variant, which corresponds to the aims and tasks of my program:

-the standard of the "initial identification": the emotional, psychological coherence with the screen environment and the plot /bond of the events/ of the narration;

-the standard of the "second identification": the identification with the hero of the work of a cinema art;

-the standard of the "complex identification": the identification with the author of the work of the cinema art, preserving the "initial" (primary) and "secondary" identification with the following interpretation.

For an excellent mark, a student shall show:

-a high level of understanding criterion, the appraisal, interpretative criterion, and the creative criterion;

-a thorough understanding of "complex identification": and

-high level of knowledge of the history of Russian film.

V. Reading list

Books for all themes.

1. Budnitsky, O.V. (2000). Terrorism in the Russian Emancipating Movement. Moscow.
2. Budnitsky, O.V. (2001). The History of Russian Terrorism. Rostov.
3. Geiman, A. (1997). Revolutionary Terror in Russia. Moscow.
4. Odessky, M.P. and Feldman, D.M. (1997). The Poetics of Terror. Moscow.
5. Olshansky, D.V. (2002). The Psychology of Terror. Moscow.
6. Olshansky, D.V. (2002). The Psychology of Terrorism. St-Petersburg.
7. Razzakov, F. (2003). The Century of Terrorism. Moscow.
8. The Bloody Terror (2000). Moscow.
9. The Modern Terrorism: The Condition and Prospects (2000). Moscow.
10. Zharinov, K.V. (1999) Terrorism and Terrorists. Minsk.
11. Zhukhrai, V.M. (2002). Terrorism. The Geniuses and Victims. Moscow.

Books for Lecture 1: The 1930s

1. Afanasiev U. *Metastases of Stalinism*// Cinema Art. - 1989. - N 1.
2. Bernshtein A. *Convicted as an Enemy of the People* // Cinema Art. - 1993. - N 3. - P. 92-99.
3. Chernenko M. *Shot Courses* // Cinema Art. - 1993. - N 3. - P. 30-35.
4. Chronicle of Humanity: Encyclopaedia |Red. B. Harnberg. - Moscow, 1996. - 1200 P.
5. Deriabin A. The Discrete Fascination Of Gipnotism: Mechanism Of The Influence Of Soviet Cinema Of 30-S - Early 50-S // Doors. Moscow, 1993. - P. 17-31.
6. Esenshtein S. Selected Works. Vol. 1-6. Moscow, 1964.
7. Ginsbourg S., Zak M., Urenev R. and others. History of Soviet Cinema. Vol. 2. Moscow, 1973.
8. Groshev A., Ginsbourg S., Lebedev N., Dolinsky I. and others. A Short History of Soviet Cinema. - Moscow, 1969.- 616 Pp.
9. Joungblood D. Soviet Cinema. Ed. University of Texas Press, 1993.
10. Katz. E. The Film Encyclopedia. NY 1979.
11. Klimontovich N. *Them as Spies*// Cinema Art. - 1990. - N 11. - P. 113-122.
12. Mamatova L. and others. Cinema: Policy and People (The 30-S) - Moscow, 1995. - 231 Pp.
13. Mamatova L. *The Model of Cinema-Myth 30-S*//Cinema Art - 1991. - N 3.
14. Mitry J. Histoire Du Cinema. Paris, 1980.
15. Predal R.. Histoire Du Cinema. Paris. Ed. Corlet, 1994. - 200 P.
16. *Stalin And Cinema*//*Cinema Art* - 1993. - N 3. - P.100-102.

17. Turovskaja M. and others. <u>Cinema of the Totalitarian Epoch</u>. Moscow, 1989. - 50 P.
18. Urenev R. <u>A Short History of Soviet Cinema</u>. - Moscow, 1979.
19. Urenev R. <u>Soviet Cinema Art of 30-S</u>.- Moscow,1997.- 110 P.

Books for Lecture 2: The 1940s

1. <u>Chronicle of Humanity: Encyclopaedia</u> |Red. B. Harnberg. - Moscow, 1996. - 1200 P.
2. Deriabin A. <u>The Discrete Fascination of Gipnotism: Mechanism Of The Influence Of Soviet Cinema Of 30-S - Early 50-S</u> // Doors. Moscow, 1993. - P. 17-31.
3. Esenshtein S. <u>Selected Works</u>. Vol. 1-6. Moscow, 1964.
4. Ginsbourg S., Zak M., Urenev R. and others. <u>History of Soviet Cinema</u>. Vol. 3. Moscow, 1975.
5. Groshev A., Ginsbourg S., Lebedev N., Dolinsky I. and others. <u>A Short History of Soviet Cinema</u>. - Moscow, 1969. - 616 Pp.
6. Joungblood D. <u>Soviet Cinema</u>. Ed. University of Texas Press, 1993.
7. Katz. E. <u>The Film Encyclopedia</u>. N.Y. 1979.
8. Kleiman N. <u>A World Without the War</u>. Moscow, 1995 - 48 P.
9. Mitry J. <u>Histoire Du Cinema</u>. Paris, 1980.
10. Predal R. <u>Histoire Du Cinema</u>. Paris. Ed. Corlet, 1994. - 200 P.
11. Shmyrov V. *Old Mefisto (M.Chiaureli)*// <u>Cinema Art</u>. - 1989. - N 8.
12. Turovskaja M. and others. <u>Cinema of the Totalitarian Epoch</u>. Moscow, 1989. - 50 P.
13. Turovskaja M. *The Films of the Cold War* //<u>Cinema Art</u>. 1996. - N 9. - P. 98-106.
14. Urenev R. <u>A Short History of Soviet Cinema</u>. - Moscow, 1979.

Books for Lecture 3: 1950 through the early 1980s

1. Anninsky L. <u>The 60-S and Us</u>. Moscow,1991 - 255 Pp.
2. <u>Chronicle of Humanity: Encyclopaedia</u> |Red. B. Harnberg. - Moscow, 1996. - 1200 P.
3. Fomin V. <u>Cinema and Power: Soviet Cinema of 1965-1985</u>. Moscow, 1996. - 372 P.
4. Ginsbourg S., Zak M., Urenev R. and others. <u>History of Soviet Cinema</u>. Vol. 4. Moscow, 1978.
5. Groshev A., Ginsbourg S., Lebedev N., Dolinsky I. and others. <u>A Short History of Soviet Cinema. - Moscow, 1969</u>. - 616 Pp.
6. Joungblood D. <u>Soviet Cinema</u>. Ed. University of Texas Press, 1993.
7. Katz. E. <u>The Film Encyclopedia</u>. N.Y. 1979.
8. Kleiman N. <u>A World Without The War</u>. Moscow, 1995 - 48 P.
9. Maksimov A. *Elusive S Devils*// <u>Rakurs</u>. Moscow, 1996. - P. 105-139.
10. Margolit E., Shemiakin A. and others. <u>The Cinema Of The Thaw</u>.- Moscow, 1996.
11. Mitry J. <u>Histoire Du Cinema</u>. Paris, 1980.
12. Predal R. <u>Histoire Du Cinema</u>. Paris. Ed. Corlet, 1994. - 200 P.
13. Stishova E. *Passions of Comissar*// <u>Cinema Art</u>. - 1989. - N 1.
14. Urenev R. <u>A Short History of Soviet Cinema</u>. - Moscow, 1979.
15. Vlasov M. and others. <u>Soviet Cinema 70-S-Early 80-S</u>. Moscow, 1997 - 182 P

Books for Lecture 4: The late 1980s - Present

1. Chernenko M. *Shot Courses* // <u>Cinema Art</u>. - 1993. - N 3. - P. 30-35.
2. <u>Chronicle of Humanity: Encyclopaedia</u> |Red. B.Harnberg. - Moscow, 1996. - 1200 P.
3. <u>Cinemania: Encyclopaedia of Russian Cinema</u>. - Moscow, 1997.
4. Bojovich V. *Frozen Nature/'The Inner Circle'*//<u>Cinema Art</u>. -1993.- N1.
5. Dobrotvorsky S. *The Myth , The Lie and The Truth* //<u>Cinema Art</u>.-1993.-N 3.- P.35-37.
6. <u>Encyclopaedia Of Cinema</u>.- K&M. Moscow, 1998.
7. Jabsky M. and others. <u>The Test of Concurrence</u>. Moscow, 1997. - 121 P.
8. Matizen V. *Cutting Trotsky/(Trotsky)/* <u>Cinema Art</u>. - 1994. - N 5. - P. 144.
9. Predal R. <u>Histoire Du Cinema</u>. Paris. Ed. Corlet, 1994. - 200 P.
10. Zak M. and others. <u>Russian Cinema: The Paradoxes of Renovation</u>. Moscow, 1995. - 142 P.

VI. Teaching Methodology

A synthesis of lectures and seminars with frequent discussions about Russian films on the theme.

VII. Additional remarks about the course

The course Mass and Individual Terrorism in the Mirror of the Russian Cinema: The Feature Films of the Sound Period *may be used to study cinema history.*

.

8.3.Organizations' Internet Sites

Accuracy in Media
http://www.aim.org
American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP)
http://www.aacap.org
American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)
http://www.aclu.org
American Family Association (AFA)
http://www.afa.net
American Psychological Association
http://www.apa.org
American Psychological Association – Violence on Television
http://www.apa.org/pubinfo/violence.html
Coalition for Quality Children's Media
http://www.cqcm.org
Educators for Social Responsibility
http://www.esrnational.org
Future Wave
http://www.futurewave.org
Mothers Against Violence in America (MAVIA)
http://www.mavia.org
National Alliance for Nonviolent Programming
NA4NVP@aol.com
National Association for the Education of Young Children
http://www.naeyc.org
National Coalition on Television Violence (NCTV)
http://www.nctvv.org
National Institute on Media and the Family
http://www.mediafamily.org
Parenting for Peace and Justice Network
http://www.ipj-ppj.org/ppjn-new.html
Parents Television Council (PTC)
http://www.ParentsTV.org
The UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen
http://www.nordicom.gu.se/unesco.html
TV-Turnoff Network
http://www.tvurnoff.org

8.4. Bibliography

- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (2002). Media Violence Harms Children. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Is Media Violence a Problem?* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.10-11.
- Basta, S.S. (2000). Culture, Conflict, and Children: *Transmission of Violence to Children.* Lauham – N.Y. – Oxford: University Press of America. 256 pp.
- Bensley, L., Van Eenwyk, J. (2000). *Video Games and Real-Life Aggression: A Review of the Literature.* Olimpia, WA, 47 pp.
- Bok, S. (1994). TV Violence, Children, and the Press. Discussion Paper D-16. Harvard University, pp.201-224.
- Bok, S. (2002). Violent Entertainment and Censorship. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in Film & Television.* San Diego, Ca: Greenhaven Press, Inc., pp.163-170.
- Cannon, C. (1995). Media Violence Increases Violence in Society. In: Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 17-24.

- Cantor, J. (1998). Children's Attraction to Violent Television Programming. In: Goldstein, J. (Ed.). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, pp. 88-115.
- Cantor, J. (1998). Mommy, I'm Scared. San Diego – New York – London: A Harvest Original Harcourt Brace & Company, 249 pp.
- Cantor, J. (2000). Mommy, I'm Scared: Protecting children from Frightening Mass Media. In: *Media Violence Alert.* Zionsvill, IN: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., pp. 69-85.
- Cantor, J. (2002). The Unappreciated V-Chip. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in Film & Television.* San Diego, Ca: Greenhaven Press, Inc., pp.171-178.
- Cantor, J. and others (2000). *Media Violence Alert.* Zionsville: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., 120 pp.
- Cantor, J., Harrison, K., Kremer, M. (1998). Ratings and Advisories: Implication for the New Rating System for Television. In: Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.179-211.
- Carlsson, U. and Feilitzen, C. von (Eds.) (1998). *Children and Media Violence.* Geteborg: UNESCO International Clearing House on Children and Violence on the Screen, Goteborg, 387 p.
- Cefrey, H. (2001). *Coping with Media Violence.* N.Y.: The Rosen Publ. Group, 107 pp.
- Cerulo, K.A. (1998). *Deciphering Violence.* N.Y. – London: Routledge, 189 pp.
- Chapman, G. (2001). The Effects of Violent Video Games on Children Are Exaggerated. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 79-81.
- Considine, D. (2002). Teen Rebellion Films and Juvenile Delinquency. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in Film & Television.* San Diego, Ca: Greenhaven Press, Inc., pp.33-42.
- Cooper, C.A. (1996). *Violence on Television.* Lanham-N.Y.-London: University Press of America, 201 pp.
- David, P. (1999). Children's Rights and Media: Conciliating Protection and Participation. In: Feilitzen, C. von and Carlsson, U. (Eds.) (1999). *Children and Media: Image, Education, Participation.* Goteborg: UNESCO International Clearing House on Children and Violence on the Screen, p.31.
- Dodrill, R. (1993). *Violence, Values & the Media.* Sacramento, CA: Foundation for Change, 156 pp.
- Dudley, W. (Ed.) (1999). *Media Violence: Opposing Viewpoints.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, 186 pp.
- Edgar, K.J. (2000). *Everything You Need to Know About Media Violence.* N.Y.: The Rosen Publ. Group, 64 pp.
- *Entertainment Ratings. Hearing (...) Congress. July 25, 2001.* (2002). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp.11-145.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Russian Teenagers and Violence on the Screen: Social Influence of Screen Violence for the Russian Young People. *International Research Forum on Children and Media*, N 9, p.5.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Violence in Russian Films and Programmes. *International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen* (UNESCO), N 2, p.5.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Violence on the TV and Russian Youth. *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities,* N 1, pp.131-145.
- Feilitzen, C. von and Carlsson, U. (Eds.) (1999). *Children and Media: Image, Education, Participation.* Goteborg: UNESCO International Clearing House on Children and Violence on the Screen, 483 pp.
- Freedman, J. (1999). Studies Have Not Established a Link Between Media Violence and Violence. In: *Media Violence: Opposing Viewpoints.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 49-53.

- Freedman, J.L. (2002). *Media Violence and Its Effect on Aggression: Assessing the Scientific Evidence.* Toronto-Buffalo-London: University of Toronto Press, 227 p.
- Gedatus, G.M. (2000). *Violence in the Media.* Mankato, Minnesota: Life Matters, 64 pp.
- Gellman, R.M. & Hartman, T. (2002). *Bad Stuff in the News.* New York: SeaStarr Books, 116 p.
- Gerbner, G. (1988). *Violence and Terror in the Mass Media.* Paris: UNESCO, 46 pp.
- Gerbner, G. (2001). Communities Should Have More Control over the Content of Mass Media. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.129-137.
- Goldstein, J. (1998). Immortal Kombat: War Toys and Violent Video Games. In: Goldstein, J. (Ed.). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, pp. 53-68.
- Goldstein, J. (1998). Introduction. In: Goldstein, J. (Ed.). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, pp. 1-6.
- Goldstein, J. (1998). Why We Watch. In: Goldstein, J. (Ed.). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, pp. 212-226.
- Goldstein, J. (Ed.) (1998). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, 270 pp.
- Gunter, B., Harrison, J., Wykes, M. (2003). *Violence on Television.* Mahwan, NJ – London: Lawrence Erlbaum Ass., 307 p.
- Hamilton, J.T. (1998) Media Violence and Public Policy. In: Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.1-12.
- Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.) (1998). *Television Violence and Public Policy.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 394 pp.
- Hamilton, J.T. Violence on Television Is a Serious Problem (2002). In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Is Media Violence a Problem?* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.18-21.
- Hattemer, B. & Showers, H.R. (1993). *Don't Touch That Dial. The Impact of Media on Children and the Family.* Lafayette, Louisiana: Huntington House Publishers, 238 pp.
- Katzemann, C.S. (Ed.) (2002). *Securing Our Children's Future.* Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, 444 pp.
- Keegan, P. (2002). Video Games: The Lastest Format for Screen Violence. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in Film & Television.* San Diego, Ca: Greenhaven Press, Inc., pp.93-103.
- Kemalipour, Y.R., Rampal, K.R. (Eds.) (2001). *Media, Sex, violence, and Drugs in Global Village.* Lanham - N.Y. – Oxford, 293 pp.
- Kipping, P. (2001). Teaching Media Literacy Can Help Address the Problem of Media Violence. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp.126-128.
- Kraidy, M.M. (2001). Between Globalization and Localization: Television, Tradition, and Modernity. In: Kemalipour, Y.R., Rampal, K.R. (Eds.) (2001). *Media, Sex, violence, and Drugs in Global Village.* Lanham - N.Y. – Oxford, pp.261-272.
- Kunkel, D., Wilson, D.J. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: Implication for Public Policy. In Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.149-162.
- Lamson, S.R. (1995). Media Violence Has Increased the Murder Rate. In Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 25-27.
- Landler, M.(1998). TV Turns to an Era of Self-Control. In: McGuckin, F. (Ed.). *Violence in American Society.* N.Y.: The H.W.Wilson Company, pp.100-105.
- Leonard, J. The Negative Impact of Media Violence on Society is Exaggerated. In Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 31-37.

- Levin, D.E. (1998). *Remote Control Childhood?* Washington D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 184 pp.
- Levine, M. (1996). *Viewing Violence.* N.Y.: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, 256 pp.
- Levine, M. (1998). *See No Evil. A Guide to Protecting Our Children from Media Violence.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 290 pp.
- Males, M. (2001) Teenagers Are Not Becoming more Violent. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 82-84.
- McCauley, C. (1998). When Screen Violence Is Not Attractive. In Goldstein, J. (Ed.). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment.* N.Y., Oxford University Press, pp. 144-162.
- McGuckin, F. (Ed.) (1998). *Violence in American Society.* N.Y.: The H.W.Wilson Company, 183 pp.
- *Media Violence. Hearing (...) Congress. October 25, 1984.* (1985). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 121 p.
- Miller, F. (1994). *Censored Hollywood: Sex, Sin & Violence on the Screen.* Atlanta: Turner Publishing, Inc., 312 p.
- Ovsyannikov, A.A. (2001) Declaration of Humanitarian Value in Contemporary Russian Society. In: *Teaching Social-Humanitarian Disciplines in Russian higher Education: Conditions, Problems, and Perspectives.* Moscow: Logos, pp.16-23.
- Pally, M. (1991). *Sense and Censorship: The Vanity of Bonfires.* N.Y.: Americans for Constitutional Freedom. Vol.1, 37 pp. Vol. 2, 67 pp.
- Pally, M. (1994). *Sex & Sensibility.* Hopewell, NJ: The Ecco Press, 198 p.
- Payne, J. (2000). Surveying the Effects of Media Violence. *Media Violence Alert.* Zionsvill: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., pp.89-94.
- Postrel, v. (2001). The Government Should Not Regulate the Marketing of Violent Media. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 105-107.
- Potter, J. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: New Methodological Development. In Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.55-103.
- Potter, W.J. (1999). *On Media Violence.* Thousand Oaks, CA – London: Sage Publication, Inc., 304 pp.
- Potter, W.J. (2003). *The 11 Myths of Media Violence.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc., 259 pp.
- Prince, S. (2002). A Brief History of Film Violence. In: Torr, J.D. (Ed.). *Violence in Film & Television.* San Diego, Ca: Greenhaven Press, Inc., pp.21-32.
- Provenzo, E.F. (1991). *Video Kids.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. *Renewing the Mind of the Media* (1998). Washington D.C.: United State Catholic Conference, 36 pp.
- Roach, T.J. (2001). The Paradox of Media Effects. In: Kemalipour, Y.R., Rampal, K.R. (Eds.) (2001). *Media, Sex, violence, and Drugs in Global Village.* Lanham - N.Y. – Oxford, pp.5-15.
- Semati, M.M. (2001). Sex, Violence, and Terrorism in Hollywood's International Political Imagery. In: Kemalipour, Y.R., Rampal, K.R. (Eds.) (2001). *Media, Sex, violence, and Drugs in Global Village.* Lanham - N.Y. – Oxford, pp.235-260.
- Siano, B. (1995). Evidence Connecting Media Violence to Real Violence is Weak. In Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 38-48.

- Slaby, R.G. (2002). Media Violence: Effects and Potential Remedies. Katzemann, C.S. (Ed.). *Securing Our Children's Future*. Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, pp. 305-337.
- Snow, N. (2001). Social Implication of Media Globalization. In: Kemalipour, Y.R., Rampal, K.R. (Eds.) (2001). *Media, Sex, violence, and Drugs in Global Village*. Lanham - N.Y. – Oxford, pp.7-28.
- Sounders, K.W. (1996). *Violence as Obscenity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 246 p.
- Steyer, J.P. (2002). *The Other Parent: The Inside Story of Media's Effect on Our Children*. N.Y.: Atria Books, 278 pp.
- Stoughton, C. (2000). *Media Violence Alert*. Zionsvill, IN: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., 120 pp.
- Tarasov, K. (1997). Film Violence: Attraction and Repulsion. In: *Test of Competition*. Institute of Cinema Art, Moscow. 1997, 74-97 pp.
- Tarasov, K. (2000). Cinematograph of Violence and its Influence: *Cinema in Modern Society*. Institute of Cinema Art, Moscow, 256-356 pp.
- Tarasov, K. (2000). Film Violence: Attraction and Repulsion. In: *News from The UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen*. N 2, p. 5).
- Tarasov, K. (2002) Aggressive Cinema-TV- Diet and Students. *Higher Education in Russia*. N 3, pp.66-76.
- *Television Violence. Hearing (...) Congress. July 12, 1995*. (1995). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 489 p.
- *Television Violence. Hearing (...) Congress. May 18, 1999*. (2001). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 124 p.
- *The UN Convention on Children's Rights, Article 17*.
- Thoman, E. (1995). Media Literacy Education Can Effectively Combat Media Violence. In Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media*. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 127-129.
- Torr, J.D. (Ed.) (2001). *Violence in the Media*. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, 155 pp.
- Torr, J.D. (Ed.) (2002). *Is Media Violence a Problem?* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, 95 pp.
- Torr, J.D. (Ed.) (2002). *Violence in Film & Television*. San Diego, Ca: Greenhaven Press, Inc., 188 pp.
- Udina, E. (2002). Violence in the Documentary Reality. *Higher Education in Russia*. N 3, pp.76-82.
- UNESCO (1994). *Programme International pour le Développement de la Communication: non-violence, tolerance et television*. Paris: UNESCO, 89 pp.
- *Violence in the Media*: Antitrust Implications of Self-regulation and Constitutionality of Government Action (ДАЛЕЕ С ОБЛОЖКИ) (2001). Washington D.C., 102 pp.
- Wekesser, C. (Ed.) (1995). *Violence in the Media*. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, 192 pp.
- Wilson, B.J. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: The Importance of Context. In Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.13-53.
- Wilson, B.J., Kunkel, D. and others (1997). *National Television Violence Study*. Thousand Oaks – London: Sage Publications, 1997, 568 p.

- Wilson, B.J., Smith, S.L. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: The 1994-95 Results. In Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp.105-147.
- *Youth Culture and Violence. Hearing (...) Congress. May 13, 1999.* (2000). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 150 p.
- Zhabsky, M., Korobitsyn, V. (2002). Freedom & Responsibility in TV. *Higher Education in Russia.* N 3, pp.61-66.

8.5.About the Author

Prof.Dr.Alexander Fedorov is President of Russian Association for Film & Media Education since 2003, head of department and professor of media education/literacy and film history at Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute (Russia) since 1987. He also has taught at the Russian New University. He is the member of Russian Academy of Cinematographic Arts & Sciences (since 2002), Russian Union of Filmmakers (since 1984), CIFEJ (International Center of Films for Children and Young People, Canada), IRFCAM (International Research Forum On Children and Media, Australia). He is also the member of the UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children, Youth and Media and FIPRESCI.

He holds a MA degree from Russian Institute of Cinematography (VGIK, 1983), Ph.D.(1986) and Ed.D.(1993) degrees with an emphasis in media education from Russian Academy of Education (Moscow).

Postdoctoral affiliation: Central European University, Budapest, Hungary: Visiting Senior Research Scholar (grant from *Soros Fondation*), Oct.1998. Kassel University, Germany: Visiting Senior Research Scholar (grant from *DAAD*), Jul.-Sept.2000. Maison des Sciences de l'Homme (*MSH*, Paris, France): Visiting Senior Research Scholar, Sep.-Oct.2002. Kennan Institute (The Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, D.C., U.S.): Research Scholar, Mar.-Sept.2003. He received the scientific grants/fellowships from: *Program of Russian Ministry of Education for Leading Scientific Schools (2003-2005), MacArthur Foundation (USA):* travel to UNESCO International Media & Media Education Conference (Paris, France, Apr.1997) and individual research project (2003-2004), *Russian Foundation for Humanities* (1999-2000, 2001-2003); The *President of Russian Federation Cultural Foundation* (2002); *The Program "Russian Universities"* in humanities area (2002); *Soros Foundation (USA):* 1) *Research Support Scheme* (RSS, 2000-2002); 2) *Program "Civil Society",* 1998-1999); 3) HESP (*HESP-CDC - Course Development Competition,* 1998); Education Program for the best text of university lectures (1997); *Switzerland Scientific Foundation* (Nov. 2000); *Russian Ministry of Education:* research in humanities area (1997-2000), etc.

He was the speaker in the many international media and media education/literacy conferences: Association for Media and Technology in Education, Concordia University (Montreal, Canada, May, 2003), World Congress 'Toys, Games and Media', University of London, Institute of Education (London, UK, Aug. 2002), The Council of Europe's Hearing on Internet Literacy (Strasbourg, France, March 2002),), 3rd World Summit on Media for Children (Thessaloniki, Greece, March 2001), International Council for Educational Media ICEM-CIME - Conference 'Pedagogy and Media' (Geneva, Switzerland, Nov. 2000). *World Summit 2000: Children, Youth and the Media - Beyond the Millennium* (Toronto, Canada, May 2000), AGORA European Children's' Television Center (Thessaloniki, Greece, June, 1999), *Educating for the Media and the Digital Age* (Vienna, Austria, UNESCO, Apr. 1999), *World Media Education/Literacy Summit* (Sao-Paulo, Brazil, May 1998), *Media & Science* (Montreal, Canada, Oct. 1997), *Youth and the Media, Tomorrow* (Paris, France. UNESCO, Apr. 1997), etc.

He is the author of 250 articles and …books about media, film, media education/literacy.

List of Selected Publications of Alexander Fedorov

Books:
1. Fedorov, A. (2003). <u>Media Education in the Western Countries</u>. Taganrog: Kuchma, 238 p.
2. Fedorov, A. (2003). <u>Media Education in Pedagogical Universities.</u> Taganrog: Kuchma, 124 p.

3. Fedorov, A. & Chelysheva I. (2002). Media Education in Russia: Short History of Development. Taganrog: Poznanie, 265 p.
4. Fedorov, A. (2001). Media Education: History, Theory and Methods. Rostov: CVVR, 708 p.
5. Fedorov, A. (1994). The Training System of Students of the Pedagogical Institutes and Universities for the Aesthetic Education of Pupils on the Basis of the Screen Arts (Cinema, TV, Video). Taganrog: Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, 383 p.

Brochures:

1. Fedorov, A. (2003). Ecological Theme in the Russian Feature Film Art of Sound Period: Problems and Tendencies. Taganrog: Kuchma, 48 p.
2. Fedorov, A. (1999). Film Art in the Structure of Modern Russian Education. Taganrog: Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, 68 p.
3. Fedorov, A. (1990). Video Discussion: Cinema – Video – Youth. Rostov: Rostov State Books' Publishing House, 80 p.
4. Fedorov, A. (1989). It Does Hard to Be Young: Cinema & School. Moscow: Cinema Center, 64 p.
5. Fedorov, A. (1989). Education of Students by the Means of Arts. Rostov: Rostov State Pedagogical Institute, 72 p.
6. Fedorov, A. (1987). "For" & "Against": Movies & School. Moscow: VBPK, 64 p.

Selected Articles:

1. Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Russia. Alma Mater. 7, 29-32.
2. Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Belgium. Pedagogica, 1, 97-99.
3. Fedorov, A. (2002). Film Art and Art Education. Pedagogica, 2, 21-26.
4. Fedorov, A. & Novikova, A. (2002). Basic Theoretical Conceptions of Media Education. Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities, 1, 149-158.
5. Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Canada. Higher Education in Russia, 1, 116-118.
6. Fedorov, A. (2002). Russian Cinema: Very Short History. Total DVD, 5, 38-45.
7. Fedorov, A. (2001). A Russian Perspective. Educommunication (Belgium), 55, 92-95.
8. Fedorov, A. (2001). Media and Media Education. Alma Mater, 11, 15-23.
9. Fedorov, A. (2001). Von der Filmpadagocic zur Mediaenpadagogik. MERZ: Mediaen + Merziehung (Germany), 4, 256-261.
10. Fedorov, A. (2001). Media Education in France. Alma Mater, 3, 46-47.
11. Fedorov, A. (2001). Problems of Audiovisual Perception. Art & Education, 2, 57-64.
12. Fedorov, A. (2001). Russiask Medieundervising I Informajons-Alderen. Media I Skole og Samfunn (Norway), 1, 36-37.
13. Fedorov, A. (2001). Violence on the TV and Russian Youth. . Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities, 1, 131-145.
14. Fedorov, A. (2000). The Digital Media Challenge & Russian Media Education. Pedagogy and Media: The Digital Shift. Geneva: ICEM-CIME, 21.
15. Fedorov, A. (2000). En Sammenlignende Analyse Mellom Tyskland og Russland. Media I Skole og Samfunn (Norway), 4, 38-41.
16. Fedorov, A. (2000). Violence in Russian Films and Programmes. International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen (UNESCO), 2, 5.
17. Fedorov, A. (2000). Media Education in Russia: Past and Present. International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen (UNESCO), 2, 7.
18. Fedorov, A. (2000). Cinema-Art in the Structure of Russian Modern Arts Education. International Research Forum on Children and Media (Australia), 9, 5.
19. Fedorov, A. (2000). Russian Teenagers and Violence on the Screen: Social Influence of Screen Violence for the Russian Young People. International Research Forum on Children and Media (Australia), 9, 5.
20. Fedorov, A. (2000). The Terminology of Media Education. Art & Education, 2, 33-38.
21. Fedorov, A. (2000). Ungdom og Russisk Filmvold. Media I Skole og Samfunn (Norway), 1, 16-23.
22. Fedorov, A. (1999). Vold pa Skjermen: Social Paverkning pa Russisk Ungdom. Media I Skole og Samfunn (Norway), 5, 37-39.
23. Fedorov, A. (1999). Cinema Art in the Structure of Russian Modern Media Education. Educating for the Media and Digital Age. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, 100-105.

24. Fedorov, A. (1999). Media Education in Russia. Educating for the Media and Digital Age. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, 93-95.

25. Fedorov, A. (1999). The Cinema Market: What about Russia? Canadian Journal of Communication, 24, 141-142.

26. Fedorov, A. (1999). Russian Teenagers and Violence on the Screen. International Research Forum on Children and Media (Australia), 8, 10.

27. Fedorov, A. (1998). Screening Images. Media I Skolen (Norway), 5, 58-59.

28. Fedorov, A. (1998). The Problem of Aesthetic Education of Students' Youth on the Screen Arts' Material. Psychological & Pedagogical Problems of the Personality's Formation in the Education Systems. Moscow: International Academy of Education, 129-138.

29. Fedorov, A. (1998). Medieundervising for Russiske Studenter. Media I Skolen (Norway), 3, 40.

30. Fedorov, A. (1998). Media Education of Russian Students on the Material of the Media-Screen Arts. Revista de Ciencia e Tecnologia: International Congress on Communication and Education (Brazil, Sao Paulo), n 2, file 003.

31. Fedorov, A. (1998). Montreal Festival of Telescience. Audience (USA), 199, 21.

32. Fedorov, A. (1998). From Boarding School to Nuthouse. Audience (USA), 199, 19-21.

33. Fedorov, A. (1997). The Cinema and TV Preferences of Russian Students. Les jeune et les medias demain: Problematiques et perspectives. Paris: UNESCO-GRREM, 16.

34. Fedorov, A. (1997). The UN's New Media Movement. Audience (USA), 196, 40.

35. Fedorov, A. (1997). America, America. Cineaste, XXII, 4, 62.

36. Fedorov, A. (1996). Crime on the Russian Screen. Audience (USA), 186, 14-16.

37. Fedorov, A. (1995). Russiske Studenters Kino og TV Preferancer. Media I Skolen (Norway), 4, 54-56.

38. Fedorov, A. (1995). Film & TV – The Features of Mass Culture. Audience (USA), 184, 40-41.

39. Fedorov, A. (1995). Filmclubs Yesterday & Today. Audience (USA), 183, 15-17.

40. Fedorov, A. (1994). The Screen Arts and Young Spectators. The Means of Communication and the Problems of development Child's Personality. Moscow: UNPRESS, 55-57.

41. Fedorov, A. (1994). The Russian Screen since 1960. Audience (USA), 179, 20-22.

42. Fedorov, A. (1994). The Training of Students of the Pedagogical Institutes for Aesthetic Education of Students Youth. Specialist, 1, 15-19.

43. Fedorov, A. (1993). The Screen Arts and the Students Youth. The Problems of Film Education Now. Moscow: Association for Media Education, 100-104.

44. Fedorov, A. (1993). Les Dernieres-nees. Les Revues de Cinema dans le monde. Paris: Cinemaction-Corlet-Telerama, 136.

45. Fedorov, A. (1992). Red Alert. Film Threat (USA), 6, 13.

46. Fedorov, A. (1992). Les Gaietes mortelles de l'armee rouge. Panoramiques (France), 6, 116-117.

47. Fedorov, A. (1992). C'est pas du cinema. Panoramiques (France), 6, 118.

48. Fedorov, A. (1987). The Unseen Masterpieces: Still or Yet? Cinema Art, 3, 87-89.

Alexander Fedorov, e-mail: 1954alex@mail.ru