

<https://doi.org/10.58193/ilu.1818>

From *Homo Sovieticus* to Many Selves Unraveling Identities in (Post)-Soviet Cinema

Heleen Gerritsen and Irina Schulzki, eds., *Decolonising the (Post-)Soviet Screen* (Berlin: Apparatus Press, 2024).

Alena Kolesnikova
(FAMU, Czech Republic)

The anthology *Decolonizing the (Post)-Soviet Screen* (2024) serves as a unifying collection of works by authors sharing the same goal: to rediscover and reevaluate the Soviet and post-Soviet film legacy. Edited by Heleen Gerritsen and Irina Schulzki, the book focuses on the decentralization of the long-standing Soviet film hegemony — with its center in Moscow — and examines how decolonization theories are applied to works submitted by two dozen scholars, filmmakers, curators, and culturologists from the former “peripheries” of the Soviet Union and its successor empire.

It needs to be acknowledged that the ambitious task of decolonizing this cinematic heritage is anything but simple. It requires a nuanced analysis of over sixty years of film and animation history, varying by region. Nonetheless, the anthology presents a wide range of research, colored by personal, and sometimes brightly colonial, experiences, helping readers piece together the puzzle of decolonization processes. The feeling of connecting lost and found fragments into a coherent picture pervades the book's structure and discourse. Arguably, such a complex subject could only be presented effectively through the form of an anthology.

A notable companion volume in discourse, form, and size is *Postcolonial Approaches to Eastern European Cinema* (2014), which also analyzes regional films through a decolonial lens.¹⁾ These two sistering volumes are united not only by their anthological form, but also by their theoretical foundation — drawing mainly on Alexander Etkind's concept of “internal colonization,” Edward Said's work on Orientalism and the application of “otherness,” and Homi Bhabha's “hybridization.” This academic arsenal helps to redefine the analyzed regions and their connections to hegemonic powers, spanning widely from Eastern Europe to Central Asia, covering an enormous ideological archipelago once ruled by the Soviet Union.

1) Ewa Mazierska, Lars Kristensen, and Eva Närepea, *Postcolonial Approaches to Eastern European Cinema: Portraying Neighbours on Screen* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014). The book investigates the mutual perception of neighboring countries and their portrayal in cinema; it explains the issue of Eastern European evolution after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The concern with the redefinition of space — alongside its embedded culture — stands as a gravitational point in every chapter. The introduction to the volume, “Decolonizing Minds,” is presented by the academic duo Irina Schulzki and Natascha Drubek. Although Drubek is not one of the book’s editors, her role as a founder of the open-access journal *Apparatus* and the recently established publishing house Apparatus Press — both dedicated to rethinking the media cultures of Eastern, Central, and South-Eastern Europe — provides a strong reasoning for her involvement. Their research aligns with the book contributors’ motivation, where they altogether “underscore the pressing necessity of reevaluating the cinematic legacy of the Soviet and post-Soviet eras within global decolonisation processes” (12). The essay raises questions about terminology and regional identity, corresponding to the polemics of how we ourselves define Eurasia. Does it depend on the viewer’s perspective or on geopolitics? How many regions that share similar experiences of the weight of authoritarian control yet distinct, historical traumas, can be encompassed under a single narrative? What countries qualify as “post-Soviet,” and how shall we look at them? Is there such a thing as a post-Soviet identity, and can it ever be unified? The volume does not seek to provide easy answers. As the authors note, “the use of ‘post-’ within this volume’s title bears witness to the imminent travails of shedding imperial legacy, even in geopolitical (self-) nomination” (10). This ambiguity invites readers to an individual journey of creating your own name for the region(s), as well as breaking from imposed imperial homogeneity. As the authors emphasize, “one should, by all means, start by decolonising one’s own mind” (10).

As the authors underscore (10), the urgent need to reexamine the Soviet legacy is central to understanding both the past and the present — cinematically and culturally. In these terms, they consider the absence of institutional recognition regarding the complexity and diversity of post-Soviet identities the main struggle for fighting an omnipresent Soviet narrative. In this situation I would like to note that many Western universities have only recently begun reevaluating Slavic studies,²⁾ which illustrates how firmly Moscow’s cultural hegemony continues to shape our perception of the East. Russia’s long-standing position as the established gatekeeper to the Slavic world and its culture has allowed imperial perspectives on geopolitical and cultural “peripheral” regions to be bypassed.³⁾ This situation highlights, on the one hand, the unfortunate academic simplification of a complex cultural constellation within Western institutions,⁴⁾ and on the other, Russia’s successful usurpation of Slavic studies. These dynamics are, unfortunately, not addressed in the volume. This omission is understandable, as including them would have shifted the book’s focus away from its central focus on cinema. Aligning with and supporting the need to reevaluate the contemporary Slavic cultural space, the authors of the book em-

2) See Ewa Thompson, “The Field Isn’t ‘Slavic Studies’ at All — It Should Be Called ‘Russian Propaganda Studies’ — A Few Exceptions Only Confirm the Rule,” *Ukrainian Studies*, December 21, 2023, accessed September 1, 2025, <https://ukrainian-studies.ca/2023/12/21/interview-with-ewa-thompson-the-field-isnt-slavic-studies-at-all-it-should-be-called-russian-propaganda-studies-a-few-exceptions-only>.

3) Academics such as Susan Smith-Peter and the CORUSCANT collective acknowledge the Russo-centric orientation of Slavic studies, Russian studies, and Russian history, and argue for a process of repositioning and decolonial readjustment within these fields. Susan Smith-Peter and Sheldon Pollock, “How the Field Was Colonized: Russian History’s Ukrainian Blind Spot,” *Russian History* 50, no. 3–4 (2024), 145–156. CORUSCANT, “Our Manifesto,” *CORUSCANT (the European branch of the Russia Program)*, accessed September 1, 2025, http://coruscant.therussiaprogram.org/manifesto_en.

4) We also need to take into consideration that Slavic studies, with their emphasis on Russia, partly emerged from post-WWII US politics in response to the perceived threat from the Soviet Union. As Tomasz Kamusella argues, this dynamic set off a chain reaction that resulted in Russian dominance within the field. Tomasz Kamusella, “War and Russian Studies in the West,” *Wachtyrz*, 2022, <https://wachtyrz.eu/war-and-russian-studies-in-the-west1/>.

phasize the urgency of shifting perspectives. Also, they call for redirecting “researchers’ and film festival programmers’ focuses, a rigorous revision of (film) history, and [adopt] a new, more inclusive, and respectful language in film studies and the humanities in general” (12).

The introduction to the book and the chapter written by Serhii Ksaverov (“Losing Identities: Horror Narratives in Two Late Soviet Ukrainian Films”) suggest one of the reasons why we face a reality where Soviet cultural diversion is absent in our imagination. Ksaverov highlights the concept of *homo sovieticus*⁵⁾ as one of the central inventions of Soviet ideology. This creation, as a product of intense propaganda, presented a new identity, a “type dreamed of by early communists and actively mythologised in Soviet cinema” (292). This collective identity turned into a Soviet archetype that ostensibly unified people as different as the Chukchee, Belarusians, Chechens, and other nations. This instrument served the USSR well, particularly through Socialist Realism and its emphasis on *camaraderie*, leading to the erasure of national histories under the promise of a utopian future and ultimately producing a homogenized Soviet identity (134).

In the context of East-West institutional negotiations, I would like to comment on western participation in creating the image of a homogeneous Soviet identity. We can recall an archetypal image in American films produced in different genres and timeframes, as for example *Ninotchka* (Ernst Lubitsch, 1939), *The Iron Curtain* (William A. Wellman, 1948), *Walk East on Beacon* (Alfred L. Werker, 1952).⁶⁾ Here we must recognize that the cinematic propaganda machines of the two Cold War rivals were launched on both ideological fronts, pursuing the same mission of constructing the contradicting identities of *us* and *the others*. In my opinion, this heavily contributes to the reasons why the image of a homogeneous Soviet identity became successfully established in both East and West. From this perspective, the anthology aims to demystify this monolithic cultural narrative by highlighting unique national experiences and breaking the established portrayal. As noted, “this volume critically assesses how filmmakers, through both the Soviet era and its dissolution, grappled with and portrayed complex identities amidst shifting imperial and national landscapes” (11). This multiplicity of past and contemporary identities is articulated through the voices of many nationalities, offering a short introduction to the subject and film history of each country.

Methodologically, the essays vary depending on their focus but tend to include textual and comparative analysis, qualitative research, and narrative critique. The writing style remains flexible and largely determined by the authors’ preferences, which leaves a lot of room for freedom and creative expression. I find this to be a positive sign — it invites readers from outside academic spaces to engage with the material and mirrors the book’s broader goals of inclusion and decolonial practice (12).

The structure of the book consists of four sections, along with a prologue, introduction, and epilogue. Each section explores a distinct topic, connecting various authors through shared research. The volume opens with a prologue by Heleen Gerritsen on the late-Soviet Ukrainian film *Decay* (Belikov, 1990), examining the parallel between atomic decomposition and “cultural and geopolitical disintegration and the epistemological shifts it entails” (13). The nuclear tragedy of 1986 — and the radioac-

5) *Homo sovieticus* is a term describing a communist ideology centered around the creation of a “New Soviet Man.” This creature is characterized by a set of shared values, comradeship and obedience. During the 1980s, this term was re-appropriated and turned into a satirical anti-communist form of expression of identity.

6) The investigation on the image of communism was done by Yasmine Lyna Benali with the analysis of Hollywood films from around the mid-1900s. Yasmine Lyna Benali, “The Visual Rhetoric of the Early Cold War: The Representation of Anti-Communist Propaganda in Hollywood Movies (mid-1900s)” (Master’s thesis, Université Jean Monnet Saint-Étienne, 2023–2024).

tive particles that spread across European streets — once again finds its metaphorical mirroring in the omnipresence of an imperial narrative. The article envisions the disintegration of Block №4 as a symbolic transformational point, examining how the collapse of the Soviet Union impacted cinematic production across the post-Soviet landscape. It introduces readers to the persistence of both internal and external Russian colonialism, where film production is actively used as a soft power instrument of propaganda in the “internal regions” (27). Gerritsen investigates the ideology underlying this cinematic monolith and traces the development of contemporary Russian films that deviate from the established colonial framework. These films open debates on forced assimilation, the loss of traditions, and other traumatic experiences, as described by autochthonous filmmakers from regions such as the Caucasus, Sakha, Tatarstan, and others. Gerritsen therefore calls for recognition and support of this ongoing disintegration, advocating the use of a “Fourth Cinema” perspective and the creation of platforms for films that, while classified by production origin as “Russian,” are in essence “anything-but-Russian.” Such works enrich cinematography with authentic specificity, a quality that is explored in greater detail in the second section of the volume.

In practice, as the author emphasizes, amplifying the voices of these decolonizing filmmakers prompts a “[reassessment] of the film history of the republics and ‘regions,’ beyond the dominating Russian-Soviet film legacy” (29). Gerritsen’s argument aligns with broader evaluations of colonial practices in the film industry and Western visual culture. A foundational work in this area is by Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, who analyze the principle of focalization in cinematography and media, as well as mechanisms that enforce a dominant perspective — resulting in misrepresentation, stereotyping, and the marginalization of “the others” within their own lands and cultures.⁷⁾ Similar practices are taken up by some contributors in the following essays of the edition under discussion, with particular attention to the eastern cultural and cinematic sphere.

— — —

The first chapter, “On (Post)-Soviet Orientalisms and Internal Colonies,” investigates the identity and cultural nuances of countries such as Tajikistan, Georgia, and Kazakhstan. The collection of essays, contributed by Anisa Sabiri, Dušan Radunović, Nino Dzandzava, and Assiya Issemberdiyeva, aims to deconstruct these regions’ portrayals, which are often embedded in romanticized Russian imagery (51). The choice of authors reflects the broader aim of introducing authentic marginalized voices, as discussed in the previous chapter. The theoretical framework for this inquiry draws on Edward Said’s analysis of West–East negotiations,⁸⁾ alongside works by David Chioni Moore, Alexander Etkind, and other scholars advancing postcolonial debate. This foundation provides readers with an opportunity to engage with a nuanced vision of colonial history and the lasting influence on these regions. The section guides the reader through depictions of the Caucasus mountains and Kazakh steppes as romantic wildernesses — landscapes where women and lands are portrayed as heavenly beautiful, and nights as

7) Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media* (London: Routledge, 1996).

8) Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978). The author argues the cultural representation of the “Orient” and its distortions in culture, romanticization, emphasizing the aspect of ‘enlightenment’ leading to multiple imperial incursions into Asian and North African territory. The politics of the Russian and Soviet Empire were methodologically similar.

dark as the local scoundrels' intentions toward outsiders.⁹⁾ Deconstructing this imagery is essential for the research presented here.

Radunović's essay builds on this theme by examining the implementation of cultural colonial practices and the responses of Georgian artists. His study is particularly noteworthy for its depth: he grounds the discussion in literature before moving into Georgian Soviet cinematography, analyzing the historical colonial context and cinematic semantics in tandem. The related issues of imperial and colonial representation — including self-exoticization and self-stereotyping — form the core of Dzandzava's essay. Her colonial reading of Soviet films by Georgian directors provides a striking example of how native culture was misrepresented, in ways that continue to "inspire colonial aspirations, strengthen clichés, and feed prejudices about Caucasians among people born even in the post-Soviet era" (85).

The whole section investigates the complexities of national and colonial identities and how these were manipulated in Soviet cinema. It emphasizes re-engaging the "colonial subject" with their land and history through film narratives as a form of emancipation, while also studying how cinematic structures presented the sovereign identities and traditions of local peoples. The ongoing decolonial debate, as this chapter demonstrates, is highly complex, and this case study offers valuable insights into the experiences of the Caucasus and Central Asia — highlighting parallels with certain Western colonial practices.

Nevertheless, as noted in the book's introduction, readers are encouraged to treat the Western decolonial perspective not as a replacement of prior discourses, but rather as an "optics" or "alternative path" for exploring these dynamics. From this standpoint, the contributors introduce new dialectics into decolonial discourse by exposing both past and ongoing tensions between the hegemonial center and the regions. While the section touches upon the term "settler colonialism," a form of colonialism in which outsiders displace or assimilate Indigenous populations,¹⁰⁾ it does not fully apply this framework to these areas. This omission seems a missed opportunity to provide an additional lens for understanding these regions as internal colonies — first Russian, and later Soviet. The next chapter takes up this notion more directly, applying it to the Caucasus and several inner Russian republics while accounting for historical and cultural differences.

The second section, "Echoes of Empire: White Feminism and Colonised Landscapes," analyzes films and literature produced by Indigenous authors from oppressed regions within modern-day Russia, such as Kabardino-Balkaria and Sakha, with a cover of Soviet and contemporary films. Presenting works by academics such as Serian Carlyle, Caroline Damiens, Adelaide McGinity-Peebles, and Natalya Khokhlova, the section's aim is to emphasize how these republics preserve and reassert their distinctive cultural identities through cinema. The whole section challenges the notion of "inner Russian"

9) Personal artistic interpretations based on Susan Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin and Tolstoy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). The book presents a wide study on the imperial depiction of the Caucasus region with a textual analysis of Russian classic literature. Some of the techniques are identical to the depiction of North Africa and Asia by the West, such as the feminization of the land, romanticization, exoticization and civilizing rationale as concealed instruments of colonization.

10) See Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012), 1–40. Tuck and Yang identify additional methods of settler colonialism that are relevant to this section — for example, transforming Indigenous land into settlers' new home and disrupting the established relationships between local communities and their land. The practice of colonial subjugation and enforced control emerged after local resistance to Soviet collectivization processes, as stated by Serian Carlyle in the following section (126).

cinema by presenting dissenting films as “decolonising entities, reclaiming Sakha cultural identity and history after centuries of Imperial Russian, Soviet, and indeed, post-Soviet Russian oppression” (175). The articles achieve such tasks by investigating the colonized-colonizer relationship (123) and the portrayal of decolonial attributes in female protagonists (175), who are enriched with specific national cultural markers. The section sets the stage for both academics and cinephiles to recognize Indigenous filmmaking and to help relocate the “center” of Russian film production to the “periphery” by highlighting local stories, shaping together a “multipolar, decolonized cinema history” (169). It offers rich textual analyses of films and their protagonists’ behavior, whose alienation, nonconformism, and occasional subordination to hegemonic ideology reflect imperial, Soviet, and contemporary Russian systems of oppression.

The third section, “Intersecting Ecologies and Ideologies: Ecocriticism and the Path to Decolonising Spaces,” centers on the Soviet regime’s exploitation of nature and the representation of ecological tragedies and emotional reflection in visual art. The projects and professional approaches of filmmakers and artists are showcased, for example, in an interview by Lukas Brasiskis and Masha Shpolberg (*Icy Water, Acid, and Free Forests — The New Ecocinema from East-Central Europe: Interview with Rugilė Barzdžiukaitė, Ian Soroka and Emilija Škarnulytė*). It serves as an insightful, practical methodology for engaging with these themes in the cinema industry. The analyses of films and image cultures by Ksenia Bespalova and Martyna Ratnik offer an alternative path for uncovering how generational trauma, politics, and environmental degradation are intertwined.

The chapter opens powerfully with an exploration of the cinematic depiction of the Aral Sea disaster, caused by a 1960 Soviet irrigation project. This examination of ecocide becomes a tool for “understanding the fractured relationships between local inhabitants and their environment” (15). The section highlights authentic artistic strategies for approaching and processing ecological disasters through film, in many cases independently of whether they are framed as Soviet or post-Soviet experiences. Through their interviews and analyses, filmmakers and theorists demonstrate inspiring solidarity and openness in constructing a united eco-centric vision and in developing new ways of addressing both past crises and future environmental challenges. The geographical scope of the section may appear complex for some readers, since the discourse does not focus solely on eco-cinema from neighboring Soviet regions but extends to works from West and Central Asia, the Baltics, and even several Western countries. At the same time, this broader approach serves as a powerful reminder of interconnectedness — one that transcends the boundaries of time, space, and nation.

The final section, “Resisting Genres, Decolonial Discourses and Platforms,” presents various forms of artistic expression within decolonial discourse. By analyzing genres such as horror and animation, it showcases a wide range of resistance practices employed by Soviet and post-Soviet filmmakers and artists. Readers encounter processes of reevaluating old narratives and readjusting them to modern decolonial perspectives and histories, as well as examples of methodological deviations in film production and animation that articulated alternative visions while still circumventing Soviet censorship.

The chapter opens with two essays on the horror genre. Alesha Serada examines Belarusian horror media, while Serhii Ksaverov analyzes Ukrainian horror films from the late Soviet period. United by genre and thematic concerns, the essays highlight tensions in the relationship between the individual and the state, with attention to the artistic instruments used to portray them. Serada emphasizes the reactivation and reevaluation of folklore narratives within a contemporary frame, while Ksaverov focuses on the distinctive identity of Ukrainian horror at the end of the Soviet era and its contextual comparison to both Western and Soviet film traditions.

The next subsection turns to animation, criticizing the narrative of ideological unity within Soviet film production. The exploration of Estonian animation influenced by Pop Art by Andreas Trossek's analysis of Estonian animation influenced by Pop Art and Olga Blackledge's study of Davyd Cherkas'skyi's Ukrainian animated trilogy reveal subtle departures from mainstream Soviet animation aesthetics, creating small but significant "glitches" in the system. Blackledge argues that Cherkas'skyi's animations, with their hybrid origins, open a new space through the remediation of popular colonial narratives such as stories of voyagers and discoverers. Her detailed examination of the trilogy's visual strategies, such as cut-outs, caricatures, character morphs, and other visual stylizations, underscores its distinctiveness from Soviet animation of the time. Moreover, she shows how the remediation of scenarios and characters subverts colonial romantic tropes, transforming them into dynamic postmodern comedies open to alternative interpretations. These essays demonstrate how stylistic "otherness" carved out space for artistic autonomy in the face of Soviet homogeneity and censorship.

The section concludes with an interview conducted by August Schaller and Masha Shpolberg, which offers a perspicacious discussion on the artistic and production struggles of contemporary Ukrainian filmmakers. The full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine has forced rapid change within the filmmaking community, creating acute difficulties for both national and arthouse cinema industries, making this contribution particularly timely.

While this section is intellectually rich, it can feel somewhat overloaded due to its engagement with multiple genres. Although the theme of artistic adaptiveness during Soviet rule and wartime provides a coherent through-line, dividing the section into smaller thematic units might have enhanced readability. Nevertheless, the chapter effectively demonstrates the many forms of creative disobedience and cultural survival under hegemonial pressure — from stylistic divergence against state filmmaking prescriptions, to hybridization of forms, and ultimately to the emergence of distinct film identities.

The volume's epilogue, delivered as a personal story, focuses on the making of the famous Georgian film *Repentance* (Tengiz Abuladze, 1987). The film is framed as an allegorical depiction of a totalitarian "imagined" reality, and the essay invites readers on a journey to reconstruct the film's adventurous and provocative production under Soviet rule. The epilogue can be seen as an allusion to the decolonial discourse of the book, manifesting the filmmaker's courage and commitment to reevaluate past events. Fifty years ago, Abuladze and his film crew could not refrain from addressing the traumas and crimes of the Soviet regime. With *Repentance*, they established an artistic precedent for depicting and criticizing Stalinism, thereby sparking public awareness and initiating a debate on Stalin's terror.¹¹⁾ With a charming intimacy, the story acts as an inspirational postscript and invites us to participate in a "mysterious act of creating harmony from chaos" (355).

— — —

One of the central challenges in dismantling Soviet propaganda narratives is the need to construct a new myth — or set of myths — with which a nation can identify. The loss of identity is simultaneously a process of creating one. This is a nuanced issue: the collapse of *homo sovieticus* calls for the birth and recognition of new subjectivities, not only from within post-Soviet countries but also in the per-

11) The movie depicts some parallels to the Josef Stalin's politics of terror, such as the Great Purge, deportations, censorship and the campaign against religion, along with characters' justification or denial of committed crimes. Some of the stories and names mentioned in the film are based on or identical to real people and events.

ception of the wider world. Yet questions remain: must this new, mystified subject become *homo patrioticus*, or should it incline towards Western internationalism, which risks reproducing neocolonial dynamics and circling back to self-colonization?¹²⁾ It seems that the volume and its contributors do not attempt to define these new identities within such fixed binaries. Instead, they reflect the complexity of negotiations between authentic national and Soviet inheritances, or, alternatively, between hybridized and post-Soviet identities. Research on films produced during the Soviet era demonstrates the successful deconstruction of both mythological frameworks and the applied Soviet standardization of cinematography, identity, and culture more broadly.

Importantly for *Iluminace's* readers, contemporary post-Soviet cinema continues to grapple with struggles similar to those found in East-Central European cinema, particularly around self-identification and self-colonization. Jana Dudková's analysis of Slovak cinema, for example, highlights the marginalization and detachment of characters from the "center."¹³⁾ From a broader perspective, such analyses open discourse on the nuanced relationship between the "margins of empires" and their processes of self-exploration and self-nomination. This narrative offers a unifying perspective between post-Soviet and Central European identities, rather than reinforcing their polarization within an East–West dichotomy.

Overall, the book offers a wide range of different and unique research, essays, and reflections contributing to the topic of decolonization. One of its biggest achievements, in my opinion, is the authors' and editors' effort to represent the broadest range of (post)-Soviet countries, upholding their national visual cultures as well as challenges that they faced during film production under the Soviet regime. That said, it should be noted that Chechen, Crimean, and Armenian past and contemporary films along with their reflections were missing from this anthology. Including the histories and experiences of these nations would enrich future volumes and further decentralize the post-Soviet cinematic narrative. This omission points to fertile ground for future research by scholars, editors, and artists — perhaps even giving rise to a sequel volume in the years to come.

Bibliography

Benali, Yasmine Lyna. "The Visual Rhetoric of the Early Cold War: The Representation of Anti-Communist Propaganda in Hollywood Movies (mid-1900s)" (Master's thesis, Université Jean Monnet Saint-Étienne, 2023–2024).

CORUSCANT. "Our Manifesto," *CORUSCANT (the European branch of the Russia Program)*, accessed September 1, 2025, http://coruscant.therussiaprogram.org/manifesto_en.

Dudková, Jana. "Between the Center and the Margin: The Notion of Central Europe in Slovak Cinema after 1989," *Iluminace* 25, no. 4 (2013), 79–94.

12) Alexander Kiossev draws on the Western implication of soft-power and cultural colonization, broadening the definition of colonialism and self-colonization. Talks on the cultural trauma of absence, where "peripheral nations" are voluntarily rejecting their own identity and traditions or constructing a national identity by importing western interpretations, seeking recognition and approval. Alexander Kiossev, "The Self Colonizing Metaphor," *Atlas of Transformation*, 2010, accessed September 1, 2025, <http://monumenttotransformation.org/atlas-of-transformation/html/s/self-colonization/the-self-colonizing-metaphor-alexander-kiossev.html>.

13) Jana Dudková, "Between the Center and the Margin: The Notion of Central Europe in Slovak Cinema after 1989," *Iluminace* 25, no. 4 (2013), 79–94. The author analyzes center–periphery relationships and their cinematic representation in the films of Martin Šulík, Miroslav Šindelka, and Štefan Semjan.

- Gerritsen, Heleen, and Irina Schulzki, eds. *Decolonizing the (Post)-Soviet Screen* (Berlin: Apparatus Press, 2024).
- Kamusella, Tomasz. "War and Russian Studies in the West," *Wachtyrz*, 2022, <https://wachtyrz.eu/war-and-russian-studies-in-the-west1/>.
- Kiossev, Alexander. "The Self-Colonizing Metaphor," *Atlas of Transformation*, 2010, accessed September 1, 2025, <http://monumenttotransformation.org/atlas-of-transformation/html/s/self-colonization/the-self-colonizing-metaphor-alexander-kiossev.html>.
- Layton, Susan. *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin and Tolstoy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Mazierska, Ewa, Lars Kristensen, and Eva Näripea. *Postcolonial Approaches to Eastern European Cinema: Portraying Neighbours on Screen* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014).
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).
- Shohat, Ella, and Robert Stam. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media* (London: Routledge, 1996).
- Smith-Peter, Susan, and Sheldon Pollock. "How the Field Was Colonized: Russian History's Ukrainian Blind Spot," *Russian History* 50, no. 3–4 (2024), 145–156.
- Thompson, Eva. "The Field Isn't 'Slavic Studies' at All — It Should Be Called 'Russian Propaganda Studies' — A Few Exceptions Only Confirm the Rule," *Ukrainian Studies*, December 21, 2023, accessed September 1, 2025, <https://ukrainian-studies.ca/2023/12/21/interview-with-ewa-thompson-the-field-isnt-slavic-studies-at-all-it-should-be-called-russian-propaganda-studies-a-few-exceptions-only>.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012), 1–40.

Biography

Alena Kolesnikova is a Ukrainian multimedia artist and filmmaker working and living in Prague, Czech Republic. Her works include multimedia installations, videos, photographic projects, and vr collaborations. She concentrates on themes of human connection, the inner and outer self, and societal constructs. Her works were shown in various Prague, as well in other Czech, German, and Colombian art galleries.

Email: kolesn01@st.amu.cz