

Study on the Integration of Documentary Art and Objectivity

Wen Tao

School of Music and Media, Shenyang University, Shenyang, Liaoning Province, China

Keywords: Documentary; Subjectivity; Objectivity; Fusion

Abstract: “Authenticity” has always been a common concern of the documentary industry and academia. As early as the early development of documentary, there was a debate about which is more important for the artistry and objectivity of documentary. In recent years, the level of China's cultural construction has been gradually improved, along with the development and changes of the market-oriented degree and artistic techniques of Chinese documentaries. The issue of “authenticity” has been paid more and more attention by the industry and academia. The author believes that the “authenticity” of a documentary is a true expression of the creator's subjectivity and a combination of art and objectivity. This paper attempts to make an in-depth analysis of the “authenticity” of the documentary and contribute wisdom to the development of the documentary.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the discussion of “subjectivity” and “objectivity” in documentary filming is very intense in the industry. As far as the content of documentaries is concerned, they can leave a highly thought-provoking record of their thoughts, environment and vision. Perhaps future historians will find that documentaries are no less important than the chronicles and ancient Diaries of historians in recording human beings [1]. As far as the filming process is concerned, the valuable part of the documentary process is that it affirms the importance of imagination and resonates while deepening the true meaning of life. This learning process makes people feel that they are still truly alive. The author believes that this is the fusion of the subjective and objective of the documentary, that is, the subjective truth.

2. Subjectivity of Documentary Film

Among the many forms of non-dramatic films, such as tourism films, industrial films, natural science films or teaching films, documentaries are the most important ones to change the social forces up to now, because they clearly and continuously present the “true picture of life”.

3. Documentary is the original appearance of real life

A documentary can be either a manipulated and anticipated paper or a lyric and Impressionist work. The possibilities for a documentary are almost unlimited, but the essence of a documentary is its deep respect for reality. It reflects the true charm and contrasts with the escapist entertainment. It is committed to the uncertainty and richness of the original real life.

What does real life really mean? In literal sense, truth is what we can see, measure and build on consensus. But for wealthy big TV companies or money-sending organizations, in order to avoid being accused, the content of the documentary must be legally valid. Therefore, the above organizations tend to produce teaching films or closely controlled news programs. Those who really include sociological critiques and implicit personal opinions rather than company opinions are not enthusiastic.

Because “truth” should not only include the physical world that is visible from outside, but also contain the inner meaning of what is photographed. The writer diverts the reader's attention between the level of things familiar to the public and the level he feels as a narrator. It has a long history; although the film has not yet developed the same degree of freedom, all kinds of famous works

always present the characters and events in the film from a clear and author-like style.

A good modern film will not only present what we see in a special way, but also give us everything we need when we use our high level of awareness. Because the modern documentary explores a story that has not yet been developed, it implies the wisdom to grasp the meaning of the event on the spot [2]. The documentary is the subject matter and the viewer. It is the event and the reaction to the event. It is also juxtaposed with the good and the evil. It is just like the real people in life compare two things in the heart and decide which one is more meaningful. The filmmaker also saw humor and pain, so he arranged the entire work to reproduce the true meaning of the film they received.

The feature of modern documentary is that the events it presents and the author's reaction are just like what happens on the spot, so the audience is like experiencing the situation and then adapting to the important moments in their lives.

Taking the film *Soldier Girls* (1981) as an example, this film not only shows how the U.S. military trains women soldiers, but also extensively presents training scenes including sexual abnormalities in many real and informal moments, especially some disturbing humiliating acts against women [3]. But until the end of the film, it skillfully avoided an important contradiction, that is, war is so barbarous and unfair, whether the trainees are men or women, many military traditions and thinking will not be realized if the trainees are kind enough to train. The experience of watching "Female Soldier" is actually the audience to use the visual to feel the things that make the author moved and troubled. This film never taught us how to feel or think about it. It allowed the audience to witness all the contradictions and irritating facts they saw, inciting the audience to understand the truth after a series of uneasiness.

But it needs to be emphasized that because most of the works are made by people, the feeling of the film is not just from the director, but from a group of people with the same ideas. On the contrary, watching movies is usually another group - the audience. Therefore, on various levels, the documentary is an art form with a very subjective expression.

4. The Objectivity of Documentary Films

4.1 Objectivity and "Balanced View"

People habitually believe that documentaries are necessarily objective. Because TV current affairs programs often present opposite views, so that both sides appear equally in the programs to express their own opinions, to ensure the fairness of the event in view, as well as the issue of events and characters without prejudice [4]. This non-interventionist approach in the 1930s made the well-respected British newspapers unreasonable when reporting news from Nazi Germany. As the situation moved, we already knew that any journalist at that time had a position on a particular issue. In fact, they also interpreted their position in reporting the incident, so it is impossible to do so-called justice or responsibility [5].

The emphasis on balanced reporting was originally strategically designed by journalists, who saw it as a safe path through dangerous and blaming minefields. As long as a writer keeps presenting his collective opinions, he can avoid being accused, and he can also escape the disaster of damaged reputation or litigation [6]. From this point of view, this practice assumes that all opinions are inclusive of self-deception, and it only limits the creation of things to a standard and almost no features.

Another equally important issue is "irresponsibility". In human life, which is full of various uncertainties, it is the issue of "fairness and inequity". For example, a journalist is reporting a story accusing a surgeon of improper treatment. To be cautious, he should not only report to both sides of the debate, but also tirelessly test whether there is a mistake from all aspects that can be proved. This tradition, excellent journalists and successful detectives will follow and be universal.

Disclosure of an event with insight and persistence is often referred to as "objective", and the so-called "balanced view" perception is often regarded as the principle of news reporting. Worse, this means that journalists have deceived their own subjective consciousness and deceived the

public, misunderstanding that this is objective.

4.2 The choice between objectivity and subjectivity

The superstition that cameras can objectively record everything began to disintegrate in the face of some practical considerations. For example, what is the “objective” camera location? Where does the camera have to be before it counts? When is it time to “objective” when a person decides to turn on the camera and then turn off the camera? When a film worker watches the material he photographed, how does he detect which part is the most representative of “objective reality”?

All splicing decisions are based on the need to delete long and ambiguous fragments, and to trim the original events so as to make them relatively more concise and meaningful essence. In other words, film production is a series of highly significant decisions, including what to shoot, how to shoot, and how to use it in the end.

If you want your work to be perceived as fair, balanced and objective by the audience, you will need to have a broad grasp of your subjects on the basis of reality and the trustworthy material. At the same time, you must have the courage and insight to make an interpretative judgment on how to use them.

Like many craftsmen, most film directors operate in a process of self-assertion, which is logically subjective and operates in a way that relies more on reflection than on conscious inference. The directors know what works and works. Of course, this technique is unattainable for novices and seems to deliberately remove them. Even so, even professional staff often make mistakes or distortions before and after starting the filming.

Many directors have been half-jokingly accused of making decisions in the unfathomable life of art. This may be another natural result of the division of art and technology in our society. If this is true, this cultural class system will particularly hurt the working members of the documentary because they are the ones who are responsible for the entire film vision.

5. Fusion Creation of Documentary Films

Documentary exists to explore the organization of human life rigorously and to promote individual values belonging to human beings. The best work in the documentary, as you can imagine, is a model of limited enthusiasm.

The film should not only show the sense of fact, it should feel the same. In other words, it may point out what is the universal truth, or offer sincere but subjective feelings. To take care of what the audience will think, that is, they have thought beforehand that every stage of the film will impact the audience, and they have also learned when the audience will need to be explained from the film in order to alleviate their anxiety. When things are more complicated, simplifying reality will be inevitable, and it is necessary to make a statement about complex human life. It is necessary to achieve a balance between the two.

Although a documentary must present real things, it is not a real challenge to acquire that natural instinct on the screen. For the creators of any film, the real challenge lies in the balance of ethics, morality and drama after the integration of art and objectivity has been determined. The reason why it is called creation is the key to facing the above challenges. The documentary must be presented under the guidance of the subjective consciousness of the creator and the objective facts that the subjective consciousness of the audience can communicate with each other.

References

- [1] Robert Flaherty. History in Images: World Documentary Quality Archives [M]. 2005.
- [2] Wenshoushan. Talking about the way of thinking [M]. 1997.
- [3] Zheng, Jane. Contextualizing public art production in China: The urban sculpture planning system in Shanghai[J]. Geoforum, 2017, 82:89-101.
- [4] Curtis S, Curtis S. Shape of Spectatorship: Art, Science, and Early Cinema in Germany[J].

German Studies Review, 2017, 40(2):583-584.

[5] Chio J. Managing the Masses in Mass Media[J]. Current Anthropology, 2015, 56(3):487-488.

[6] Millard K. Revisioning obedience: Exploring the role of Milgram's skills as a filmmaker in bringing his shocking narrative to life.[J]. Journal of Social Issues, 2014, 70(3):439-455.