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ABSTRACT

Russia has a culture of communal living that already existed far before the Soviet era. In the soviet regime, communal living was seen as an instrument to reach Soviet’s utopian objective. In order to minimize dissident movements and rebellions, people are pressed to live together so they can watch each other. As a result, no Russian word could describe privacy, the concept itself did not grow in Russian society. Although consciousness of privacy needs began to grow. In the meantime, people around the world start to fix privacy issues by formulating the law, while Soviet people still dealing with the concept itself. Many of Russian films shows the privacy issue in Soviet communal life, one of them is a film by Kantemir Balagov (2019) titled Дылда/Дула (Beanpole). The film is relatively new, therefore, not much previous research about it. By analyzing how the film Дылда shows privacy in Soviet communal life, it will reveal that now is seeing privacy as an issue. With the three dimensional view of CDA, the result obtained is that critiques arise for this ‘crisis of privacy’ as a consequence of lacking privacy by people outside Soviet.
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INTRODUCTION

The culture of communal life in Russian society already exists since their ancestors used to live collectively back then. Maslenikau (2015, p. 4) explains that in the past the Proto-Slavs who headed north found a land without masters in the form of steppes and forests. Due to the forces of nature, vast territories, and the need for one another to survive, required the Proto-Slavs to live collectively. Society was divided into two groups, the lower class paid tribute to those who
protected them by appointing a prince or Княз (Knyaz). (Fachrurodji, 2005, p. 17). Collective as the way of life makes it easier for the rulers to organize their people (Parry, 1969, p. 199). A large area becomes an obstacle for people in power in communication and an opening for control of their people as a commune.

Colum McCann, an Irish writer of fiction, said in an interview with Robert Birnbaum (2003) that there is no word for "privacy" in Russian. Parry (1969, p. 196-197) seeking into the Soviet translation of Article 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations in 1966 into Russian, where the word “privacy” is translated личная жизнь (lichnaya zhizn), which means 'personal life'. The word is considered not broad enough to describe privacy. Personal life is a part of privacy but is not limited to that. The absence of the word 'privacy', shows that Russian previously was not familiar with the concept of privacy. The culture of communal life is one reason that shapes people’s mindset, so that awareness of the need for privacy is tossed aside.

In the Soviet era, the government nationalized private assets, property related to the livelihoods of many people including houses, are claimed to the state. As a result, large urbanization made big cities experiencing a housing crisis in the 1920s. intending to solve the housing problem, Soviet Government echoed the “new collective vision of the future” through 'kommunalka', short for 'kommunalnaya kvartira' (коммунальная квартира-коммуналка), (Utekhin et al., 2010). Kommunalka is inhabited by more than 2 to 16 families. Every family lives and works in one room. People are pressed to live side by side in limited space, so they cannot get privacy space. Kitchen and toilets are outside the room and shared with other residents, but not all kommunalka have a bathroom for bathing. It is common for people to visit public baths or banya (баня). Bathing was also done collectively in banya.

Oskey and Leshchinsky (2011) mention, “Soviet man has nothing to hide from it’s comrade” (p. 199). Orlando Figes (2007) explains that the aim of eliminating privacy space and ownership is to turn individual societies into communist fraternal communities. Communal life culture was used by the government to hold the leash in the communist regime.

The culture of communal life and the phenomenon of privacy crisis in Soviet society are widely featured in films. One of them is the film Дылда/Dylda (Beanpole) by Kantemir Balagov tells about two women with physically and mentally broken down, searching for hope after wartime. Another interest in this film is it addresses the issue of same-gender love in a communal Soviet society where there is almost no privacy between them. Same-gender love is a taboo back then and also the privacy issues that we discuss are some pieces of dystopian life in the Soviet regime.

Based on the background above, this article will discuss how the issue of privacy in the communal life of Soviet society is shown in the film Дылда. The purpose is to identify the issue of privacy in the communal life of Soviet society by using the critical discourse analysis method.
from Norman Fairclough with a three-dimensional view of discourse. The observations from the text supported by data collected through the literature study method.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Movie or Film is a medium of communication (Worth, 1981). According to Worth’s statement, Effendi (1986) agreed that film does have the power to communicate, to carry messages to a group of people who gather in a certain place. Then, it is right to say that film has a language for itself. The language of the film is a union between audio and visual that poured from a script. Everything on the show is a sign of something that refers to another thing. Through semiotics, film is seen as a collection of signs. Larry Gross (1980) continues, through these signs, the role of the audience is needed to conclude the meaning of the film so the relationship between filmmaker and audience can be established. Regarding Gross' notion, film is seen as a mirror image. Audience will see and hear then deduce the meaning, the feeling concern (premise) through the organisms (elements, structures, the language in the film).

The organisms of film consist of 3 structures, (a) shot: a series of pictures in one take; (b) scene: called a short segment containing one or more continuous shots; (c) sequence: a long segment consisting of several related scenes, a complete story. The visual elements in the film or what is called the mise en scene consist of 4 things, namely the lighting or camera angle, the setting, costumes, and the movements of the players, including expressions.

As a mass media of communication, film is considered as a discourse that forms and shapes society. Film is a public consumption product and the main idea comes from the society itself. As for the interest behind it, to drive public opinion, film departs from modified reality. There is no ordinary thing in film, everything is set up to deliver the message. The aim is to provoke a new ideology that may lead to a critique. Film is powerful to shape society, the way they see things and thoughts.

Semiotic is a study of the sign process which fits in film study. The semiotic theory used in this article comes from Roland Barthes’ view in the development of Saussure's on denotative meaning by contributing the concept of connotative meaning (Mudjianto and Nur, 2013, p. 77). According to Barthes in Allen (2003, p. 51), denotation is literal meaning of content, original and explicit, while connotation is an indirect meaning as a continuation of literal meaning and can be born from experience both cultural and personal. In addition, Barthes believes that readers have an important role to play the connotative function. Connotation is the second level of denotative meaning, both bear an idea or ideology through myth. Myth is the way of delivering messages that are transmitted through existing meanings because it has signs, signifiers, and signified. Myths are described naturally, in order to straighten out subjectivity.

To discover behind the iconic sign in a visual form, Barthes came out with concept inspired
by Camera Lucida his book *Camera Lucida: Reflection on Photography*. Barthes explains how to explore the meaning of photography with the meaning of *studium* and *punctum*. Studium is the value of a photo as a whole, the meaning of all aspects in a photo. Punctum is something, a detail, that stands out and catches the eye on the photo. It creates an unusual impression for the spectator or observer. Photos are part of the cinema or film. The scope of film is wider and sometimes the details are missed by the five senses. In relation to film, the concept of camera Lucida is used to explore a scene through the frame that is displayed. The meaning of the studium is used to assess the whole scene, while the meaning of the punctum is used to explore the message of the film language, the details displayed by the filmmaker or operator, including the camera technique and angle used, as well as the treatment included.

Culture is a symbolic system and has a public meaning that can be correlated to form traditions and become collective identities. (Geertz 1973, p. 128). In his opinion, it can be seen that Geertz sees culture from a semiotic perspective. Cultural meaning is carried out by interpreting symbols from the perspective of the culture itself so that we can find out the background, function, and purpose of a culture. In connection with this article, the communal living culture in Russian society in its development is a demand of the authorities. This causes the concept of privacy to finally not emerge. The culture of communal life bears strong collective solidarity and consciousness.

A long time ago, Greek philosophers separated the concepts of 'Outer' and 'Inner', between public and private, between collective and personal as an action for privacy consciousness (Holvast, 2009, p. 15). Ferenstein (2015) states that since a thousand years ago, even now, people have been accustomed to upholding comfort, prestige, and material above privacy without realizing, those things are related. Departing from the many disputes and privacy concerns, Western society first realized that they needed laws for privacy. Through a legal perspective, Warren and Brandeis introduced the concept of privacy in 1980 as the right to oneself, to be free to control personal matters. In its development, privacy has been identified in various fields, therefore, the meaning of privacy is biased. However, Haag in Uteck (2009, p. 92) sees that privacy is broadly similar.

"Privacy is the exclusive access of a person (or other legal entity) to the realm of his own. The right to privacy entitles one to exclude others from (a) watching, (b) utilizing, (c) invading (intruding upon, or in other ways affecting) his private realm.” (Anne Uteck. 2009, p. 92)

According to the statement, privacy is control over matters (information or actions) regarding oneself and what is meant by the right to privacy is the right not to be known or disturbed by others in its fulfillment. In general society, some classes are formed from physical or psychological ties
of the subject. Westin's opinion suggests that ultimately privacy comes from self-encouragement and is usually influenced by the culture and habits of the subject.

The legal basis for protecting privacy is contained in article 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The regulation was launched by the United Nations in 1948 which was adopted by its member countries and became a universal legal reference. "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks ". (United Nation. Universal Declaration of Human Rights)

Privacy requires its own "space", this implies that privacy refers to a physical place. Roessler in Klepikova (2015) sees that privacy is a safe and responsible dimension of doing something, where someone can do something freely without the influence of public awareness. Roessler's statement refers to a place that allows an individual to behave independently of himself. Roessler's opinion then used to classify the material with a focus on the setting in the film Дылда.

PRIVACY ISSUE IN FILM ДЫЛДА

As a result of the influence of capitalism in Russia, people perceived the public area as all that is owned by the state (Oskey and Lishcinsky, 2011). During the Soviet era, the state held kommunalka ownership, which means that even the houses, that were inhabited by most of the people, were assumed as a public area, regardless of the collectivity inside. Therefore, to classify the zones in this discussion, it is necessary to pay attention to the territorial boundaries of Soviet society. Public area refers to public facilities where anyone is free to enter and exit. A semi-public area is a communal area that is used in general. Utekhin et al (2010) explained that the residents of the kommunalka are like families with each other, they grow and live in front of each other. The concept of ‘outsider’ is used to limit individuals to people outside their territory, in this case, kommunalka. People outside the kommunalka are still assumed to be outsiders and cannot go in or out without the occupant's permission (insider). People that are allowed to enter must pass through a common area for residents. The only thing that can be said to be a private area is the bedroom where the occupant's authority over the area is even stronger.

Despite the limited censorship and regulations of the Soviet era, film in Russia is now a mass communication medium. As time goes by, now Russian films are not inferior to Hollywood productions. Many of the Russian films feature stories of Soviet life and issues in society. Many Russian films have entered large-scale international film festivals, including Дылда/Dylda (Beanpole). Russian government has also permitted the film Дылда to be shown in theaters. The film Дылда brings back memory for Russians who have experienced the Soviet period as nostalgia, but for non-Russians, it can be seen as social criticism.
According to Roessler’s definition of privacy, there are zones to classify the level of privacy. Shots and dialogues are divided into three levels of zones based on the privacy of activities that can be seen through the setting in the film.

- **Public area**, which is an area that has direct access to the environment and is a place for general activities to occur. This area is used as an interaction space because it is open and free to interact with outsiders.
- **Semi-public area**, which is an area where residents can interact with fellow residents in the house, such as family. Strangers or outsiders cannot enter without consent.
- **Private area**, which is a personal area. Areas where one can have personal freedom. Like a bedroom or bathroom because they are not used simultaneously.

Classification is also related to the territorial boundaries that a person has built. According to Laurens in R. Said (2014), territoriality is a relationship between behavior patterns and the ownership rights of a person or group of a place. Barliana et al. in R. Said explains that the form of territory can be various, such as objects, areas, or rooms managed by individuals or groups. In short, territory is an area or object that is managed by a person and assumed to be his.

Дылда is a film by Non-Stop Production, written by Aleksandr Terekhov, in collaboration with Kantemir Balagov as the director. Beanpole was released on May 16, 2019. The premiere of the Beanpole film was held at the 2019 Cannes Film Festival and was nominated in the Queer Palm and Prix categories and won Best Director in the Un Certain Regard category at the festival.

Дылда tells about a tall and blonde nurse named Iya but people call her Beanpole (Дылда / Dylda). Iya, worked in a military hospital, as a nurse. She lives with a child named Pashka from her close friend during the war and also her loved one, Masha. Iya suffers from post-concussion syndrome due to war, which is a condition where a person is consciously ‘freezing’ or comatose. Until one day while joking with Pashka, Iya accidentally stiffened and fell onto Pashka's body until the child finally died. Masha, who returned from the war, also works at the same hospital and lives with Iya. Masha asked Iya to conceive her child because her uterus had been removed. But Iya never gets pregnant. Masha meets Sasha who likes him. After not getting the consent of Sasha's parents, Masha then returns with Iya and creates their dream of having children together.
### Scene

Iya and Masha are in the public bathhouse. When they took the water, Masha realized Iya noticed the wound on her stomach. Then she asks about it. Masha did not answer, he went with a bucket of water to the bench.

| Dialog |
|--------|
| Ия : Откуда в этот?  |
| Ия : Тебя не болит почка?  |
| Ия : Не надо были с ними.  |
| Маша : Но я отбыла.  |
| Ия : Зачем?  |
| Маша : Человека внутри хочу. Понимаешь? Детя хочу. Вцепляться.  |

Translation

Iya : What’s that from?
Iya : Does your kidney hurt you?
Iya : We shouldn’t have gone with them.
Masha : I had to.
Iya : Why?
Masha : I want a human inside me. Understand? I want a child. To hold onto.

The meaning of the studium in this scene is that in banya the room for men and women are separated, each one takes a bath in one large room without a partition. This is demonstrated by using a long-wide shot to display a busy scene. As Shulman (2018) describes, the situation inside is like a slippery floor full of naked people.

Moving to a close-up shot when highlighting the scar on Masha's stomach drag the camera to her face but only shows Masha's face from the side, is called a side profile angle shot, used for hiding the feelings and thoughts of the actor (Thompson, 2018, p. 54-55). Then the camera shoots Iya with ¾ front view, here Iya's eyes are shown staring at Masha's stomach and face alternately.
and asking about the wound but Masha didn't answer and left. The meaning of punctum in this small scene is that Masha is not comfortable to be in that place. Masha's expression also looked uncomfortable when she was brushed over by the passers-by behind her. Through this scene, it can be seen that personal activities, like bathing, carried out in public places cause discomfort.

Another punctum is Iya's position is lower than Masha who sits on the bench as shown in the shot. According to this treatment, we know that the filmmaker wants to present Masha as a superpower over Iya, who is under her. This is proven because Iya has feelings for Masha. Through the dialogue that Masha wants children, describes the hopes of the Soviet people after the war. They want to live a normal life again with their family.

One last punctum that has been found in this scene is a ticket on everyone’s wrist. A ticket is valid for one person including a locker and a tin container for water. That is why the ticket that is obtained cannot be lost. Usually, the ticket is tied with a rope and worn on the ankle or hand like a bracelet like a punctum which is seen in the shot shown, it can be seen that Masha and the woman behind her are wearing bracelets on their wrists which are bath tickets.

**Discursive Practice**

Bath was a special occasion for Soviet people, especially after World War II, 1945. At that time the majority of Soviet people lived in communal cities and not all of them had a bathroom as stated in the Soviet Union Review, Vol. 2 by Russian Trade Delegation (1923). Water heating was also not owned by most houses in the Soviet Union and many were the only places that facilitated it. Therefore, Russian people are familiar with public baths or banya. Generally in banya, people bathe in one large room with lots of hot and cold taps and long benches (Leder, 2001, p. 52). The mass bathing activities in banya represent Soviet society without class distinctions, they clean themselves and get naked together.

**Social Practice**

In the Soviet era, banya was part of a campaign to improve public cleanliness in socialist life by uniting the collectivity of society (Kushmina, 2019, p. 21-22). At that time most banya was managed by the state and named by number (Brue, 2008). The combination of these two concepts (hygiene and health) was an effort to maintain health in order to achieve the common goal of Soviet society. Starks in Vujosevic (2013, p. 4) states that the promotion of health and hygiene aims to realize a utopian communist life, “universal equality” in the absence of disease in society. Banya provides soap, but according to Tsesis (2017, p.16), free soap is rough on the skin and smells bad, so people usually bring their toiletries. This shows that the government pays less attention to the facility’s quality. Banya with private showers set a higher ticket price (Shulman, 2018). Privacy
can be obtained by an exclusive person whereas the majority of Soviet society is a society of the proletariat, a working society that does not have much money. This scene shows that there was government interference and so personal space was pushed aside in Soviet society. Bathing as an activity with the highest intimacy at that time was encouraged by the government to be done communally. This illustrates that the state has a strong power over its people.

Semi-Public Area • Dapur – Scene 1 & Scene 2 Dimension of text Scene 1 (00:07:43 – 00:08:09)
**Scene**

Iya and Pashka entering the busy kitchen. The women cooking and washing dishes, two men play chess together at the dining table in the center of the room. Iya went in and look for his pot. The old man gave the pat to her.

| Dialog |
|--------|
| Человек : Ия ердевуна, помочь? |
| Ия : Не здесь. Где моя кастрюля? кто-то взял? |
| Женщина : Боже, кто хочет? |
| Ия : Спасибо |

Translation

Old man : Iya Segeyevna, do you need help?
Iya : It is not here.
Iya : Where’s my poy? Did someone take it again?
Old Woman : Goodness, who’d want it?
Iya : Thank you.

Scene 2 (1:28:38 - 1:29:11)
Scene

The old woman complained about Sasha who often visited Masha and now they paint the room so that the smell of paint spreads while she looked for salt.

Dialog

С. женшина : Тепер краской вонята. За них, верёт ходит взять к себя. Салт а где на мир? Есус, поддержему Есус. Тебя с подроска переставляю а быть а влизу..

Translation

Old Woman: Now the whole place stinks of paint. Where did she find him? Always visiting. Where is my salt? Jesus, where is it? Always moving stuff like they are the only ones here.

The meaning of the studium in scene 1 and 2 is that the kitchen becomes a public area where the interaction between residents as outsiders is free and open. Communal kitchens characterized Soviet working society with great solidarity. Punctum in scene 1 of the kitchen is seen through the pan shot, a technique of taking pictures from one level, then rotating the camera horizontally to show exploring indoor activities that illustrate the closeness of the residents. Dialogue in scene 1 shows that Iya thinks that one of the neighbors takes it without permission. It is portrayed that Soviet people are suspicious of one another.

The meaning of the studium in scene 2 of the kitchen is that Soviet society actually needs personal space, but privacy itself is against Soviet communal culture. The meaning of punctum in scene 2 of the kitchen can be seen from the use of camera treatment which was focused on and following the movements of the old woman then changed the focus to Yes being in the kitchen too and hearing the woman's complaints. This treatment was used to put pressure on Iya's mood, which was shown with an irritated expression. The old woman's dialogue narrates her feelings as the subject of the story. Both Iya and the old woman were disturbed by the arrival of Sasha, who was an outsider in their private environment.

Discursive Practice

The kitchen is described as the heart of life in the kommunalka. Apart from being a place for cooking, the kitchen is also used as a gathering place for residents' meetings or just to chit-chat (Utekhin et al., 2010). Messana (2011) says, "it's a place where you chat, where you shout, and where you settle collective problems". She added that each family has its own stove and its own cabinet so that private space can be created. In the kitchen, residents sometimes wash their clothes in the sink. Private daily life becomes an activity that can be watched by other residents (Semenova, 2014).
The habit of doing activities together in the kitchen creates a high level of solidarity between residents. Although the level of physical closeness is high, psychologically they still have high walls. This is triggered by differences in backgrounds that sometimes cause jealousy. The Soviet utopian ideal was to achieve a classless society, but the "ex-bourgeoisie" who then lived under one roof with the common man could blow up a sense of exaggerated sentiment.

Social Practice

Many of the stories tell of former bourgeois being mistreated by other inmates. Some of them in Messana (2011) tell that their parents often lost their eating utensils, especially those from royal or bourgeois families during the Bolshevik era. Someone tore the curtains that were put on in the kitchen, as well as bad words that mock the bourgeoisie in the cupboard. They chose to keep their backgrounds as a secret for safety reasons. They were no different from ordinary society. The sentiments created by the residents reflected a strong sense of communist nationalism. This means that the utopian life of a communist society is only a dream but in reality, it is impossible to achieve. Disputes over using other people's belongings often occur. One of the informants in Semenova said that they were suspicious of each other. They hide their stuff, such as food, salt, pepper, and toilet needs in a locked cabinet or the room (Figes, 2007). The cutlery that was simply placed in the kitchen and lost one by one was stolen and sold by the neighbors themselves. Valuable cooking utensils and cutlery are also stored in the cleanest place.

These two scenes show that there is consciousness for privacy in Russian society. Even so, the concept is not yet fixed. The communal kitchen represents a private space where there is a public space, likewise in the public space, a private space is formed. The closeness of the residents depicts Soviet society as a working society of strong solidarity.

Private Area  ●  Bedroom - Scene 1 & 2 Dimension of Text
Scene 1 (01:22:49 – 01:25:51)
Scene
Sasha helps Masha carry a bucket of water. Arriving at the door, Sasha asked and splashed water on Masha. In the room, Iya took a stone from beside the fireplace, wrapped it in a cloth, and placed it on his stomach. Iya saw Sasha and Masha enter, running after each other in a wet state and making a scene. Iya, vomiting.

Dialog
Маша : Спосибо тебе, кормилец. Всё я само дежь.
Саша  : А ты не впустишь меня

Маша : Порожи. Стоит.
Саша  : Думаешь, ты выгнать меня? Я никуда не поеду.
Маша : Твои смятение всем убираи.
Маша : Иди к наших тряпку на кухне и зелёная. У тебя задержку за неделю. Прасти очень рады.
Ия      : Почему ты впустил его
Маша : Не знаю. Прошли

Translation
Masha : Thank you, Breadwinner. I can take it from here.
Sasha  : You still won’t let me in?.
Masha : You troublemaker. Stand still.
Sasha  : Think you can kick me out? I am not going anywhere.
Masha : Clean up your mess.
Masha : Go get a rag. The green one from the kitchen. You are a week late. Sorry to be so happy.
Iya      : Why did you let him in?
Masha : I don’t know. Just because.
Sekuen Adegan 2 (01:36:42 - 01:38:35)

**Scene**
Sasha, Masha, and Iya eat together at the dining table in the bedroom. Sasha continues to stir the porridge. Iya, reprimand him. Masha gave Sasha’s porridge to Iya. Iya angry and tell him to not come over again. Masha stand up, Sasha took over their plates bring it to the kitchen. Masha holding Iya's hand slowly but then Iya got up and left Masha at the table alone.

**Dialog**
Ия : Что не вкусная кашу, не соленая? Саша : Да, я просто не голоден.
The studium meaning of these two shots shows that the room has various functions, like a living room, dining room, and space for resting. The bedroom is the only place that supports any private activity. However, because it is multi-functional, bedrooms are not truly private, the occupants of the rooms still have to share space with others.

At the beginning of scene 1 of the room, Sasha asked Masha to allowed to enter, this was related to the previous corridor scene where Sasha who came was not allowed to enter, but in this scene, Masha did not answer. When Sasha runs into the room with Masha while chasing the camera, it only focuses on Masha and Sasha where Iya is also in the room but instead becomes punctum. The filmmaker shoots Iya in a separate scene using close-up shots that show Iya's furious expression. The punctum meaning from the treatment is that Iya as an 'outsider' in the relationship between Masha and Sasha and becomes left behind. On the other hand, Iya disliked having "other
people" in his territory, especially since that person was Sasha. It was emphasized again when Iya curtly asked Masha why she allowed Sasha to enter. The meaning of the punctum is also shown through the position of the actor, Masha is now lower than Iya, which implies that Iya now has power over Masha. At that time Masha wanted Iya to be pregnant and she did not know that at that time Iya was not pregnant, Masha depended on Iya. Another punctum in this scene is the voices of other people talking and the music that comes from outside the room. Indicates that the sound from inside the room can also be heard by neighbors.

Scene 2 of the bedroom shows Iya, Masha, and Sasha eating in the room. Then, Iya asks Sasha not to come again. The meaning of this punctum is that Iya is jealous and annoyed to see Sasha who always visits for Masha’s sake. Iya says "Не ходит к нам былшу" which means don't come to us again, but he uses the word "былшу" which means the past. Iya warned Sasha not to get too close to her and Masha. Iya sees Sasha as an outsider and doesn’t want if he gets to know about her and Masha too much, or Sasha will find out too many things than he shouldn’t.

Discursive Practice

The bedrooms in the kommunalka are the only territories in which the owner has the highest authority. Fellow residents cannot enter the room unless otherwise permitted. Rooms are given by the government to individuals and may be occupied by their families. Iya and Masha are former women on the battlefield. Iya, the one who returned first, experienced the trauma of concussion syndrome due to war. Then, she became a nurse in a military hospital. Iya, as a working community, is given a room in the kommunalka. Meanwhile, Masha, who returned after the war ended, lives with Iya because she is considered a relative. Masha then works as a nurse at the same hospital as Iya. This shows that jobs are given by the state in return for the state to guarantee the life of its people, including providing a place to live.

Due to limited private space, a room is made more than just a place to sleep. The rooms are arranged in such a way that they can be used as a living room as well as a dining room. A resource person in Messana (2011, p.44) said that even though the distance between the rooms is sticking together, some of them have joint doors that are not used anymore, it is possible for neighbors to hear conversations and voices from inside the room. Gentleman in The Guardian (2001) said that "The walls are so thin you can hear people talking quietly". Nothing can be done without being a topic of conversation for other residents, she added.

Social Practice

Kleptikova (2015) describes the life of the Soviet people in one word, "privatelessness" or lack of privacy. People must be careful in acting and speaking. A source in Messana (2011, p. 31-
32) told about her father who was arrested by the authorities as a result of reports from plumbers in the building who suspected her father was involved in an underground organization. This is clear evidence that the Soviet government took advantage of the application of a communal culture of life to minimize the emergence of underground movements that were feared to threaten the country. This also reflected that the Soviet apparatus was indiscriminate and would pursue any defection. To hold the people to their class, the government suppressing people’s private space. As a result, there is a consciousness in society that about "this is life", "there is nothing better than this" and there is no awareness of resistance.

Both of the bedroom scenes show that the loss of privacy influenced the cautious and secretive characteristics of Soviet society. This causes them to not easily trust people so that they seem to shut themselves off from people who are considered outsiders. In addition, by displaying the only private space that is not yet completely private, it illustrates the limitations of the expectations of Soviet society.

CONCLUSION

Russian society in the Soviet era was not familiar with the concept of privacy. This is caused by the communal culture that has been formed for a long time, so it’s influenced people's mindset. Besides, communal culture was used as a tool to control and regulate society to realize Soviet utopian dreams. In the meantime, the consciousness of privacy as a human right is starting to grow in other countries of the world. This made the Soviets seem left behind. Although Soviet people sense the need for privacy, they feel safer and more comfortable to live communally, regardless of cultural influence and government propaganda.

Privacy issue in film Дылда/Dylda (Beanpole) put in three classifications, based on Roessler's definition of privacy that refers to the dimension as a physical place. According to the film, we divided into public areas, semi-public areas, and private areas. Through this research, the "crisis of privacy" in Soviet society proved by the use of a bedroom as the only private area even though it is not completely private. One room can be inhabited by more than two people, not to mention the distance between rooms and inadequate building materials further limit the privacy of someone who lives there. Also, the invasion of the outsider in the film shows that there was almost no private place in the Soviets.

After Soviet dismissed and Russia became open to the world, Russian people realized that privacy is something they need and have the right for it. Through the language of film, Kantemir Balagov recounts the life habits of communal people in Soviet era, and privacy is depicted as hard to get in that society. From a non-Russian perspective, the Soviet concept of privacy, and its application has become an unusual phenomenon where there is nothing personal and intervention in one's personal space is depicted as general. Therefore, privacy issues in Soviet society are
represented as social criticism in the film Дылда.
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