

**ALEXANDER FEDOROV,
ANASTASIA LEVITSKAYA, OLGA GORBATKOVA**

**SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY IN
THE MIRROR OF SOVIET AND
RUSSIAN CINEMA**

Fedorov, A.V., Levitskaya, A.A., Gorbatkova, O.I. *School and university in the mirror of Soviet and Russian cinema*. Moscow: ICO Information for All, 2017. 152 p.

The relevance of the book topic is highlighted by the following reasons: audiovisual media (cinematography, television, and the internet) are effective means of affecting the audience, especially school children and youth (due to their age peculiarities and a high degree of their media contacts); in recent decades Russian schools and universities have significantly been altered and reformed and are still the focal point of vigorous debates; consequently, the analysis of school and university topic transformation in the mirror of Soviet & Russian audiovisual media texts is highly topical nowadays both for culture studies, film studies and media education.

The research material of this book is audiovisual media texts about school and university; the authors use a comparative hermeneutic analysis of audiovisual media texts relating to the topic (including stereotypes analysis, ideological analysis, identification analysis, iconographic analysis, narrative analysis of media texts, media text's character analysis, etc.), anthropological and gender analyses.

For researchers in the field of cinematography, pedagogy, cultural studies, media culture, sociology, political science, for teachers, post-graduate students and university students of humanitarian specialties.

** This research was funded by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation (RSF, project No. 17-18-01001) at the Rostov State University of Economics. Project theme: "School and university in the mirror of Soviet, Russian and Western audiovisual media texts". Head of the project is professor Alexander Fedorov.*

SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY IN THE MIRROR OF SOVIET AND RUSSIAN CINEMA

COPYRIGHT © 2017 BY ALEXANDER FEDOROV

1954ALEX@MAIL.RU

ALL RIGHT RESERVED.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 2 1

P. CM.

INCLUDES BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES.

1. FILM STUDIES. 2. FILM CRITICISM. 3. CINEMA. 4. FILM. 5. MASS MEDIA. 6. SCREEN. 7. IDEOLOGY. 8. RUSSIA. 9. USSR. 10. MEDIA LITERACY. 11. MEDIA STUDIES.

Contents

	Introduction.....	5
1	Soviet silent films about school and university (1919-1930).....	9
2	Soviet films about school and university of the Stalin era and the first post-Stalin years (1931-1955)	13
3	Soviet films about school and university of the "thaw" period (1956-1968)	21
4	Soviet films about school and university of the "stagnation" period (1969-1985)	37
5	Soviet films about school and university of the "perestroika" period (1986-1991)	66
6	Russian films about school and university (1992-2017).....	84
	List of Soviet and Russian film on school and university topics.....	127
	References.....	147

Introduction

The relevance of the research topic is highlighted by the following reasons: audiovisual media (cinematography, television, and the internet) are effective means of affecting the audience, especially school children and youth (due to their age peculiarities and a high degree of their media contacts); in recent decades Russian schools and universities have significantly been altered and reformed and are still the focal point of vigorous debates; consequently, the analysis of school and university topic transformation in the mirror of Soviet, Russian and Western audiovisual media texts is highly topical nowadays both for culture studies, film studies and media education.

Our research material is feature films about school and university; we use a comparative hermeneutic analysis of audiovisual media texts relating to the topic (including stereotypes analysis, ideological analysis, identification analysis, iconographic analysis, narrative analysis of media texts, media text's character analysis, etc.), anthropological and gender analyses.

For this purpose we understand the concept "media text" in the context that "definitions of media texts have moved far away from the traditional view of text as words printed in ink on pieces of paper to take on a far broader definition to include speech, music and sound effects, image and so on... Media texts, then, reflect the technology that is available for producing them" (Bell, 1996, p. 3). Obviously, in this respect, we imply that an audiovisual media text (in cinema) above all relies on the above-listed audiovisual images.

The *research objective* is to provide a holistic characteristic, reveal the peculiarities, and identify the place, role and importance of the school and university topic in the mirror of Soviet & Russian films both for culture studies, film studies and media education through a comparative analysis.

The *object of research* is the evolvement of the topic – school and university in the mirror of Soviet & Russian feature films.

The *subject matter* of this studies the transformation of key conceptions, stereotyped models (by which we mean a generalized representation of various phenomena in a graphic and descriptive form) of the school and university topic in the mirror of cinema.

The *research hypothesis* is that classification and a comparative analysis of content models, genre modifications, stereotypes of media texts on school and university will enable us to conclude about cultural, pedagogical, sociocultural lessons of this topic transformation; forecast the development of the topic; launch a teacher training course on the project's subject.

We use hermeneutic analysis methods of media texts suggested by C. Bazalgette (Bazalgette, 1995), A. Silverblatt (Silverblatt, 2001, pp. 80-81) and U. Eco (Eco, 2005, p. 209) giving due consideration to such key media education concepts as media agencies, media/media text categories, media technologies, media languages, media representations, and media audiences.

Our research problem results from a contradiction between a comparatively high investigation level of the school and university topic in Soviet audiovisual media texts of the 1960s – 1980s (primarily in cinematography) by Soviet researchers (Baranov, 1979; Gromov, 1982; Kabo, 1974; Levshina, 1978, 1989; Paramonova, 1975, 1976; Penzin, 1973, 1986; Rabinovich, 1969; Rybak, 1980; Stroeva, 1962; Tolstykh, 1988; Usov, 1980, et al.) and insufficient attention to a comparative analysis of the topic evolution in Russian audiovisual media from the Soviet period to the present day (Arcus, 2010; Zharikova, 2015; Shipulina, 2010). On the other hand, foreign scholars (Bauer, 1998; Dalton, 1999; Farber & Holm, 1994; Keroes, 1999; Trier, 2001, et al.) who analyzed the school and university topic in audiovisual media texts did not attempt to compare the Western production of this kind to the Russian one.

It should be noted that Soviet works about school and university in the mirror of audiovisual media not infrequently were deeply influenced by the communist ideology (especially it concerns works by K. Paramonova and Y. Rabinovich) that, in our opinion, prevented an in-depth analysis of the topic for culture studies, film studies and media studies.

Foreign researchers in the first place were more interested in the political analysis of Soviet and post-Soviet media texts (Dubois, 2007; Kenez, 1992; Lawton, 2004; Shaw & Youngblood, 2010; Shlapentokh, 1993; Strada, 1989; Strada & Troper, 1997) rather than in the analysis of school and university on the screen.

Neither Russian nor foreign researchers have approached the media education aspect of the comparative analysis of school and university in the mirror of Soviet & Russian audiovisual media texts so far. However, in our opinion, it is very useful both for education studies and culture studies, especially for training future teachers, cultural specialists, psychologists, sociologists, etc.

It stands to reason that reading of any media text is changeable and subject to political regimes fluctuations. Hence, it becomes clear that Soviet publicistic and academic literature about school and university in the mirror of audiovisual media (Baranov, 1979; Gromov, 1982; Kabo, 1974, 1978; Paramonova, 1975, 1976; Penzin, 1973, 1986; Rabinovich, 1969, 1991; Soloveitchik, 1975; Stroeva, 1962, et al.) very often were based on communist ideological approaches.

Let us site a passage from a book by one of media education leaders of the Soviet period – Y. Rabinovich (1918-1990): “The Communist party of the regional committee has adopted the course program... It concerns the university audience – future propagandists of the Marxist-Leninist theory, leaders of political education circles. That is why methodological issues are addressed in detail. ... By way of example, one unit from the course “Introduction”: “Soviet multinational art” is an active assistant of the Communist party in shaping people’s views and beliefs. Socialist realism is a creative method of the Soviet film art. V. Lenin considered the cinema to be one of the most important arts. Regulations of the Communist party and the Soviet government about literature and art... Art in the USSR and

socialist countries in combating the bourgeois commercial cinematography, aspirations of progressive film artists of capitalist countries to reach true representation of reality” (Rabinovich, 1991, p. 86).

Media texts about school and university used to be analyzed in the Soviet time mostly from that standpoint. For instance, K. Paramonova (1916-2005), Professor of the Film Institute, when analyzing films about school children wrote in the 1970s that “cinema artists must promote raising communism builders by their films who are wholly developed, well-bred, tenacious and vigorous, selflessly devoted to the Soviet motherland and Lenin’s party. ... Questions of morality and ethics, the ideal that young citizens of our country should follow – all this is also reflected in many films” (Paramonova, 1975, p. 21).

However, much fewer ideology-driven works which used some films about school at media studies were published in the Soviet period (Levshina, 1989; Penzin, 1986; Rybak, 1980; Usov, 1980, et al.).

In the post-Soviet years, researchers preferred to ignore media interpretation of school and university. Some attempts to reflect on this topic from a new perspective were made, for example, by L. Arcus (Arcus, 2010) and N. Shipulina (Shipulina, 2010). O. Grigorieva (2007), T. Mitina (2015), T. Suspitzina (2002) and others explored the teacher’s image in the context of visual anthropology and gender studies.

One of the few articles that are not only about an onscreen but also about a media image of the teacher belongs to A.A. Machenin (2016). But here again he mainly explores a media representation of the teacher’s image rather than the school and university topic in general but on modern material. By the way, both A.A. Machenin and N.B. Shipulina and some others, in our opinion, rightly point out that beginning from the 1970s – 1980s one can feel a significant decline of the social and moral status of the teacher on the screen.

As to works by foreign researchers (Dubois, 2007; Kenez, 1992; Lawton, 2004; Shaw & Youngblood, 2010; Shlapentokh, 1993; Strada, 1989; Strada & Troper, 1997, et al.), they did not analyze school and university in their studies of Soviet and Russian audiovisual media texts. Anyway, we failed to find any meaningful analysis of school and university in Soviet and post-Soviet audiovisual media in Western research works during our survey on the topic; though, of course, they studied the image of school and university in Western audiovisual media texts, mainly in the cinema (Ayers, 1994; Bauer, 1998; Burbach and Figgins, 1993; Considine, 1985; Dalton, 1999; Edelman, 1990; Farber & Holm, 1994; Joseph and Burnaford, 1994; Keroes, 1999; Oliker, 1993; Schwartz, 1963; Trier, 2001, et al.).

Let us give a generalized hermeneutic analysis of Soviet films about school and university with the help of technologies suggested by C. Bazalgette (Bazalgette, 1995) and U. Eco (Eco, 2005, p. 209). For this purpose we will roughly divide Soviet films about school and university into the following groups:

- 1) silent films (1919-1930);

- 2) sound films of the Stalin era and the first post-Stalin years (1931-1955);
- 3) films of the thaw period (1956-1968);
- 4) films of the stagnation period (1969-1984);
- 5) films of the perestroika period (1985-1991).

It stands to reason that these timeframes of the periods, in our opinion, cannot be precisely defined; the same goes with attaching films to a certain period.

1. Soviet silent films about school and university (1919-1930)

Venue; historical, sociocultural, political and ideological contexts

Historical background of media texts, market conditions that contributed to the plot and creation of media texts, impact of that time events on media texts

This historic period was marked by such important events as the civil war (main fighting took place in 1918-1920 while in the Far East the war continued up to 1924); famine in the Volga region (1921-1922); the Kronstadt Rebellion (1921); antireligious policy; attempts to manage child neglect and illiteracy (during 1919-1930); the New Economic Policy (NEP) plan implementation that restored the economic market and petit bourgeoisie (the so-called NEPmen) for a short while (1921-1928); creation of the USSR (1922) and the All-Soviet Union Pioneer Organization (1922) supervised by Komsomol (established in 1918); death of Vladimir Lenin (1924); struggle for power in the higher USSR echelons (as a result, Leon Trotsky – the main rival of Joseph Stalin was removed from all decision-making posts in 1927 and was exiled in 1929); collectivization in agriculture (1928-1930); introduction of universal primary education in schools (since 1930); the beginning of industrialization (the first five-year plan of the national economy development of the USSR was adopted in 1928); Bolshevik repressions against other political parties, the noble class, the bourgeois class, the clergy and intelligentsia.

A relative creative freedom amid the ideological censorship in culture and arts enabled Soviet artists, writers, photographers, theatre workers and film-makers to carry out radical experiments with the form. Due to this relative freedom hundreds of western entertainment films were widely shown during the NEP years.

The new economic policy in the USSR led to the establishment of incorporated, cooperative film companies, and in the 1920s the Soviet film industry actually worked in a competitive market that revived genre commercial film making.

It goes without saying, the political and sociocultural conditions, events that contributed to the plot and film production of Soviet films of the 1920s could not but influence films about children and for children. Hence, for example, there were produced films about exploits of teenagers during the civil war, about homeless children and pioneers, about eradication of illiteracy and so on (*Red Devils*, 1923; *Vanka – a Young Pioneer*, 1924; *The Island of Young Pioneers*, 1924; *Golden Honey*, 1928; *Small and Big*, 1928; *Torn Sleeves*, 1928; *Tanka – the Bar Girl*, 1929, et al.)

How the knowledge of real historic events of a given period promotes awareness of these media texts, examples of historical allusions in these media texts.

There were a lot of films about children (in particular, about homeless children) in the 1920s in contrast with films about school and university – there were about a dozen of them. And this is understandable from the commercial point

of view: it was much easier and more beneficial to attract audiences to watch films about heroic “red devils” fighting with “whites”, to watch screen stories about young homeless thieves rather than films about real school everyday routine.

Sociocultural, ideological, worldview, religious contexts

Ideology, world outlook of these media texts authors in the sociocultural context; ideology and world culture reflected in the media texts.

The communist ideology in the USSR failed to attain its objective in the 1920s since the new economic policy prevented complete state regulation and total censorship of film making (as well as of culture in general). There were no “allotments” concerning films about school, though their creators were supposed to stick to the communist ideology.

World outlook of people belonging to the “world of school” reflected in the media texts.

The world outlook of people in Soviet silent films about school was entirely optimistic: illiteracy and homelessness were perceived as transient phenomena in contrast to the Pioneer and Komsomol movements that were recognized as constant and inviolately progressive ones.

The value hierarchy in this worldview was: the most meaningful school protagonists of Soviet silent cinema – pioneers and Komsomol members – were characterized by communist ideological commitment, collectivism, heroism, honesty, uncompromising attitude to internal and external enemies, atheism, industry, readiness to help good or not quite good people. Adherence to such values used to be the basic stereotype of success. Such values in the cinema were not only to be reflected but also impressed, formed and strengthened.

Structure and narrative devices in these media texts

The structure, plot, representativeness, ethics, genre modification, iconography, characters can be roughly presented as follows:

Venue and period of media texts

The setting of the media texts: the recent past (the revolution, the civil war) and present (the 1920s). As previously noted, the movies of the 1920s showed children mainly as fighters (with “whites”, bourgeois, kulaks and other negative personalities). And even films about school did not focus on studies but on the vigorous pioneer and Komsomol activity.

Household goods and living conditions: the setting and household items in the films about school are modest and ascetic.

Genre modifications: drama, adventure drama.

Devices of reality representation:

- positive characters are often shown in an idealized variant;
- negative characters, by contrast, are grotesque with prominent negative traits.

Typology of characters:

– *age of characters*: school students are 7-17 years old, however, there are more teenagers among them; the age of the other characters is different, but grown-ups under 60 prevail;

– *level of education*: school students' level of education corresponds to their grade, teachers allegedly have a higher (university) education, the education of other characters can be different;

– *social status, profession*: the financial situation of school children is approximately equal, but they can come from both workers' and peasants' families and intelligentsia. Their parents have various professions.

– *marital status of characters*: school students are naturally unmarried yet; most adults are married;

– *appearance, clothes, constitution of characters, their character traits, vocabulary*: the appearance of school children in films of the 1920s is varied.

Photos of the 1920s give us a glimpse of the appearance, clothes and constitution of Soviet school students and teachers of that time.



Soviet school students of the 1920-s at the lesson

Most school characters in Soviet films of the 1920s possessed tenacity of purpose, emotionalism, energy, optimism, courage, adherence to principles, common speech vocabulary, ambition to become part of the pioneer/komsomol collectivism, to do well in school, to help the elderly. And if there were characters who showed negative traits, they changed for the better in the end...

Significant changes in the lives of the characters: a young man lives a normal life but then he learns that his peers have already joined the pioneer organization.

Problem encountered by the character: disruption of a character's usual life (for example, the young man is eager to become a pioneer against his religious parents' will);



Soviet teachers of the 1920s

Solution to the problem: the young man becomes a pioneer after overcoming all the obstacles.

As for teachers in the films, they used to be portrayed: 1) either as fighters for a new communist future; 2) or as representatives of the former grammar school who gradually begin to realize the meaning of revolutionary changes.

Naturally, there were also teachers-enemies in the films of the 1920s. For example, the film *A Man with a Case* (1929) showed a former “white” guard who became a university professor after the civil war. Besides that this professor maligned honest people, left his wife, and to crown it all killed his friend to conceal his past crimes...

2. Soviet films about school and university of the Stalin era and the first post-Stalin years (1931-1955)

Venue; historical, sociocultural, political and ideological contexts

Historical background of media texts, market conditions that contributed to the plot and creation of the media texts, impact of that time events on the media texts.

The greater part of this historic period coincides with the peak of the Stalin totalitarian era of the socialist regime (national domain, the communist party and its ideology, I.V. Stalin's unlimited power based on repressions and industrialization).

The period of forcible collectivization of private peasant farms (1928-1930) was followed by the 1932-1933 famine which claimed the lives of 7 million people (Statement..., 2008). The second half of the 1930s was marked by mass repressions which affected as many as 4 million people, about a million of whom were shot (Roginsky, 2010).

The Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945 was the most serious test for Soviet people that took the lives of tens of millions of people. The post-war period of 1946 – the early 1950s was marked not only by reconstruction of destroyed cities and factories but also by new (though not so large-scale as they were in the 1930s) repressions of the Stalin regime, confrontation with leading Western countries (the so-called post-war “cold war”). I.V. Stalin's death in March 1953 triggered changes in the USSR, though the most important “thaw” changes began only after N.S. Khrushchev's uncovering of Stalin's crimes and his “cult of personality” at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956.

As for school education, during the 1930s and in the early 1940s it was mixed but from 1 September 1943 till 31 August 1954 the Regulation of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR № 789 of 31 May 1943 “On introduction of separate education for boys and girls in the 1943-1944 school year in secondary schools in regional cities, capital centers of Union and autonomous republics and large industrial cities” came into effect. It ran that “co-education of boys and girls in secondary schools causes some difficulties in raising children; such co-education neither takes into account the physical development of boys and girls, career education, practical training, military education and training nor provides the required discipline of school students” (Statement..., 1943).

During the greater part of the mentioned period the cinematograph in the USSR already belongs to the state, though in 1928-1936 there was a Soviet-German studio “Mezhrabpomfilm” in Moscow created instead of the former joint-stock studio “Mezhrabpom-Rus”(1924-1928). In 1936, “Mezhrabpomfilm” was transformed into a film studio “Soyuzdetfilm” (since 1948 it became known as the M. Gorky film studio). Thus, unlike the studio “Mezhrabpomfilm” the studio “Soyuzdetfilm” began to specialize in films for children and youth. 77 films were

shot by Soiuzdetfilm from 1936 till 1948 in all. And though they were primarily intended for children and youth, the topic of school was not major there.

It goes without saying, that the political and sociocultural conditions, events contributed to the plot and creation of these films, dictated their rules. That is why the films about school of the 1930 – the first half of the 1950s to a greater or lesser degree reflected the “general” policy of the ruling and the only party.

Good school children were always on the side of Bolsheviks while worse students (they still appeared on the screen) either improved in the end or were duly punished.

How the knowledge of real historic events of a given period promotes awareness of these media texts, examples of historical allusions in these media texts.

For obvious reasons the Soviet films of the 1930s – 1950s did not even mention the terrible famine of 1932-1933, mass repressions and concentration camps, but they contained a lot of revolutionary politics, spies and collectivism ideas in them. Lack of market competition and self-preservation instinct made film makers interested in the ideological and political “correctness” of their production but not in their financial profitability.

For example, on the threshold of revolution children in the film “*Three Children from the Same Street*” (1939) helped a Bolshevik to spread leaflets against the tsar and his government. Grammar school students carried bullets in their school bags to Bolsheviks in the film *The Lonely White Sail* (1937). The film *The Ballad of Cossack Golota* (1937) told about children who sided with “reds” during the civil war. A teenage gypsy in the film *Friends from a Gipsy Camp* (1938) behaved in the same way. The film *Partisan’s Daughters* (1935) showed children who struggled with rich peasants (that is with the so-called “kulaks”). Courageous kids helped the Soviet border patrol in the film *Ai-Gul* (1936). The spy film *Gaitchy* (1938) told about a pioneer who also assisted frontier guards: he helped them arrest a Chinese spy (a former “white” guard) named Yanyga and a traitor – engineer Sapov. The film *High Award* (1939) related a story about a spy who infiltrated under a mask of a clown into a country house of a Soviet aircraft designer where his children were spending their vacation. The film *The Train to Moscow* (1938) showed children who prevented a train crash. In the film *Captain Varya* (1939) a girl rescued a lighthouse-keeper. In the film *Siberians* (1940) school students were looking for Stalin’s smoking pipe that he had given to a local hunter during his banishment in tsar Russia. In the film “*Timur and his Team*” (1940) pioneers helped elderly people and soldiers’ families with domestic work.

The topic of school was not mentioned in the trilogy by M. Donskoy (*My Apprenticeship, Gorky’s Childhood, My Universities*) based on A.M. Gorky’s prose either...

As a rule, school students in the films created in the 1930s – 1950s do not study, instead they “1) struggle with enemies of all kinds (from spies to rodents)”; 2) hold sittings, elections, meetings and votes; 3) work or enjoy unrealistic

children's hobbies necessary for their future profession, for example, – poultry breeding” (Pritulenko, 1995, p. 106).

We share the view of N.I. Nusinova that “the cliché of the Soviet era – “children are our future” turned the children’s film world of the totalitarian epoch into the Orwellian futurology where children were little adults or aliens from the wonderful world of communism into this still imperfect grown-up world of communism being built. The Soviet child had a power of young Heracles, a life experience of a mountain Sapien and a political awareness of a district committee secretary of the communist party” (Nusinova, 2003).

On the whole, only 8 films about school (10%) were shot by the “Soiuzdetfilm” studio out of 77 films: *Class Seven* (1938), *Personal File* (1939), *Spring Stream* (1940), *Brother of a Hero* (1940), *Romantic People* (1941), *The Village Teacher* (1947), *The Red Scarf* (1948) and *The First Grader* (1948).

Other Soviet film studios also made films about children and school during this period, though it did not make any difference, since there were very few such films.

Thus, “school as it is – with its daily routine, corridors, recreations, classroom, rows of desks, blackboard, teachers and students – was nearly absent in Stalin’s cinematograph. If it was scarcely mentioned it was given little screen time, and the episodes connected with school served as some background of the plot (as in the unissued film *Father and Son* by M. Barskaya). The unsuccessful films *Class Seven* by Y. Protazanov and *Personal File* by A. Razumny were exceptions that proved the rule” (Arcus, 2009, p. 206).

L. Arcus gives the following reasons for that:

- the danger of the school structure for the film industry as it reminded about the state model too much;

- impossibility to show a school student (as a dramatic character) not as a hero (revolutionary struggle, exposure of spies, rescuing people), because no serious conflicts and dramas in screen versions of the Soviet school were possible;

- the changes that the state pedagogical conception underwent; it replaced the so-called “perekovka” in the 1930s (i.e. reeducating of erring children and teenagers with labour and collectivism, aimed at teaching them strict discipline and the established Soviet standards of behavior, the deviation from which was punished with repressions) (Arcus, 2009).

This conception seems weak to us due to the following reasons:

- the Stalin film industry endeavored to show not a real but an ideal Soviet school with a united positive community of teachers and students where either a liar or a boaster could appear for only a short while, as he would soon realize the gravity of his offence and again joined the honest and modest school community). Hence, such a presentation of school system and models of such conflicts supplied the audience with the associations connected with a rather positive image of the socialist state and this did not threaten the regime but, on the contrary, provided strong support for the communist propaganda;

– though the image of a school hero dominated in the Stalin cinematography, it coexisted with images of ordinary good school students who rectified “misguided” fellow students;

– though the state pedagogical conception underwent substantial alterations since the mid-1930s (Statement..., 1935), it did not affect the worked-out film pattern of correcting bad school children: in the films *Class Seven* (1938) and *The Red Scarf* (1948) negative characters mend their way under the influence of positive characters... But the films of the second half of the 1940s – the first half of the 1950s showed the established single-sex education in schools. For example, in the film *The Red Scarf* (1948) a brother and a sister study in different schools – for male and female students, whereas in the film *Alesha Ptitsyn Develops his Character* (1953) the main character, who learns that a woman-trainee would teach them a lesson, reacts so: “A college girl won’t cope with us. ... It will be hard for her to deal with us”. And his classmate agrees with him: “She’d better go to a girls’ school, girls are easier to deal with, after all”.

Sociocultural, ideological, worldview, religious contexts

Ideology, world outlook of these media texts authors in the sociocultural context; ideology, world culture reflected in the media texts.

The dominant communist ideology, total government control and strict film censorship of the Stalin era took away any choice from film makers: they had to stick to this ideology based on national property, collectivism, and bolshevism (including extensive glorification of proletariat leaders), atheism, class struggle, hatred to USA and European bourgeoisie, and “public enemies”. The so-called socialist realism dominated in the Soviet culture of the 1930s – the first half of the 1950s, which certainly involved films about school. Undoubtedly, the socialist realism had nothing in common with genuine realism; it was more like an idealism created according to the official political dogmas of that time.

World outlook of people belonging to the “world of school” reflected in the media texts.

The world outlook of people in Soviet films about school made in the 1930s – the first half of the 1950s was very optimistic and aimed at building the “bright communist future”. School students were united into a successful and happy collective body guided by wise tutors (teachers, parents, party officials), able to shape their own destiny, i.e. turn into standard “cogwheels” in the world-beating socialist state machine.

The value hierarchy in this worldview was: communist ideological commitment, collectivism, heroism, honesty, uncompromising attitude to internal and external enemies, atheism, and industry, readiness to help good or not quite good people. Adherence to such values used to be the basic stereotype of success in that screen world. Such values, attitudes and conduct in the cinema were not only to be reflected but also impressed, formed and strengthened. These values were constant throughout the film action. If a student temporarily betrayed these values, he successfully returned to them at the end of the film.

Structure and narrative devices in these media texts

The structure, plot, representativeness, ethics, genre modification, iconography, characters can be roughly presented as follows:

Venue and period of media texts. Let us omit the stories about children-heroes who help “red” soldiers and border patrol. The scene in the films made in the 1930s – the first half of the 1950s about school is laid in school classrooms, corridors, courtyards and flats, and the time in the film coincides with the time when the film was released.

Household goods and living conditions: the setting and household items in the films about school are modest and ascetic, though the poverty of the students’ families is not accentuated. For example, the film *The First Grader* (1948) shows the beginning of the new school year: there is a big portrait of Stalin in the hall, there is a typical Lenin’s phrase for all Soviet schools on the wall: “Learn, learn and learn!” There is a banner at entrance – “Welcome!” The school students hear the words from the school radio: “We congratulate Soviet school students on the beginning of the new school year”.

Genre modifications: mostly drama, sometimes comedy.

(Stereotype) devices of reality representation:

- positive characters are often shown idealized;
- negative characters, by contrast, are grotesque with prominent negative features;
- there appears a “intermediate” option– a character who looks negative (or partly negative, or misapprehensive) in the beginning, but later he corrects his conduct under the influence of his friends / parents / peers and joins his well-bred and like-minded classmates (*Wake Up Lenochka*, 1934; *Class Seven*, 1938; *Brother of a Hero*, 1940; *The Red Scarf*, 1948; *Towards Life*, 1952; *Alesha Ptitsyn Develops his Character*, 1953; *Certificate of Education*, 1954, etc.).

Typology of characters:

- *age of characters:* school students are 7-17 years old, however, there are more teenagers among them; the age of the other characters is different, but grown-ups under 60 prevail;

- *level of education:* school students’ level of education corresponds to their grade, teachers allegedly have university education, the education of other characters can be different;

- *social status, profession:* the financial situation of school children is approximately equal, but they can come from both workers’ and peasants’ families and intelligentsia. Their parents have various professions.

- *marital status of characters:* school students are naturally unmarried yet; most adults are married;

- *appearance, clothes, constitution of characters, their character traits, vocabulary:* the appearance of school children in the films of the 1930s – the first half of the 1950s comply with Stalin’s socialist realism stereotypes.

This film frame from the film *The Red Scarf* (1948) gives a good glimpse of the characters’ – school students’ – looks, clothes, and constitution.



A frame from the film *The Red Scarf* (1948)

Thus, school students in the films of the 1930s – the first half of the 1950s were mostly motivated, emotional, active, optimistic, brave, balanced, with polite speech (though sometimes rhapsodic), determined to become useful members of the pioneer/komsomol organization, to study well and help the elderly. As for negative characters (boastful, deceitful, etc.), they would always change for the better at the end of the film.

As for teachers in the films, they often became symbols of struggle for new communistic future and “to create such image of a struggling teacher, a heroic personality (almost a mythologic hero) the film contained elements of extreme social environment, where the teacher had to survive and resist either a real enemy, such as former kulaks seeking to kill him (for example, in the films *Tanka – the Bar Girl, Alone*) or a non-personified enemy such as homelessness, juvenile delinquency (*Road to Life, The Pedagogical Poem*)”(Shipulina, 2010, p. 6).

By the second half of the 1930s the Soviet screen presented a super positive image of the teacher and educator which was approved and respected by the government (honors, diplomas and other awards) and the whole society. For example, the main character in the film “*The Teacher*” (1938) was nominated a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and the audience hears a phrase which is very important for the ideological conception: “The teacher is a new person, and the Soviet power has made him so!” The films *The Village Teacher* (1947), *The First Grader* (1948), *The Pedagogical Poem* (1955) created similar screen images of exemplary and respected teachers and educators.

Taken as a whole, the Stalin era “constructed a professional image of the school teacher combining the images of the Soviet and Russian intellectual. The old image was to legitimize the Soviet one due to their common past. The main features of the pre-revolutionary intellectual myth (the messianic idea,

enlightenment, asceticism, unselfishness) were interpreted in a new way in the Stalin worldview.”(Chashchukhin, 2006, p. 135).

This film frame from the film *The Village Teacher* (1947) gives a good glimpse of the characters’ – school teachers’ – looks, clothes, and constitution.



A frame from the film *The Village Teacher* (1947)

At the same time the Soviet cinematograph remembered to criticize the school and teachers of the czarist regime. The films *The Conduit* (1935) and *Man in a Case* (1939) presented negative images of grammar school teachers: dogmatists and reasoners with a disagreeable appearance.

Significant changes in the lives of the characters: school children live a usual active Soviet life but there is a student among them who: is always late for school (*Wake Up Lenochka*, 1934), tells lies (*Brother of a Hero*, 1940), neglects schoolwork (*Spring Stream*, 1940), refuses to design a model airplane (*Class Seven*, 1938), refuses to fulfill a community assignment (*The Red Scarf*, 1948), considers himself superior to others (*Certificate of Education*, 1954). There were also (but very rare) worse variants when a school student commits a theft of school property (*Personal File*, 1939).

Problem encountered by the character: disruption of usual life because there is a character among school students who for one reason or another becomes an outsider in the harmonious team of the socialist school.

Solution to the problem: the “right” characters (school students, teachers, parents, senior party officials) individually or by joint efforts put the “wrong” student on the right track – to become a true pioneer/communist.

Unlike the school topic the topic of university was marginal for the Soviet cinematography of the 1920s – the first half of the 1950s (see, for example, *The Right to a Woman*, 1930; *The Law of Life*, 1940) and had no apparent impact on

film making. Seemingly, university at that time was considered to be a too elite institution to be worthy of mass replicating on the screen.

Conclusions. Thus, the hermeneutic analysis of media texts about school and university of the 1920s – the first half of the 1950s enables us to draw the conclusion that the Soviet cinematography based on the communist ideology:

- in the 1920s sought to depict children, teenagers, youth as committed ideological fighters (who set a good example to backward-looking adults) for the Soviet power and atheism, for the pioneer movement, for sports records; fighters against enemies of different types, illiteracy and homelessness, instead of usual school children who are busy studying or playing games;
- in the 1930s – early 1940s showed school children mostly as fighters: 1) with spies and other public enemies; 2) with German occupants; 3) with negligent and bumptious students;
- in the second half of the 1940s – the first half of the 1950s focused on a mild variant of school struggle against negligent and bumptious students;
- by the mid-1930s developed a screen image of an ideal teacher, a true leader of the communist doctrine, respected by the government and society, a skillful and successful professional;
- used stereotyped storylines, role and gender character profiles in the films about school and university thus avoiding genuine realism and psychological narrative depth.

3. Soviet films about school and university of the "thaw" period (1956-1968)

The "thaw" (1956-1968) in the USSR quite significantly changed media interpretations of school and university. A characteristic feature of the this period was the so-called "return to Lenin's norms of life," which in practice meant that, politicians tried to take, from their point of view, the most valuable aspects of the 1920s policy. As for the schools - it meant democracy elements in the educational process, a certain, albeit constrained by ideology, creative freedom of teachers and students. As A. Prokhorov aptly notes, films about school in the 1960s reflected the general spirit of the revived utopianism (Prokhorov, 2007).

In this context, it is interesting to compare two films of the 1960s depicting schools of the 1920s: *Beat, the Drum!* (1962) and *Republic of SHKID* (1966).

The first of these films, made during the "early thaw" period, is a mixture of naive (although perhaps timeserving disguised as "naive") ideas of the authors about the total rightness of the communist reformers of the school system (young characters organizing the pioneers' community) and the negative image of the representatives of the old gymnasium (the teacher of mathematics and the best, well-born students of the class).

The second one, on the contrary, (also somewhat naively, but sincerely) asserts the possibility of integration of the best representatives of the pre-revolutionary intelligentsia (the principal of school for orphans named after Dostoevsky – Viktor Nikolayevich Sorokin, nicknamed VikNikSor) in the process of creating a new school. VikNikSor in the filigree performance by S. Jursky is "a great idealist and utopian. VikNikSor believes that a person is unique, and the collective of unique people can be an association of creative individuals who do not have to give up themselves and freedom to be together" (Arcus, 2010).

Both films were shot in black and white for a reason, so that the image on the screen reminded viewers of the surviving chronicles of the 1920s. However, against the mediocre visual background of *Beat, the Drum!*, the picture of the *Republic of SHKID* was sophisticated and esthetic, an excellent play of light and shadow referring the audience to the silent film classics. Equally extraordinary was the film montage. Actors' performance in the *Republic of SHKID* was significantly superior to the straightforward interpretation of the characters in *Beat, the Drum!*

As for the use of black and white picture in films depicting schools, in our opinion, it was not always justified. Of course, the intention of the authors of *Beat, the Drum!* (1962) and the *Republic of SHKID* (1966) to produce films resembling a newsreel from the 1920s is understandable. But what drove a director to choose to film in black and white a merry satirical comedy "*Welcome, or No Trespassing!*"? Most of the other films depicting school and university (*Spring in the Riverside Street*, 1956, *See You Next Spring*, 1960; *My Friend, Kolka*, 1961; *Mishka, Serega and I*, 1961; *Wild Dog Dingo*, 1962, *We Love You*, 1962, *Come Tomorrow*, 1962, *Call, open the door*, 1965, *I Loved You ...* (1967), *We'll Live Till Monday*, 1968,

The Transitional Age, 1968, *The Man-to-Man Talk*, 1968, etc.) could have been color. Apparently, there are good reasons why in the XXI century with the help of computer processing (I think, without any damage to the artistic expression), color versions of the popular films were created - *Spring in the Riverside Street* (1956) and *Come Tomorrow* (1962).

Presumably, Soviet cinematographers of the 1960s were too susceptible to the fashion for the black-and-white stylistics of the French "new wave" and "cinema-verite", believing that modern films about schoolchildren should be as close as possible to the "chronicle" image.

The film *Mishka, Serega and I* (1961) is a vivid example of the school's film interpretation in the initial phase of the "thaw" period. Two conflicts unfold concurrently: 1) an eighth grade boy Igor now and then makes mistakes, taking up with punks, then with a selfish and foppish boxing trainer; 2) a young class teacher can not establish contact with his eighth grade. In the course of the film viewers see obvious signs of a deficit of socialist times: a queue to buy a TV is so long that shoppers have to come daily to register in the waiting list, and builders fail to finish an apartment house by May 1 without the help of high school children who work there as electrical installers after school. However, conflicts are resolved by the end of the film: the young teacher becomes schoolchildren's favourite, and Igor gives his friends the word to be an exemplary Komsomol member. Notably, before this promise he utters a lofty monologue: "For people like me, there is no place in communism! But without communism I will not live! ... And without the Komsomol I can not live!". Most likely, this phrase appeared in the film as a reaction of scriptwriters to the adoption by the 22nd CPSU Congress (1961) of the Charter of the CPSU, including the Moral Code of the builder of communism, whose material base was promised to be created by 1980.

By the way, the rhetoric about communism in the thaw films depicting education system underwent a curious transformation. While in the picture *Mishka, Serega and I* (1961) these words sound quite seriously, and the drama about parents and children *Big and Small* (1963) ends with pretentious narrative comment: "Why did you not ask yourself: Was I a communist in my family life?", the film *Citizens and Organizations, please note* (1965), produced only two years later, features a high school student who comes up with a device activated by the movement of students along the school corridor which immediately plays a recording of a cheerful voice: "Stop! Are you ready to live and work in communism?", shown with an obvious irony. Two years later the authors of *Valentin Kuzyaev's Personal Life* (1967) went further: in the key episode of the film, located in the television studio, the then popular band "Singing Guitars" is performing a cheerful pro-Communist song with the words: "Do you want to go camping? Yes! Do you want a million? No!", while the main character, a not very intelligent high school student Kuzyaev listens to it without any enthusiasm and, contrary to previous school film standards, he never becomes better than he is by the end of the film.

L. Arcus, in our opinion, very accurately noticed the characteristic feature of the thaw period films about schoolchildren: in the 1960s, not all of them portrayed a non-conformist character being corrected under the influence of mentors, peers and parents. For example, in the film *My friend, Kolka!* (1961) "there is a class of children. There is a boy standing out of the crowd, Kolka Snegirev. But this time he is not a renegade and egoist, but on the contrary – a bright individuality, an artist, a man who searches for truth, and not a form, for real, not imaginary. He requires breathing from life, and sincerity from the people. He is clearly loved by authors and spectators. His class wants to help him, get over troubles - but without the intention to change him, to assimilate with others. They like him the way he is. It's not a fantasy genre, it is a "thaw" period film with its charming ability of wishful thinking" (Arcus, 2010). The truth is, the film did not escape from some treacle, especially in a touchingly happy ending, when Kolka, the founder of the SSoCS (Secret Society of C-Students), deftly defeats carnappers and deserves the gratitude of the police and a vigorous pioneer song of classmates.

Non-standard students with strong personality and subtle inner world were the main characters in many other school films of the 1960s: *Wild Dog Dingo* (1962), *Call, open the door* (1965), *I loved you ...* (1967), *We'll Live Till Monday* (1968), *Transitional Age* (1968), *The Man-to-Man Talk* (1968).

The cinema images of Soviet teachers changed in the thaw period, too. Very important in this respect is the image of a school teacher from the melodrama *Spring in the Riverside Street* (1956). Here, perhaps, for the first time in the Soviet cinema, a story of the student's love for his teacher appeared. Actually, the authors of the film made sure that there was nothing shocking in this situation: the love story unfolds within the walls of the evening school, the students of which are although young, but grown-up people – workers of the metallurgical plant.

Despite the lyrical melodrama of this story, it contained a kind of ideological overtone: in fact, according to the then ideological doctrine, the working class was "the main component of the structure of Soviet society, the bearer of knowledge necessary for Soviet people" and therefore could "teach the teachers (the intelligentsia) what is impossible to learn in any institution: to be a real Soviet person" (Grigorieva, 2007). And the main character – the teacher of the evening school Tatiana – is so young and inexperienced, that is really likely to fall in love with a charming Sasha, her, so-to-speak, "mentor" from the working class. On the other hand, thanks to the talent of the film's creators, the situation was ambiguous: "in a typical melodrama of the 1930s, Sasha would be entrusted with saving Tanya from herself, but *Spring in the Riverside Street* boldly leaves the question of who has improved who open (Youngblood, 2012, p. 177).

In the earlier mentioned film *My Friend, Kolka!* (1961) the previously unshakably positive image of a teacher / mentor appears in the form of two rival characters: a liberal one and a conservative one. A conservative is the teacher Lydia Mikhailovna. In fact, she and a chairman of the pioneer council Valera Novikov "could become the ideal heroes for films in the previous decades. Always

with some unfortunate young character who tore himself away from the collective and placed own interests above the interests of the class and school, there appeared to a number of wiser and more reasonable teachers and comrades ready to teach a harsh moral lesson, threatening to expel from school or exclude from pioneers or Komsomol members. But Lydia Mikhailovna and Valera Novikov are not portrayed as ideal carriers of collective wisdom" (Artemieva, 2015, p. 54-55): an active public figure and an excellent student Valera is a cynical informer, while a teacher is an avid party functionary (she coordinates all her work with the opinion of the district committee of the CPSU) and a retrograde.

Liberal vs. conservative pedagogical conflicts arose later in the films *My name is Kogea* (1963), *Trains go past the windows* (1965), *We'll live till Monday* (1968) and many others.

In particular, in the drama *Trains Go by the Windows* (1965), the headmaster of a provincial boarding school, remarkably performed by L. Krugly, at first seems to be a positive democrat and a wise mentor for children and teens, while a traditional duo of a conservative middle aged school teacher and a young teacher (a recent graduate of the university) unfolds along. However, gradually, the image of the ironic headmaster gives away the authoritarian features of a tough, soulless manager, and he turns out to be much more dangerous for a young heroine than explicit conservatives.

Seemingly an outspoken conservative and a negative character in the satirical comedy *Welcome, or No Trespassing!* (1964) – the principal of the pioneer summer camp Dynin, brilliantly performed by Y. Evstigneev, is also not so straightforward: he sincerely desires that the institution entrusted to him is kept in order (though supported by denunciations), so that schoolchildren get full nutrition (and not chat while eating), play active games (but quietly), bathe in the river (under supervision and in shallow parts), watch movies in the evenings (but without love episodes).

Another negative image of a teacher, however presented more harshly, appeared in the film *What if it's love?* (1961). There's a scandal at school: a strict teacher of the German language gets a love letter, written by a high school senior Boris addressed to his classmate Ksenia. Ideologically brought up Maria Pavlovna is certainly very worried: honour and moral standards of Soviet school are challenged. Thus, due to her interference, relationships of Ksenia and Boris are being discussed by school faculty, their classmates, parents, and neighbours.

Today the conflict of the film by Y. Raizman *What if it's love?* seems to be trifle: school seniors date, so what? However in 1961 things were different. The problem of the first teenage love, that fell under the social pressure, was discussed earnestly in almost all press. In a word, this film had about the same resonance in the 1960s, as *Little Vera* in the end of the 1980s.

Sexual motif was, perhaps, the boldest one in the Raizman's film, because strict Stalin's censorship that ruled in the 1930s-1950s, did not let premarital sexual contacts between school students (and youth in general) on the screen. It was only

in the NEP (New Economic Policy in Russia in the 1920s) period that Soviet cinema could afford making such a film as *A Prostitute* (1927). In the sound Soviet cinema (until the Perestroika), love affairs of young women could only be depicted in retro period films, such as film adaptation of Leo Tolstoy's (*Resurrection*) and Panas Mirny's *Hooker*, where main characters were young "fallen" women, but action took place, naturally, during the times of "hated Tsar's regime".

We agree with an opinion that the motif of sexual guilt was born by the Soviet culture's Puritanism, grounded in the 1930s both socialistically and socially realistically. In the 1960s the love language was slowly rehabilitated, but the sex language only remains to exist within medical or obscene vocabularies. According to Maria Pavlovna and Ksenia's mother, sex before marriage is something catastrophically amoral. "Better" characters (for example, a young teacher) clean Boris and Ksenia's love of suspicions in "this". The thaw period film criticism followed the same route" (Romanova, 2012, p.192). Sexual context in school films was so important for Soviet society and state, that it was argued about in the Central Committee of CPSU, in the Ministry of Culture and The Cinematographers' Union. As a result, the film scene of intimacy between Boris and Ksenia was cut shorter and voiced over.

Lev Anninsky wrote that "the message of Raizman's film is that he plunged the plot in the atmosphere of thick everyday life, social force, rigid predetermination, small pinpricks that people stung, killed the feeling with" (Anninsky, 1991, p. 82). Iconographic analysis of the drama *What if it's love?* reveals its other differences from "thaw" optimism. Black-and-white visual picture distinctly portrays gloomy ill-provision, as though borrowed from the famous black sequence of Polish cinema of the late 1950s: black windows of the new, still not inhabited flats, dusty grounds around apartment buildings, windy emptiness around the new neighbourhood (Romanova, 2012, p. 194). Moreover, it turns out that a lot of secondary film characters are united not because of mutual positive values, but because of their desire to hurt the feelings of vulnerable teens in love.

Surprisingly, a melodrama *Story of the First Love* (1957), produced 4 years earlier, did not give rise to such censorship tornado, although it contained such plot twists that in our opinion, could have shocked the chaste Soviet public: 1) a ninth grader falls in love with his classmate and he wins her affection, too; 2) a PE teacher openly pesters his pretty student; 3) defending his girlfriend's honour, the main character courageously fights against an indecent teacher. One has to agree that no Soviet film about school until the 1980s depicted anything like the second and the third point. However, unlike Y. Raizman's film, *Story of the First Love* didn't contain any sexual scenes, and most importantly, all the plot's rough angles were smoothed by the soft lyricism of a melodrama, where even the "bad guy" PE teacher sincerely sings a hit song "Why, oh, why, I don't know, I believed your blue eyes..." The actors' age, performing ninth graders was deliberately distanced from school: J. Osmolovskaya was 19, K. Stolyarov – 20, and V .Zemlyanikin – 24.

The film made by the end of the thaw period – *We'll live till Monday* (1968), defined the authors' understanding of the Soviet school crisis as a model of the state crisis. L. Arcus accurately points out that a History teacher Melnikov in this drama is a kind of a white crow, an outsider: "almost invisible ripple of anguish runs through his face: because of ignorance ("There is no such a verb in the Russian language, my dear, save our ears"), because of vulgarity ("Baratynsky is a poet of the secondary importance"), of silliness ("Folly should be a fool's private property"), of lies and profanation of his subject ("Look at the textbook published this year"). In rendering it sounds like dissidentism, but Tikhonov succeeds most in expressing the state of hopeless torment when he's silent. It's amazing, what acting school we have lost! There are a lot of close-ups in the film, and one can write a book about the ways Tikhonov *watches*. The way he looks at his students: at a poet Genka Shestopal, he sees himself as if in the mirror; at a cynical handsome guy Batischev – seeing an eternal opponent. He watches his whole class at the end of the film having a presentiment of what is going to happen to each of them, and being aware that nothing could be changes. The main colour of his portrait is ash fatigue" (Arcus, 2010). This having no alternative weariness explains why a bachelor Melnikov is not in a hurry to return affection of a pretty English teacher, why in spite of his intense longing for a different job, he continues teaching History lessons, subjected to political climate.

On the other hand, there's something "unprofessional" about Melnikov. He looked at school as if from the outside, and he taught a lesson as though it was his first day in class and he came across the emotional deafness of pupils for the first time" (Soloveichik, 1975).

Though his main pedagogical opponent, a Literature teacher Svetlana Mikhailovna is "limited, teaches her subject "from here to here", dryasdust, self righteous, and avidly follows instructions, apart from other film teachers in the past, she has neither jolly enthusiasm, nor fanaticism. Only loneliness and again, fatigue" (Arcus, 2010).

Thus, *We'll live till Monday* no less than M. Khutsiev's masterpiece *July Rain* (1966), finely demonstrated the crisis (or even the collapse) of "thaw" ideals in Soviet intelligentsia, who sharper than others felt the essence of regressive political, social and cultural tendencies in the USSR.

Nevertheless, the major "thaw" school film, in the allegoric form having depicted the bureaucratic model of the authoritarian Soviet state, was a bold comedy *Welcome, or no Trespassing!* directed by E. Klimov based on the script by S. Lungin and I. Nusinov.

Perhaps we can agree with the opinion that the main technique in the film is an oxymoron, a combination of the incongruous: "the film's title is positioned in the frame as a political satire: the sign "Welcome" with a shining sun adorns the tightly closed gates of the camp (the most deft, however, know where you can climb through a hole in the fence). Lower is an peephole with the suspicious word "or"; and, finally, at the bottom – "No Trespassing"; all together is a typical

example of foreign policy of the socialism times. The word "or" allows one to assume a choice between both parts of the name, and equate them with the meaning "that is" (Fedorova, 2012, p. 218).

Soviet censorship, of course, went through this film of E. Klimov with his unwavering ideological hand, but did not succeed in deciphering the essence of the satirical film text to the full extent.

For example, many scenes of E. Klimov's film feature a persistent overhead slogan: "Children are the masters of our camp!", that, on the one hand, caused associations with the state, built by the camp type, and on the other hand, it hinted at the sheer hypocrisy of using the word "masters" in it, since in the USSR the real masters of life were party bosses and bureaucrats, and not workers, peasants and their children.

Unlike the period of the 1920s – early 1950s, the Soviet cinema of the "thaw" era increasingly touched upon the subject of university. Sometimes in the comedic genre (*Come Tomorrow*, 1962, *Madness*, 1965), but mostly in the (melo) dramatic (*Different Fates*, 1956, *They Met on the Way*, 1957, *The City lights up*, 1958, *Peers*, 1958, *I, Newton Street*, 1963).

In the films *Different Fates* (1956), *The City lights up* (1958) and *Peers* (1958), the theme of the university played a marginal role. In the melodrama *They met on the Way* (1957) – is was the key one. The girl who successfully entered the pedagogical college gives a helping hand to the worker who failed the entrance exams, as a result, the young tutor and her student fall in love with each other, and the latter, of course, becomes a successful student next year. In between, a cute career-centered student deserves public condemnation, and a gray-bearded "old school" professor sings songs together with his students. In a word, the film, although from the "thaw" period, was absolutely tied (both by the plot and style) to the late Stalin's epoch.

In the popular musical comedy *Come Tomorrow* (1962) a provincial girl Frosya, thanks to innate vocal abilities, enters the conservatory and, despite all sorts of obstacles and absurdities, eventually becomes a favorite of a wise teacher. A film with such a simple story and with such a heroine could have also appeared in the late 1940s, 1950s, and even in the 1970s.

Another film about students is *I, Newton Street* (1963). It also tells a story of a provincial guy who enters a university in the capital, but in the genre of a drama. Student Timothy faces a serious life test: his scientific work, written together with a classmate, wins a prestigious competition, but ... soon it turns out that it contains an awkward mistake. A weak classmate begs Timofey not to tell anyone about this, but he rejects this dishonest proposal and leaves for his hometown, where, he works on a new version of scientific work. Perhaps, there are no particular hallmarks of the thaw period. Stories about high tones students, for whom the truth is the most valuable asset, often unfolded in (audiovisual) texts both in Stalin's times and in post-thaw times, too. Only some details in *I, Newton Street* give us a

hint about its historical background: poets performing at the Mayakovsky's monument, Y. Kim's songs and expressive camera work.

The "thaw period" films (1956-1968) on the school/university topic

Place of action, historical, social, cultural, political, and ideological context

Historical context

Features of the historical period when media texts were created, market conditions that contributed to the idea, the process of creating media texts, the degree of influence of that time on media texts.

The timeframe for the historical period of the "thaw" has been defined conditionally from 1956 (denunciation of Stalin's personality cult at the XX Congress of the CPSU) to 1968 (the invasion of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia).

The main characteristics of this historical period:

- condemnation of Stalin's personality cult;
- end of mass terror of the state's citizens, while maintaining a "milder" struggle (which, as a rule, did not involve prolonged imprisonment and physical extermination) with dissenters (like Boris Pasternak, Andrei Sinyavsky, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, and others);
- the continuation of the process of industrialization (mainly heavy and military industries);
- agricultural reforms (development of virgin lands, creation of economic councils, etc.);
- realization of the state program of mass housing construction;
- a successful start of the "space era" (launching the world's first satellite, the world's first cosmonaut);
- renewal of the communist ideology, oriented to the works of V. Lenin and post-Stalinist ideologists, with less intense than, for example, in the 1920s, but still open fight against religion;
- official theses about the established unified community of the Soviet people and the absence in the USSR of class, ethnic, national, and racial problems;
- the rejection of the idea of the world revolution and the proletariat's dictatorship, replacing it with the idea of a "peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist systems" (which, of course, did not exclude the ideological confrontation against bourgeois states, the militarization, unleashing local military conflicts, intervention in Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968), military and economic support of pro-communist regimes in developing countries, for example, in Cuba).
- a drastic growth of film production, the resumption of the Moscow International Film Festival;
- expansion (still with censorship) of scope of creative freedom in the cultural sphere, including literature, theater and cinema;
- the gradual curtailment of the "thaw" tendencies (including the cinema), the reduction of the criticism of Stalinism (after Leonid Brezhnev came to power in October 1964) against the backdrop of solemn celebrations of Soviet communist jubilees on a national scale.

"The Law on Strengthening the School's Contact with Life and on the Further Development of the Public Education System in the USSR" (1958) began another reform of the Soviet educational system. The obligatory education was 8 years. An 11-year program incorporating vocational (two days a week) as well as academic training replaced the traditional ten-year primary and secondary general school. The role and share (up to 15%) of vocational training in the educational process sharply increased. It was assumed that schoolchildren will work twice a week in special training workshops (or plants/factories), and General Certificate of Education will be supplemented with a certificate of the acquired vocational qualification. By 1962 all seven-year-schools were turned into eight-year schools. However, it soon became clear that enhancement of labor training had a negative effect: the level of knowledge of students in basic subjects dropped. That is why, in September 1966, the Soviet school returned to a ten year program again, and the idea of professional training within the school curriculum, was left behind.

Table 1. Key dates and events in the USSR and the world in the "thaw" period (1956-1968): politics, economy, education and culture

<i>Years</i>	Key dates and events in the USSR and the world in the "thaw" period (1956-1968): politics, economy, and culture
1956	Khrushchev's secret speech, denouncing the deceased Joseph Stalin made to a closed session of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: February 25. Pro-Stalin's riots in Tbilisi: March. "Cominform" (Communist Information Bureau) was dissolved: April 17. Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee "On Overcoming the Personality Cult and Its Consequences": June 30. The cancellation of tuition fees in the senior classes of secondary school, as well as in secondary special and higher educational institutions of the USSR : September. The Hungarian Revolution: October 23 – November 9. The Suez crisis in Egypt: October 30 – December 22. The High Courses for Film Directors (higher education establishment) opened in Moscow: November.
1957	Letter of CPSU Central Committee about "Fostering political work of party organizations among masses and suppression of attacks of anti-Soviet hostile elements": January. Plenum of CPSU Central Committee on Literature and Art: June 22-29. The exclusion from the leadership of the CPSU of the "anti-party opposition" (G. Malenkov, V. Molotov, L. Kaganovich, D. Shepilov): June 29. World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow: July 28-August 11. A test of the first Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching the territory of the United States. The successful launch of the world's first artificial satellites: October - November. The publication in the western countries of the novel by B. Pasternak <i>Doctor Zhivago</i> : November.
1958	The Soviet film <i>The Cranes Are Flying</i> is awarded the main prize of the Cannes Film Festival - Palme d'Or: May. Exhibition of American abstractionists in Moscow. The opening of the monument of V. Mayakovsky in Moscow, where poets freely performed: July. The award of the Nobel Prize for Literature to Boris Pasternak - "For significant achievements in contemporary lyrical poetry, as well as for the continuation of the traditions of the great Russian epic novel" (<i>Doctor Zhivago</i>). The denunciation of Boris Pasternak by the USSR authorities and the leaders of the Union of Soviet Writers: October. Boris Pasternak is expelled from the Soviet Writers' Union: October 27. "The law on strengthening the school's connection with life and the further development of the system of public education in the USSR": December 24. Adoption of the "Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation", abolishing the concept of "enemy of the

	people", raising the age of criminal liability from 14 to 16: December 25.
1959	The victory of pro-communist revolutionaries in Cuba: January 1. Order of the Minister of Culture of the USSR "On serious shortcomings of ideological and educational work in the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography": January 18. XXI Congress of the CPSU: the proclamation of the complete and final victory of socialism: January 27 - February 5. Opening of the American exhibition in Moscow: July 25. The First Moscow International Film Festival: August 3-17. Negotiations between Nikita Khrushchev and D. Eisenhower in the United States: September 15-27.
1960	Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On the tasks of party propaganda in the modern conditions": January 9. The U.S. spy plane, piloted by G. Powers is shot down: May 1. L. Brezhnev is the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR: May 4. Opening of the Higher two-year scriptwriters' courses in Moscow: November 1.
1961	Soviet note of protest to US President J. Kennedy, related to the the anti-Castro landing in Cuba: April 8. Launch of the world's first Soviet spacecraft with a man on board: April 12. Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR "On Strengthening the Struggle Against Persons Who Avoid Socially Useful Work and Lead an Antisocial Parasitic Way of Life": May 4. The beginning of the construction of the Berlin Wall: August 13. XXII Congress of the CPSU. Adoption of the new Program and the new Charter of the CPSU. Decision on the removal of Stalin's remains from the tomb in Mausoleum: October 7-31.
1962	The increase in prices for meat (by 30%) and milk (by 25%) in the USSR: June 1. The demonstration of Novochoerkassk workers who protested the increase for food prices is dispersed by gunfire: June 2. Decree of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On measures to improve the leadership of the artistic cinematography": July 19. Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On increasing the effectiveness of statements by the Soviet press": September 18. After the start of the installation of Soviet missiles in Cuba, the US declares a sea blockade of the island. The politically tense Caribbean crisis begins, which forces the USSR to remove missiles from Cuba in exchange for the US promise to abandon the occupation of the "Island of Freedom": October 14 - November 20. "New World" journal publishes Alexander Solzhenitsyn's novel <i>One Day of Ivan Denisovich</i> : November. Nikita Khrushchev visits an exhibition of Moscow artists in the Manege (today Moscow Art Exhibition): December 1.
1963	The meeting of the leadership of the CPSU with the creative intelligentsia of the USSR in the Kremlin: March 7-8. Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On measures for the further development of higher and secondary education": May 9. Reaching the agreement between the USSR and the United States on creating a "hot" telephone line between Moscow and Washington: June 20. Resolution of the plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On the forthcoming tasks of the party's ideological work": June. Jamming of the Voice of America, BBC and German Wave programs in Russian on the territory of the USSR ceased. The assassination of the US President J. Kennedy in Dallas: November 24.
1964	Report of the KGB to the Central Committee of the CPSU on the anti-Soviet attitudes of VGIK students. Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On the film studio Mosfilm": February 3. The US starts the war in Vietnam: August 2. Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU removes Nikita Khrushchev from power and elect Leonid Brezhnev the First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: October 14.
1965	A. Leonov, leaving his spacecraft for 12 minutes, becomes the first person to walk in space: March 18. The USSR supplies missiles to North Vietnam: April 5. David Lean's film of <i>Doctor Zhivago</i> , starring Omar Sharif and Julie Christie, is released: December.
1966	France withdraws from the NATO military organization: February 21. XXIII Congress of the CPSU: March 29 - April 8. The visit of French President General de Gaulle to Moscow: June 20 - July 1.
1967	Six-day war in the Middle East, breaking diplomatic relations between Israel and the USSR: July 5-10. Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On measures for the further development of social sciences and enhancing their role in communist construction": August 14.

	Solemn celebration of the 50th anniversary of Soviet power: November.
1968	Order Committee on Cinematography of the USSR "On the purchase and rental of foreign films" (for the purpose of excluding the penetration of bourgeois propaganda on the Soviet screen): July 31. "Student Revolution" in Paris: May. The resumption of the USSR jamming the broadcasts of "Voice of America" and other western radio stations in Russian on the USSR territory: August 20. The invasion of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia: August 21. The publication of A. Solzhenitsyn's <i>The First Circle</i> abroad: December.

Soviet "thaw" audiovisual texts on the subject of school and university, according to the authorities, were supposed to support the main lines of the then state policy in the educational and socio-cultural spheres, that is, to show that the Soviet system of education, upbringing and culture is being reformed, and namely:

- the educational process goes beyond the previous strict framework of the Stalinist rules (while maintaining common communist landmarks and a rigid anti-religious orientation);

- the relationships between teachers and students are becoming more democratic, creative, based on the experience of Soviet pedagogues- innovators of the 1920s;

- there are some problem zones at school and university (in particular, the interpretation of the image of the Soviet teacher as an ideal representative of the educated part of the society was de-idealized).

Genre modifications of school and university subjects: drama, detective, less often: melodrama, comedy.

How does the knowledge of true historical events of a particular period help to understand the given media texts, examples of historical references in these media texts.

In the films *Flags on the Towers* (1958), *Beat, the Drum!* (1962), *The First Teacher* (1966), *Republic of SHKID* (1966), the pioneer movement of the 1920s and the pedagogical direction of Soviet teachers (like A. Makarenko, V. Soroka-Rosinsky, etc.) was shown as a positive approach. The films *Clouds over Borsk* (1960), *Miraculous* (1960), *Sinful Angel* (1962), consistently reflected the anti-religious state policy. The films *Welcome, or No Trespassing!* (1964), *Trains Go by the Windows* (1965) and *We'll Live till Monday* (1968), featured some teachers with serious professional flaws. *Story of the First Love* (1957), *What if it's love?* (1961), *Wild Dog Dingo* (1962), *I Loved You...* (1967) depicted the problem of love relations between high school students.

In the Soviet films of the "thaw" period, schoolchildren, of course, could be featured sitting in meetings, condemning someone for misconduct (for instance, religiosity or laziness). But on the whole, the cinematic focus of the interpretation of the school and university theme shifted towards the ordinary school life, to the development of the personality (*Wild Dog Dingo*", 1962, *The Gulf Stream* (1968), *We'll Live Till Monday*, 1968, *The Man-to Man Talk*, 1968, *Transitional Age*, 1968, etc.), to the examination of the inner world of teachers (*Trains Go by the Windows*, 1965, *The First Teacher*, 1966, *We'll Live Till Monday*, 1968, *Literature*

Lesson (1968), etc. At the same time, schoolchildren (unlike their film counterparts in the 1920s and 1930s) no longer appeared on the screen as some sort of conductors of the communist tomorrow, leading the lost adults on the right track.

Socio-cultural, ideological, religious context

Ideology, directions, goals, objectives, world outlook, the concepts of the media texts' authors in the socio-cultural context; ideology, culture of the world, depicted in these media texts

In the period of the thaw, communist ideology (including anti-capitalist, anti-religious orientation, the theory of socialist realism) in the USSR continued to dominate. Filmmaking was also under censorship (albeit less strict than in the 1930s and 1940s). Therefore the authors of the majority of audiovisual media texts on the school-university theme were to comply with these rules of the game. In fact, in some films (such as, *Welcome, or No Trespassing!*, 1964, *We'll Live Till Monday*, 1968, *Literature Lesson*, 1968), these rules were violated by certain oddities that arose, as it seemed, in spite of the genre or thematic field, say - whimsical rhythms, fancies of intonation, figurative accents in "wrong" places or seemingly irrelevant artistic arrangement of the narrative. Film viewers who anticipated to watch another innocent drama soon began to feel uncomfortable. They could not help feeling that though everything seemed to be clear and correct in the film, yet something was wrong, something was subtly annoying and makes the perception unsettled (Kovalov, 2016, p.11).

The world outlook of the characters in media texts about school

In general, the worldview of the characters of audiovisual media texts on the theme of school and university during the thaw, as in the previous three decades, was optimistic, at that time the optimism was connected with the prospects of building "socialism with a human face". Students -vivid personalities were often ridden by doubts (*Wild Dog Dingo, I loved you ..., We'll live till Monday*, etc.). Doubts and reflections were also characteristic of screen teachers, too (*Trains go by the windows, We'll Live Till Monday, Literature Lesson*, etc.).

At first glance, the hierarchy of values, according to this world view, has remained the same: communist ideology, collectivism, diligence, honesty, atheism, willingness to give a helping hand to good or flawed people. But there were also new colors: audiovisual media texts virtually didn't portray hatred of the internal class enemies, the heroism of the students gave way to everyday events (including first school love); at the same time, the level of critical reflection of reality has noticeably risen. For example, a school teacher from the witty comedy "Literature Lesson" not only openly dislikes his randomly chosen profession, but sets himself the task of living for at least one day ... without lying (of course, it was for this seditious intention that the film was banned for screening).

Thus, it was the model of "socialism with a human face," rather than classical communist ideals, that determined the world view of the characters in the audiovisual "school world" of the thaw period. And it was this model that quickly began to disappear when the end of the thaw by the Brezhnev regime after the

events in Czechoslovakia in 1968, when Soviet tanks were brought into Prague in fear that "socialism with a human face" could win in a single state.

Structure and narrative modes in media texts

Schematically, the structure, plot, representativeness, ethics, genre modifications, iconography, characters of audiovisual media texts about school and university in "thaw" period can be presented as follows:

- *the location and time period.* Leaving aside the plots where schoolchildren and students appeared (often episodically) only outside the walls of educational institutions (let us recall, Valery, the schoolboy from the *Elusive Avengers* who, fighting the enemies of Soviet state, actually never appear at school), one can say that the main location in films on the school theme of the "thaw" era is school classes and corridors, and the plot is set mostly (if it's not a retro about 1920s) at the time when the film is made

- *the environment typical for these media texts, household items:* the furnishings and household items of school films are still modest, at times ascetic (as, for example, in *The First Teacher*).

It is very indicative that in Soviet films on the school topic in many cases "there is no private space for a teenager – his room. Most often because of its actual absence due to the poor housing situation in the country, but even when the room is there, nothing there characterizes the owner. It's just a room with a bed and a desk, there is not the slightest attribute of its owner. ... the commitment for intellectual and high culture and the neglect of interior and decor. The same reason is why a fashionably dressed character is almost always negative" (Zharikova, 2015, p. 62).

- *genre modifications: mostly drama, sometimes melodrama or comedy.*

- *(stereotyped) devices to depict reality:* positive characters are less often shown as idealized, while negative ones, on the contrary, have deeper dimensions than just a caricature. However, relapses, of course, are possible. For example, in the professionally helpless *Boys* (1959), a cheesy teacher brings to the class a model of the space satellite, thus causing a sensation in the class only consisting of diligent and perfect schoolchildren. And in the detective story *Shadows of an Old Castle* (1966), a super-positive teacher who instantly finds contact with schoolchildren takes a job in an Estonian boarding school located in an ancient castle, very soon finds out that the key faculty members (presented rather grotesquely) are former Nazis and treacherous enemies of Soviet power.

Character typology:

- *the age of characters:* the age of schoolchildren is in the range of 7-17 years, however, teenagers are more common. The age of the adult characters (teachers, parents, grandparents, etc.) can be anything, but adults below 60 prevail;

- *the education level:* for schoolchildren it corresponds to their class; the teachers presumably graduated from higher education institution, supporting characters can have any level of education;

- social status, occupation: the financial situation of the students is approximately the same, they can be either from the families of workers and farmers, or from the intelligentsia. The professions of their parents are in a fairly diverse range.

- the marital status of the characters: schoolchildren, naturally, are not bound by marriage; adult characters are mostly married, however, single teachers appear in film more frequently;

- appearance, clothes, body build, features of their characters, vocabulary: the appearance of schoolchildren and students in the films of the "thaw" period is in the framework of then popular ideas about how the students should look (for example, wearing school uniform was obligatory).

A shot from the movie *What if it's love?* (1961) gives a good idea of the appearance, clothes, physique of characters – schoolchildren.



A shot from the movie *What if it's love?* (1961)

School children in the thaw films are mostly not so purposeful, bold, polite and active as their peers from the moving pictures in the 1930s, but on the whole they remain optimistic about life. However, more and more often negative characters appear, the hopes for reformation of whom are not as big as they used to be.

Teachers from the films of the early thaw period look similar to those in the 1930s and 1940s: they were distinguished by modesty in clothes. Teachers' clothes don't follow fashion. They look more like a uniform: a dark suit, a skirt/trousers and a jacket with a white or light blouse, classical shoes. Classical hairdo for a female teacher is a hair bun (Tatiana Sergeevna (a teacher from the film *Spring in the Riverside Street* – A.F. & A.L.) at home walks around with loose hair, but she gathers it in a bun every time she goes to work)" (Grigorieva, 2007).

Late thaw film teachers are no longer perceived by unambiguous symbols of the struggle for communism, they have lost an ideal halo, and more often they are in doubts, discontent with their life. Another serious, symptomatic for modern culture as a whole, a social problem, articulated by Soviet cinema, is a social gap decrease between a teacher and a student (Shipulina, 2010). In particular, in the

comedy *Literature Lesson* (1968), a young teacher is on back-slapping terms with a struggling student.



A shot from the movie *Spring in the Riverside Street*(1956)

A shot from the movie *We'll Live Till Monday* (1968) reflects the appearance, clothes, physique of the characters-teachers of the late thaw years.

Negative image of school and teachers of the "tsarist regime" in the thaw period occupied a marginal place in Soviet cinema (*The First Bastille*, 1965).

A significant change in the life of media characters: schoolchildren live a normal life, but among them there are students who: learn poorly (*Big and Small*, 1963, *Attention, Citizens and Organizations*, 1965; *Three and a half days from the life of Ivan Semyonov, a second-grader and a repeater*, 1966), behave badly (*My name is Kogia*, 1963, *Three and a half days from the life of Ivan Semyonov, a second-grader and a repeater*, 1966), are exposed to bad influence (*Mishka, Serega and I*, 1961), become religious (*Clouds over Borsk*, 1960, *Miraculous*, 1960), lay hands on other people's money (*We love you*, 1962), fall in love earlier the due age (*Story of the First Love*, 1957, *What if it's love?*, 1961, *Wild Dog Dingo*, 1963, *I loved you*, 1967).

The challenge that the characters face: disturbance of the habitual life, because a character, for different reasons not fitting into the standard framework of school life, shows up.

Solving the problem: early thaw period: "correct" characters (schoolchildren, teachers, parents) individually or together, return nonconformist schoolchildren to ordinary life (*My Name is Kogia*, 1963, *Three and a half days from the life of Ivan Semenov, a second grader and a repeater*, 1966, *Mishka, Serega and I*, 1961, etc.); peak and decline of the thaw: negative characters (conservative teachers, parents, counselors and other retrogrades) successfully or unsuccessfully try to restore the status quo (*What if it's Love*, 1961, *My friend*,

Kolka! .. 1961, *Welcome, or No Trespassing!*, 1964, *Trains Go by the Windows*, 1965).

Conclusions. In summary, the "thaw period" films (1956-1968) concerning school/university can be conditionally divided into two stages: early (1956-1963) and late (1964-1968), although, of course, there was a certain diffusion between the cinematography of these periods.

These audiovisual texts, according to the authorities, were supposed to support the main state policy in the educational and socio-cultural spheres, that is, to show that the Soviet system of education, upbringing and culture is being reformed: 1) the educational process goes beyond the previous strict framework of the Stalinist rules (while maintaining common communist landmarks and a rigid anti-religious orientation); 2) the relationships between teachers and students are becoming more democratic, creative, based on the experience of Soviet pedagogues-innovators of the 1920s; 3) there are some problem zones at school and university (in particular, the interpretation of the image of the Soviet teacher as an ideal representative of the educated part of the society was de-idealized).

The early thaw stage was characterized by a romantic reliance on the pedagogical experience of the revolutionary Soviet pedagogy of the 1920s and the creation of touching lyrical stories, where, despite minor difficulties, the harmony of good teachers and, at first, stumbling but in the end, good students, won.

During the second stage of the thaw, new tendencies were manifested increasingly frequent: on the one hand, the crisis, the disillusionment and fatigue of teachers, and on the other hand, the pragmatic cynicism of students.

4. Soviet films about school and university of the "stagnation" period (1969-1985)

The post-thaw period began to point out schoolchildren's pragmatic and ironic attitude towards teachers. About twenty years ago the teacher on the screen was a wise role model, a fair mentor. But in the movie *Cross the Threshold* (1970), a high school student with advanced mathematical abilities, not in the least afraid of the wrathful reaction of the teacher, openly declares: "I don't want to be in your shoes ... I hope to find a better use for my abilities ... You had not thought that you would end up in school, I hope that I manage to avoid such a fate". Thus, as *Literature Lesson* (1968), that was "shelved", i.e. not released in the cinemas, this film crossed the threshold of a positive character's respectful attitude to the pedagogical profession.

Similarly, the teacher's authority was challenged in the drama *Translation from English* (1972), where the teacher-trainee performed by G. Taratorkin did not hesitate to admit that he entered a pedagogical university because of the fear of failing more complicated examinations at technical university. An English teacher, performed by M. Bulgakova looked old-fashioned, deliberately communistically engaged elderly idealist, with fragile health damaged by stressful work.

The main character of the drama *The Diary of the School Principal* (1975), unlike his colleague from *We'll Live till Monday* (1968), has neither an antique-style apartment with an aristocratic mother, nor a girl-admirer with damp eyes, nor a velvet voice; no gestures, no righteous anger, no civic pathos... He has a small two room flat, an aging wife, a chronic time trouble and a face of the man who forgot when he had last looked at himself in the mirror (Arcus, 2010). Such a teacher, certainly, did not make the young audience willing to take up the burden of the pedagogical profession. In the brilliant performance of Oleg Borisov, the audience saw a person who has already denied himself the right to drama. A person who lives the life as it is, within the time released – because there won't be another life or time. A man who no longer charges life, time, or people – he only hopes to pay his dues. He does not feel himself a hero, he fulfills his duties. This is a quiet standing of the intellectual in the face of a deceitful era (Arcus, 2010). The principal is bitterly questioned by his own son: "Is *this* what you wasted your life on?"

A similar situation occurs in the drama *Almost the same age* (1984), where a wife sadly tells her husband, a young teacher: "It's time to become someone ... Look at yourself, what are you?". And then, with sarcasm, she adds: "A teacher ...". The situation is no better in the drama *Sweet Grass Juice* (1984), where a beginning teacher complains that children are terrible and her life did not work out precisely because of the recklessly chosen pedagogical profession.

It seems that the authors of the drama *The Follower* (1984) were going to argue with such a pessimistic stance, making a film about the high destiny of the teacher, the noble beauty of his work, the continuity of the pedagogical occupation.

From the very first shots, *The Follower* gravitates toward a symbol, parable-like system. Another variation of the return of the prodigal son is played on the screen. The story of a young, ambitious guy who could not fight the temptation (an invitation to move from the countryside to the capital, a prestigious job in the ministry) to change his occupation (the hero quits his teaching job at a rural school), but then on top of his success he rethinks his life and starts it anew, returning to an abandoned father's home.

There is something about the story of temptation and return for lots of filmmakers. Perhaps, because it allows to show a person at the turning points of life, to look deeper and more closely into his character. In *The Follower* at first it seems that the traditional plot scheme will be filled with deep meaning. There is neither an odd one out scene, nor an accidental detail, everything is carefully thought out - from the texture of the interiors to the costumes of the characters. If a small orphan Valya in the severe post-war years steals a pen from an old teacher Rusov, then a passing truck, by will of fate, will necessarily bring the boy to that wooden house from which he has just escaped. If an old Rusov adopts Valya, Rusov, Jr., after many years, having abandoned his wife and son in Moscow, will also adopt a mop headed boy, deprived of parental love. Even an occasional meeting with a chauffeur has not been spared. In about twenty years, in some incomprehensible way, he will find Valentin Rusov in the ministerial office and ask him to sell a house in a remote town of Kandaurovka.

This deliberate, circular plot sometimes loses the breath of real life. Signs of the time are limited to Robertino Loretti's songs and Yevgeny Evtushenko's poems, and the characters often seem too static and unambiguous. The purity and nobility of the conception are not implemented to the fullest – neither in drama, which suffers from schematism and straightforward motivations, nor in the film direction that attempts to translate the plot in a poetic vein. Alas, the poetics of the movie is based on banal symbols and trite metaphors, like a damaged model set of a rural school that is gathering dust on the balcony of the luxuriously furnished apartment of the protagonist during his career peak.

I. Kalnysh is constrained, unemotional in the role of Valentin Rusov. We cannot sense the inspiration of the teaching talent, which is so often declared in verbal form. Whenever the actor tries to play emotional generosity, it turns out pretentious falsity, as in the scene where Valentin, who for the first time after a long separation, met his beloved woman, eagerly invites his best student Vanechka to enter the room at a moment, frankly speaking, not suitable for onlookers.

Even such a talented master, as Nikolai Grinko, was powerless to overcome the commonplace didactics of his character, the old Rusov. However, in the film opening shots, peering at his wise and sad eyes, one believes that such a person is able to teach goodness and kindness. But as soon as N. Grinko's character begins to speak, the didacticism speaks up. Moreover, after viewing the film, its title raises a different, unplanned by the authors connotation - replication, unwillingness to go further, to introduce something intimate.

Things turn really bad for the teachers in *Practical Joke* (1976). A pragmatic schoolboy here is completely hardened, walks with a pompous gait, has imperious habits, rules the class. He is terrible in anger. The pejorative monologue that he refers to the honorable teacher on the day of her jubilee (the zero result of life, no one needs you now, the old shoe, etc.) almost falls under the crime of personal insult (Arcus, 2010).

However, one should not think that the 1970s' film represented educators solely as lost (albeit talented) losers who concede defeat in verbal fights to young pragmatists. In the same years, some school films featured talented teachers in full harmony with equally bright students.

Of course, by this time the school theme in the Soviet cinema has undergone significant changes. In *Problem Child (Certificate of Maturity, 1954)* the "healthy class" unanimously cleared of individuality an extraordinary but too proud and independent tenth-grader. But in the 1970s it were outstanding people who set the tone in such films as *Practical Joke* (1976), *The Key That Should Not Be Handed On* (1976), *Schedule For the Day after Tomorrow* (1978) and *The Tuning Fork* (1979). Their authors unequivocally made it clear that though it happens rather seldom, no school is immune from the presence of outstanding students.

These wunderkinds appeared on the screen for the reason. First, they were an exception. Then they became more numerous, almost the whole class (*The Key That Should Not Be Handed On, Tuning Fork*). And in I. Dobrolyubov's film *Schedule For the Day after Tomorrow*, an experimental "school for geniuses" in physics and mathematics emerged. The school principal matches his position: he is a young Ph.D., he plays water polo with his students. Certainly, the teachers also have academic degrees and titles. They are all cheerful, witty people. Their students catch up with them, too.

While one can doubt how the advanced intellectual teachers from *The Key That Should Not Be Handed On* and *The Tuning Fork* managed to turn the ordinary class into an elite class, it is a different story here. Special teachers. Special school. Special students with special problems? By no means – the problems are the same: the "geniuses" also fall in love, to the best of their ability cause material damage (two school laboratories are blown up in one and a half hours of screen time (not on purpose, of course, but because of a failed scientific experiment), some schoolchildren even have low grades in some subjects.

Using the terminology of "young Einsteins", the guarantee of a harmonious development of an individual is the compensation by liberal arts subjects of the gravitation towards sciences. Well, the new Literature teacher successfully copes with the task.

However, something similar has happened before in the films about "ordinary" schools. In the development of the relationships and characters of the "geniuses" the film slid over the surface, not trying to create deeper images.

As some directors say, one can't surpass the acting of children and animals. And it is true that young actors often "overplay" adults. *Schedule For the Day after*

Tomorrow came the other way. Adults cast (performed by the remarkable actors O. Dal, M. Terekhova, V. Nikulin, etc.) in all respects surpassed its younger colleagues. One can object that *Schedule For the Day after Tomorrow* features an ideal school. But, it seems, even "ideal" students have many difficult problems that require non-trivial solutions.

Similarly, *The Key That Should Not Be Handed On* can't be perceived today as alive and modern - something elusive. And this "something" is, oddly enough, the falsehood. All senior students are unique: an owl-like young man is as talented, inspirational, and wise as a forty-year-old intellectual. Sasha Maidanov is a rebel without a cause, a knight without fear and reproach. The third one is so educated that even now he is ready to defend his Ph.D. thesis (Arcus, 2010).

The film was quite sharply criticized by E. Gromov, who insisted that "one way or another, Marina Maximovna (a teacher) consciously and unconsciously creates a closed microcosm with her class, with limited access for only gifted, bright, intelligent pupils. And where are those who are not as talented? Those who prefer streets to poetry? How did a charming Marina Maximovna manage to turn an ordinary Leningrad class into a small semblance of the Tsarskoe Selo Lyceum (Alexander Pushkin's school - author's note)? ... Talented teacher, focused exclusively on talented children, willing or not brings up arrogance, and she has it, too. There is only a step away from a haughty neglect of rough, everyday work, and people who do it " (Gromov, 1981, pp. 34-35).

One of the most interesting teacher's film images of stagnation period can be found in the film *The Rescuer* (1980). Its author, Sergei Solovyev, has long been interested in the eternal themes in art: good and evil, friendship and betrayal, truth and lies, love and hatred, conscience, duty, beauty... However, it does not mean that *The Rescuer* was far from the timely problems of the turn of the 1970s - 1980s.

S. Solovyev sincerely and convincingly spoke of the danger of experiencing the beauty. The idea of *The Rescuer* is simultaneously simple and complex. The picture as if continues and develops the message of his previous work – *One Hundred Days After Childhood* (1975). It is no coincidence that one of the main roles was performed by Sergei Shakurov in both films. In *One Hundred Days After Childhood* he played a summer camp counselor who strove to bring the children into the bright world of the Beautiful, to elevate their souls. In fact, he succeeded. But the world of school lessons is sometimes so far from the life around us.

Andrei Larikov (S. Shakurov) from *The Rescuer* is a school teacher of literature, a teacher by avocation. Talent sowing "wisdom, good, eternal".

– *I came here five years ago. Happy...To teach. No luggage... But now something is wrong... I tell them all sorts of things. About the stars. About love. And then everything ends. And very different words come up...* He draws this sad conclusion in the conversation with his friends, that culminated the film.

What if one of Larikov's pupils perceives his lessons as the norm of life? There is such a person - a school graduate Asya. The relationship between Asya and her former teacher embody the main idea of the film.

– *I loved someone very much. And I believed him very much. And then he betrayed me. For no special reason, just like that.* These monologue by Asya Vedeneeva is her soul crying, the tragedy of a person disillusioned with the beloved one.

There is an alternative – the "prose of life", aiming to keep up with the Joneses. As, for example, the sailor of the rescue station Vilya ("Where have you seen it, this spiritual beauty?"). Or, perhaps, as a fashionable dressmaker Grigory Ganin ("I'm content with my life. I have a good life, and Larikov's spells have nothing to do with it!"). The authors are not in haste to deliver a verdict on them: both Vilya and Grisha are still very young. Sergei Soloviev does not give ready didactic solutions to the problem. Nevertheless, the moral result of the picture is convincing: Larikov understands that his efforts are worth it. If the words are confirmed by the deeds:

– *I've taught one, at least. This is, probably, a lot. A good person has a ripple effect...*

The title *The Rescuer* is ambiguous. Larikov seeks to save the souls of his students – Asya, Vilya, and Grisha – from selfishness, callousness. And Vilya literally saves Asya – pulling her out of the water. On the whole, every film character is looking for his/her place in the world.

The film's cast is marvellous. Vasily Mishchenko skillfully conveys sharp changes in the emotional state of his hero. Now, with a contemptuous smile and prickly eyes saying that he was "an evil and lonely man," and then Vilya is capable of a self-sacrificing act. He may stammer and lie to a girl about love, and then really fall in love, unexpectedly and deeply. During his rather short term of work at the rescue station Vilya actually saved only one person. Not many. But at the same time, enough. Therefore, it was this unexpected salvation of Asya that became the beginning of a genuine acquisition of the world around him.

The world created by Sergei Solovyov is surprisingly, provocatively beautiful. "I love the lavish withering of nature," – he echoes the classical poet Alexander Pushkin, ("Autumn"). The events pass before us as if "in a magic crystal of elegies" (A. Medvedev), sensitive to fleeting experiences and moods, able to create an atmosphere of in-depth attention to the internal world of man.

The Rescuer often flashes Asya's memory about a few minutes spent together with Larikov: – *Under this tree, we hid from the downpour. You and I. We stood side by side. You know, this pouring rain haunts me in my night dreams...* Pavel Lebeshev's camera envelops these frames with an orange haze of nostalgia. Then the color will return (by the way, by the mid-1970s almost all the films on the school theme had become color, the fashion for the black and white image had passed). The yellow leaves will rustle again and again, and it will rain again, and the mist will cloud over an old, cozy town. The nature, the lake, the deserted beach, and the old rescue station will trustfully open their beauty. The harmony of nature, the harmony of the settled world of antiquities is contrasted in *The Rescuer*

with human unsettledness, doubts. The effect is amplified not only by the camera work but also by the elegiac, sad and light melody of I. Schwartz.

How can one measure own life against the ideal concept of it? What should one do if one's dream is betrayed? These complicated questions are facing the main female character of the film, Asya Vedeneeva (T. Drubich). Contradictions between the ideal beauty and reality are at the center of the sharp inner and outer conflicts of the film's heroes. They lead Asya to a tragic decision - an attempt to commit suicide. There are as if two endings in the film. One is semantic and another one is narrative. The narrative one is a scene of a former classmate Vilya (V. Mishchenko) leaving for the army service. The semantic ending is Asya's failed suicidal attempt, the denouement of her dramatic contradictions.

The beginning of the episode is deliberately serene. On the eve of his departure for the army service, a rescue station worker Vilya wants to see his workplace for the last time: an old, chipped building on the shore of a picturesque lake. It's autumn and pretty cold. In the middle of the veranda with a rotten floor is a billiard table, dimly glittering with holes of a broken cloth. Vilya reluctantly strikes cue, then pulls out the marine binoculars ...

The whole sequence is filmed by the camera man P. Lebeshev slowly, with dignity, with a long panorama over the landscape and the "objective world," admiring the ancient station building, the beauty of the lonesome lake, the signs of autumn, which fully came to power.

... Lazily leading binoculars along the lake surface, Vilya suddenly discovers in the distance a girl in a white cloak comes to the shore. He curiously continues to observe. The girl pushes a rubber boat and sails to the center of the lake. V. Mischenko plays around with the situation: Vilya, like many "small bosses", likes showing off his authority. That's why he starts habitually yelling in the megaphone. But his confidence vanishes, when Asya pierced the boat with a nail and began to sink...

As a little digression, a few words about the boat and the nail. One of the most quoted Anton Chekhov's sayings goes that if in the first chapter there is a rifle hanging on the wall, it should go off in the second or the third chapter. A. Chekhov is one of Sergey Solovyov's favorite writers (his director's debut was a screen adaptation of Chekhov's stories). There is an exact position for such seemingly trivial things as an inflatable boat and a nail, in the film. Asya bought this boat as a gift to her beloved. A big nail is the one on which a poster of Botticelli picture was hanging, Vedeneeva was going to give it to Larikov, too.

Thus, with the help of the object symbolism S. Solovyov once again highlights the main idea of the film: actions in the name of good and love may one day turn around, by no means joyful side of being, experiencing the beauty is not easy.

But let's return to the *The Rescuer* characters. – What's going on? – Vilya is wondering. And a smooth rhythm of the picture is changing. Vilya feverishly rushes to the rescue. First with an empty aqualung, then without it. He has never

seen a person drowning before. For the first time, a man who has accustomed to a tranquil float of life must make an Act.

... And here they are on the shore. It is only now that Tatiana Drubich's heroine wakes up from the state of deep trance, in which she had been still. She starts hysterics. Vilya acts almost according to the instructions for saving from drowning, he slaps her on the cheek. But immediately he touches her face with his palm gently.

Apparently far from each other people in everyday life, the author puts them in an extreme situation. The characters of the film tell each other those things that under other circumstances, they could never admit. Deliberately indifferent, Asya tells the story of her unsuccessful marriage: – *He proposed. The family is good. Everyone is getting married. It's time for me, too.* Tatyana Drubich convincingly conveys the intonation of the character, her even and cold tone.

P. Lebeshev is a master of a poetic portrait, sensitive to the director's vision of the frame. Asya's face appears on the screen in the shaky reflections of the veranda glass, as if enveloped in a hazy veil. Unearthly. Detached. Initially, Vilya does not understand Asya. But later, when she tells him about her feelings for Larikov and about his betrayal, Vilya realized it was true love.

A flashback continues the sequence. There are two people under the tree in the rain, Larikov and Asya. He is reciting a poem. The music of I. Schwartz sounds exciting, tender and simultaneously disturbing. Both characters of *The Rescuer* acquire something. Asya regains the outer world, Vilya attains an inner world. No wonder he admits when saying goodbye: – *After this night, maybe, I'll have nothing else in my life.*

The ending is a simple and clear narration wise, but is difficult otherwise. It was important to deliver a complex range of feelings of the characters to the audience, to give a chance to think about the serious turning point in their lives.

Summing up, the school in film – both in the 1960s and in the 1970s – was in many respects more vital, more true to life than in the 1930s-1950s, when the main charge of admiration was dedicated to teachers, most commonly presented as a gray haired teacher grading students' essays. Moreover, a different view, a negative image of the teacher was often met with hostility. As E. Gromov wrote, very different teachers are being shown. From very good, almost ideal, to purely negative. Sometimes the critical attitude towards the teacher prevails. There is no need to care of a strict balance, if such bright personalities work in the cinematographic school" (Gromov, 1981, p. 35).

In *Other People's Letters* (1975) a new type of a school student appeared – macabre (from French *macabre*: gloomy, terrible). This type was only new for Soviet cinema, in western countries it has long been known (for example, *The Bad Seed* (1956) by M. LeRoy and *The Exorcist* (1973) by W. Friedkin). In fact, "macabre teenagers are therefore especially scary, that their rebellion is more terrible than that of typical teenagers because it will not pass with age. These characters are interesting primarily because they do not fulfill the main law of the

drama – they remain the same in the beginning and at the end, the story does not change anything them. Only adult characters will change – they become aware of their helplessness and horrified. ... It is in *Other People's Letters* that for the first time a macabre teenager appears – a young man who not only causes an unaccountable fear in adults (this type appeared much earlier, back in 1968 *We'll Live till Monday*, its character Batischev has some resemblance but very distant, since his position is debunked by the author), but the new type acts actively, encroaching on some rights. It is important to note that this image will find its continuation in *Plumbum or the Dangerous Game, Dear Elena Sergeevna* and a number of films in the second half of the 1980s (Artemieva, 2015, p. 121).

On the other hand, it was in the 1970s when entertaining films about school came out. Perhaps one of the last Soviet black-and-white films about schoolchildren – *Oh, That Nastya* (1971), tells about a ten-year-old girl living in a world of charming fantasies. It is really a pity that this romantic and musical story, where the animation was organically intertwined, was deprived of colors.

The director V. Menshov in his musical melodrama about school and schoolchildren *The Practical Joke* (1976) used color to the full effect. The film critic T. Kukarkina began her article about *The Practical Joke* with praise: "Menshov chose for his first director's work a dynamic form of narration, catchy, bright, and spectacular. Musical acts, beautiful faces, elegant interiors, and the plot tension overrode psychological thoroughness. The director has focused his attention on incessant emotional impact. This is facilitated by a rhythm, original editing transitions, and the lack of long shots and panning. Everything is big, bright. The film is exciting, and easily creates empathy for the characters" (Kukarkina, 1978, p. 119). But then she practically deleted all this value with a severe verdict: "The declared problems, moral conflicts are blurred, scattered in different semantic series, replaced by normative rules of ethics. ... The playwright's plan to solve essential problems is obvious, but simplified to elementary commandments" (Kukarkina, 1978, p.121).

V. Kichin was also very strict to *The Practical Joke*, arguing that the film, instead of the expected purposefulness at first, reveals an unexpected ambivalence. The director makes a deal with the viewer that there will be a debate film, a reflection film – in a word, a serious conversation. But right there, "call signs" of a game movie, a show clearly sound" (Kichin, 1977, p. 47).

In our opinion, both T. Kukarkina and V. Kichin, being aware of the original entertaining thrust of *The Practical Joke*, in vain tried to assess it as an attempt to create a psychological drama. In our opinion, there was no duality in the film: unlike *The Diary of the School Principal* and *Other People's Letters*, it never pretended to be dramatic, but was elaborate mixture of melodrama and musical.

The bid for entertainment was made by the authors of the comedy *Troublemaker* (1978). The working title of this picture – "Students Male and Female" was self explanatory. But the change was for a reason. The protagonist of the film, a graduate of the rural school Petr Gorokhov, enrolled at the Economics

department of a Moscow university, stands out among the other film characters so much that the final title justifies the content, Peter is a real troublemaker. The genre of the film is a comedy, with musical elements. Young people sing and dance, and the rest of the time they attend lectures and fall in love. A comedy is a conventional genre, allowing different approaches. In one instance, the truth of the characters is preserved. In another one, only ridiculous situations that more or less conventional characters find themselves, are important. In the third case, grotesque exaggeration becomes predominant. The example of *Troublemaker* shows that it is possible to simultaneously use three of these trends together. The whole point is whether the unity of the constituents is achieved at the same time. Many episodes of *Troublemaker* are depicted in an eccentric manner, almost in the traditions of silent films' fireworks of laughter. However, along with funny and moderately instructive scenes there are also many weak, inexpressive episodes.

Even explicit school mischief makers sometimes were featured on the screen of the 1970s so impressively that the effect turned out to be, in the end, probably not what the authors had expected. For example, the film about troubled teenagers – *Juveniles* (1976) – turned out to be weak and sketchy: "since the film authors, building up the plot, limit all culminating events within the boundaries of the dance square, they can be misunderstood, as if they sincerely believe that the root of evil for our youth lurks on a small outdoor dance floor. ... since they do not illuminate another motivation, other sources of criminal juvenile activity in the town - stabbing rampage, theft, alcohol addiction. Since nothing in this film has been seriously explained or analyzed, the viewer has nothing else but, based on what he saw, to draw the following conclusions: dances, where everything is permitted, where young people are absolutely uncontrolled, is a hotbed of evil, and therefore it is necessary to eliminate them. ... The film *Juveniles* is bursting into battle, claiming to be a topical report about our life, our imperfect reality. But this report is unreliable. And most importantly, it is pedagogically incompetent (Zhavoronkov, 1977, pp. 42, 46). In fact, the naive statement: "the boys are naughty because they do not go in for sports", the total failure of the "good" characters, contrasted with the flamboyant hooligan, exposed the artificial plot. A similar scheme but at a higher artistic level was used in *The Last Chance* (1978).

In the TV program aimed at teens, the leading actor from the film *Plead Guilty* (1983) accused his villain film character – the son of successful and wealthy parents, a ninth-grader Kolya. In fact, led by a confident director's hand, the actor did not spare black colors: cigarettes, wine, "elite" possessions, cruelty, excessive self-confidence – the most stereotypical set of interests and inclinations of a young "silver spoon" Nikolay.

Below is a scene typical for the general interpretation of the image. Nikolay is sitting in his room, the walls are covered with posters of international pop idols. He is holding a book in English (the kid is not inept) in one hand, and an imported knife with a retractable blade in another hand. A self-satisfied smile wanders playfully on his face. The scene is a sign, a poster. It can be easily put in the frame

and placed on the pages of the Soviet satirical magazine *Crocodile*. Meanwhile, the authors continue to increase the "negative charge" of Kolya's character in the same cardboard style, to a cheerful music. Nikolai beats and loots a drunk, bullies a first-grader, steals alcohol, drowns a poor dog. There is no question about the film's sincere reflection of reality. The trouble with the film is that it is done unnecessarily rectilinearly, didactically, not attempting to penetrate the psychology of the characters.

The authors' message is clear – a guilty person must carry punishment he deserved. The film's creators, obviously, wanted to make the characters and their actions extremely transparent for the young audience. Hence the contrast between Nikolai and most of his classmates – they are modestly dressed, speak the right words, go in for sports and regularly attend extracurricular activities. Hence the fate's twist of Kolya's ex buddy, who goes on summer holidays to his parents in Siberia, and returns as a reformed person.

Falsehood, even in the smallest detail, vocabulary that is strange to ordinary schoolchildren, the discrepancy between the age of actors and their characters – all these errors are immediately spotted by young spectators, as a result there is a barrier of alienation between them and the screen. Therefore, simplifying, scheming the conflict and characters, the authors do not achieve the desired, effective impact on the audience. Neither modern musical rhythms, nor bright colors of a wide screen can save the day.

By the way, director I. Voznesensky initially wanted to integrate a black and white chronicle, where real juvenile criminals would speak about themselves. The blending between the feature film and the documentary had been planned, but unfortunately, the idea was not realized. Such a hybrid, could have significantly affect if not the drama, then the style of the film *Plead Guilty*, make it closer to real life.

After all, there is the character in the film, that is sharp and recognizable – Kolya's mother. The actress I. Miroschnichenko emphasizes the hypocrisy of her heroine: on the one hand, the exemplary morality she preaches in journal articles, on the other – her own values of personal gain, prosperity, useful connections with "influential people". This fashionably dressed woman skillfully plays the mother, dedicated to her son's interests and his moral principles, she can even shed a tear on her makeup. Next, with a businesslike tone, she makes phone calls to her powerful acquaintances looking for the possibility to sweep under the carpet her son's ill behaviour. All in vain – in the ending Kolya in fury stabs a girl with a knife and is put on trial.

At the very end of the film, an episode suddenly comes up, as if baked in from another film. It is easy to imagine the scene of the trial in the sense of a moralistic poster, with the prosecutor's speech, with the witnesses' testimony, and the last plea of the accused. But I. Voznesensky used a truly cinematic mode. The trial scene is entirely built on black-and-white stop frames, that the camera caught and the director selected the amazingly in-depth moments. Every film character

appears only for a few seconds, but these seconds speak volumes. The frozen movements, facial expressions, eyes speak for themselves. Unfortunately, the film on the whole has not been made with such consideration. The script's weaknesses turned out to be insuperable and the conception was not fulfilled.

We agree with E. Gromov: "Films about difficult adolescents touch upon problems that are not easy to solve. The whole thing is the way these problems are considered. It has long been known that if an artist, raising in his work some serious and acute problems, frankly admits that he does not know how to solve them, then no claims can be made on him. The art of posing the right question is justified – you value its (the question's) correct statement, an invitation to arguments and reflections. It is quite another matter that, for the sake of a "happy" ending, they try to convince you of the existence of a positive program, moreover giving it a universal meaning. Then you don't believe the artist, and he rather takes you away from the discussion of the life problem, rather than attracts attention to it" (Gromov, 1981, pp. 37-38).

In the 1970s, films appeared about evening schools for adults (*The Big Break*, 1972, *Different People*, 1973, *Every Night After Work*, 1973). There were obvious significant changes in their interpretations. One can agree that the *The Big Break* (1972) paraphrases *The Spring on Zarechnaya Street* (1956), but "if in the first film there is a feeling of sincere faith in the possibility of building a new society, faith in the possibility of creating / educating a new person, then in the second – it's just a game that both the characters of the film, and the audience who watch the film, agree to. In both films, a special role, a special status of the teacher is emphasized. The ideal of a teacher who, proudly fulfilling his special mission both at home and at school, has remained the exclusive teacher's image in Soviet cinema for decades. But while in the 1950s this image is perceived as the only possible one, and the presented models of behavior could be considered as role models, the same image of the "correct" Soviet teacher in the 1970s acquires a touch of irony" (Grigorieva, 2007). And while in *The Spring on Zarechnaya Street* workers are first and foremost the history's leaders, factory workers in *The Big Break* are ordinary people with their own problems, and simple feelings (Grigorieva, 2007).

As well as in the thaw period, a significant share of films about school and university in the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s was devoted to love stories. It would seem that just recently, in the late 1950s – early 1960s, Soviet cinema heatedly asserted the right of school seniors to love. In the 1970s films about younger teenage love appeared (*Woodpeckers Don't Get Headaches*, *One Hundred Days After Childhood*). The right of high school students to love was already undeniable, the filmmakers were interested in the variety, complexity of modern thoughts and feelings, their relationship with each other, and with adults.

However, this kind of complexity was not intrinsic to all films about school / student love. Some of them were made according to the old plot templates. For example, the film *Yulka* (1972) did not narrate so much about love, but agitated

graduates of the eighth class to enter vocational schools, where the teaching staff was wonderful, and the students were all good and smart.

My Anfisa (1979) features a love story of Anfisa and Nikolai, charismatic young people. Anfisa is a house painter, a good cook, and a skydiver. Nikolai is a student majoring in Language Arts, likes sleeping, dreams of travelling to Africa, he is lazy, and is not really good at anything. These simple initial data are transformed by the laws of melodrama rather traditionally (Demin, 1980). Firstly, influenced by Anfisa, Nikolai drops out of the university (since he's disillusioned with the profession of the teacher). Secondly, he learns to jump with a parachute. In other words, he completely re-educates and becomes a different person. That is the actual impact of their love.

However, the future is envisioned by Nikolai rather vaguely: he might serve in the army for two years, and then he'll see where it goes from there. To put it mildly, the moral outcome of his "re-education" does not look as optimistic.

Anfisa and Nikolai were played by talented actors – M. Levtova and L. Kayurov, but the script's poverty did not allow them to create authentic, psychologically profound images. Nikolai is a university student, but the range of his interests has remained unclear to the film audience. Kolya, as a rule, is either meaningfully silent or demonstrates some lazy movements.

A few decades ago, cinema industry had presented such situations in a dramatic, edifying and didactic way. The authors of *My Anfisa*, undoubtedly, wanted to avoid this. That's why this is not a melodrama in its pure form - there are elements of a musical, and a lyrical comedy, too. Humor and melodic tunes, to some extent, concealed the lack of fresh thought and made trite situations more lively. But it seems that the artistic value of the film did not benefit from this and as a result, it was part of the gray mainstream.

Curiously enough, a film that was made two years later, *Double trouble will come* (1981), featured a similar storyline: a young hero from a well-to-do family (this time a high school student) falls in love with plasterer / house painter in her twenties. Due to the Soviet censorship of the stagnation period their relationship was limited only to the chaste kiss of the schoolboy on the cheek of the seductive representative of the working class, and his (also very modest) amorous dreams. A similar innocent plot design of the misalliance (this time between two teenagers) was also used in the drama *Before the Snow Falls Down* (1984).

Naturally, the school-love theme was used in the comedy genre, too. For example, the film *All The Way Around* (1981) used a motif which was well attested in classical literature and, consequently, in cinema, too: parents are trying to protect their daughter from dating with her classmate. Then he changes into female clothes and comes disguised as her friend. The girl's parents were played by great actors O. Tabakov and S. Nemoliaeva, and they, of course, did their best to breathe life into the storyline. But the finale of the film, that could be summarized by the sentence from a popular song lyrics "The First Love Comes and Goes Away", micrified their efforts. The authors' message to the audience was: teenage problems

should not be exaggerated, school students are not able to understand their feelings yet.

Films on school/student love theme plunged into the retro atmosphere quite more seldom. The end of the fifties-the beginning of the sixties was the time to reconsider the past. Time of spiritual renewal, of space exploration, of poems being recited on Mayakovsky Square. This time, on behalf of the current generation in their forties, i.e. those who were in their twenties back then, was remembered in the film *How Young We Were*, written and directed by M. Belikov. His previous work, which title also cited the line from the popular song – *The Night Is Short* (1982), spoke about the difficult post-war childhood. In the drama *How Young We Were* (1985), the director as though continued following his character, who turned from a schoolboy of a provincial town into a student of an engineering construction university.

The film impresses with the accuracy of the period features, from a musical phonogram, carefully bringing back the melodies of those years, to the meticulous signs. The camera, escaping from the cramped, dimly communal (shared) apartments, bathing in bright colors and in bewitching mirror glare, takes us away to wide avenues filled with people enthusiastically shouting the same word – "Gagarin!". From the dance floor filled with fireworks of lights we transfer to the emerald meadow and rocky seashore. Together with the film character Sasha, we get into a noisy student dormitory, where there is a lively exchange of a fresh saucepan of borsch for a snow-white shirt, and a tape recorder - for fashionable shoes. The first lectures, the first dates, the first part time jobs. A typical life of an ordinary student, familiar to many of us. M. Belikov makes his hero surprisingly vulnerable, open-minded, romantic, capable of a reckless act and human compassion.

How Young We Were is a nostalgic melodrama. Sasha, captivatingly performed by T. Denisenko, seems to be concerned about one thing: is it love or not? What if it's love? Is it enough or not? Probably a lot, since the authors are not tempted by excessive symbolism. Although the author's slightly indulgent and touching attitude to all without exception, actions of the protagonist, gives rise to a certain bewilderment – what about the hypertrophied infantilism of Sasha?

Another love melodrama – *School Waltz* (1977), traces its characters on the illusive border between the last school waltz and the independent adult life. According to the storyline, an interesting, remarkable Zosya (E. Tsyplakova) sincerely entrusted her first love to her classmate Gosha, who turned out to be disgraceful.

While Zosia for E. Tsyplakova was a natural spin-off of her previous roles: of a seventh grader (*Woodpeckers Don't Get Headaches*), a ninth-grader (*The Key That Should Not Be Handed On*), E. Simonova was more likely to be seen in adult roles (*Afonya*, *Missing Expedition*, *Ordinary Miracle*). Nevertheless, E. Simonova managed to play the first, obsessive, ready to be ridiculed, love. The culmination of her image was the episode in the marriage registry office. Dina is standing next to

Gosha, now her lawful husband, but stolen from Zosya. The desire is achieved, but the actress almost without words copes to say about lots of things: that having Gosha as a husband does not mean being loved by him, that she could not be able to make him happy, and they were not going to be together for a long.

Unfortunately, Gosha's image is less convincing, not dramatically justified. Having left his beloved girlfriend in a difficult moment and subsequently declaring that he values his personal freedom more than anything else, Gosha gives way to the insistent but unloved Dina, and marries her. The reasons for such a contradictory behaviour remain behind the scenes, the viewer will perhaps remember his tightness and restraint.

Without support in the psychological motivation, the authors of the film force their hero to commit a strange act: Gosha, having run away from Dina directly from the wedding ceremony, teams up with complete strangers, drunkards in the backyard and shares a bottle with them. This must have depicted the highest degree of despair, the turmoil that seized him. But as a matter of fact, the effect is the same as traditional, tacky cigarettes draw, designed to replace psychology, deep penetration into the image with a conventional sign, which denotes a person's commotion. This episode seems an unfortunate mistake, because in general, *School Waltz* is quite compelling. Low-keyed conversations, soft color tones, ordinary interiors (not everybody lives in luxurious apartments, as some heroes of *The Practical Joke*), no unnecessary editing and optical effects.

In the film *I Ask to Accuse Klava K. Of My Death* (1979), the filmmakers again, as in the thaw period drama *What if it's love?* (1961), turned to the theme of unhappy love, that makes one think about a suicide. *Grasshopper* (1979) was bold enough to show how a nice female student uses amorous / sexual connections for career growth and material well-being. The heroine of the film jumps onto the steps of success with victorious ease, not really pondering the future of those who helped her to climb up there. She, as a Grasshopper, is a certain social type, very accurately observed by the script writer F. Mironer. This type is distinguished first of all by a utilitarian approach to science, to their job, to people who are close, and the desire to live at someone else's expense. Lena behaves as a prospector, greedily seeking gold placer mines, in her pursuit of imaginary values she misses the true values – spirituality, fidelity, kindness, wrote film critics in the 1970s (Atamanova, 1979).

We remember how important it was for the Soviet cinema of the 1920s-1950s (and even in many films of the 1960s and 1970s) to show the positive impact of the collective/community/class on the person who had dropped out of it. At the end of the stagnation period, this storyline acquired a new interpretation in *Scarecrow* (1983) by R. Bykov: the cruelty of the "children's community in need of a black sheep for self-assertion and aggression output. This story is about being an outsider against one's will, and not as a conscious choice" (Arcus, 2010).

"Won't I ever laugh again? Has my life passed by and nothing else is going to happen? I will not love anybody else!" the twelve-year-old girl cries in despair.

You believe these words, they do not seem to be a stretch, a falsity. R. Bykov, who had previously directed films for and about children in a comedy, musical tone, this time turned to drama with tragic notes. The script based on V. Zheleznikov's novel presented a serious conflict – mocking and bullying a sixth-grader Lena Bessoltseva. At first, she tries to adjust herself to her new school, to fit in with her new classmates who promptly nickname her.

The world of Lena's classmates is extremely sour and miserable. Most of them long for their academic service, school lessons to finish, so that they can put on a branded jeans, get a little money and have fun. Their entertainment is monotonous - dull trampling to music, retelling ambiguous anecdotes, or jokes about teachers. They talk about money, clothes, other people's success. However, the circle of interests of their teacher (E. Sanaeva) is not much wider – all her thoughts seem to be focused on one thing: her engagement and future marriage.

This is the world where Lena Bessoltseva, a thin, awkward girl who always finds herself in ridiculous situations. She is just as unlike her classmates, as her kind grandfather is unlike other adults in the film. He buys old paintings that once belonged to his ancestral home, but walks around wearing a shabby, mended coat. A long conversation of an old man Bessoltsev (Y. Nikulin) with Lena sounds like a soul confession. The audience understands that they are related by spiritual closeness, such an open-hearted outlook, consonant with the autumn landscape of an ancient Russian town filmed by the camera work. The scene when Lena falls asleep on a disturbing, chilly, windy autumn evening, and wakes up on a sunny winter morning, goes out into the yard and sees the snow dazzlingly shining, how clear and deep the sky is above her head, acquires a special meaning. She feels renewal, finds the strength to fight on.

The pinnacle of her struggle is a scene in church's ruins, where a good-looking and popular Dima Somov, renounces Lena, being afraid to admit his own cowardice. When the teenagers burn a scarecrow of a "traitor" on bonfire, the drama reaches a point of a real tragedy.

Where were the adults meanwhile? One of the scenes answers this question. The tourists descend from a tour boat to see the sights of the town. They are offered to refreshments when a group of teenagers runs out into the square, chasing a thin girl. They knock her off her feet and begin beating. "How horrible!", someone in the crowd exclaims. But next the teenagers scatter in different directions, and vacation mood takes over – in a minute the tourists forget about what happened. Indifference, vanity, spiritual emptiness cause the authors' sadness as much as a mercantile interest. They urge to stop and think not only teenagers "having fun", but also adults, passively watching their, sometimes cruel entertainment. *Scarecrow* is a warning film. It speaks with genuine pain that under certain circumstances a conspiracy of silence may destroy or conquer everything moral.

The film was in many ways unusual for Soviet cinema. It was arguing with the sugary sweetness of the school theme, where neat boys and girls diligently

studies and listened to their parents. The film turned out to be tough to watch, very disturbing.

In the same year, 1983, an equally sharp drama about teenagers was made - *Boys* (screenplay by Y. Klepikov, directed by D. Asanova). This film was about more than troubled adolescents, it was of those who had already chosen a slippery path of crime, those who had been bailed out by a former athlete, the head of the correctional labor colony Antonov (V. Priyomykhov).

There are two scenes in the film, short but very significant. In one of them, grandmother pitifully gives her grandson a packet of cigarettes, habitually saying, that he should quit smoking. "I will, granny, of course I will", her grandson as usually answers. In the second scene, the TV journalist asks Antonov about his educational method. And when he can't specify some rules, the journalist complains that it's not good enough for a TV show.

In fact, Antonov doesn't have a graduate degree. He doesn't know how to speculate about the principles of pedagogy. But he knows more than that, he managed to find the key for his students' hearts, the key that so hopelessly escapes from the hands of his well-educated deputy, who seems to be building his relations with the teenagers by textbooks.

The teacher Antonov is not ideal. He sometimes screams and scolds, but he is always just because he values trust, respect and honesty foremost. He is aware that if there is no mutual understanding, there will be no upbringing.

The film's authors are also not inclined to idealize the situation: in *Boys* there are no episodes of hasty moral healing of lost souls. On the contrary, there are scenes of painful failures – a sudden rebellion, escapes from the colony (some of the actors were actual juvenile offenders). However on the whole the film gives hope and faith in the future of troubled adolescents.

The drama *Games for School Children* (1985) turned to the problem that Soviet cinema had tried to avoid before: the formation of personality in orphanages. There are a lot of brutal, naturalistic scenes at an orphanage filled with isolation, aggressiveness, hysteria, and anger. Violent fights between the girls, one of the scenes is shocking: a high school girl locks a seven-year-old in the washing machine and switches it on. The main character of the film is a high school student Marie. Self-absorption and detachment change for a spark of hope; uncompromising decisiveness of actions gives way to helpless depression.

Teachers rarely appear in the film. *Games for School Children* try to provide an insider's view: we see the events through the eyes of Marie, choosing from dozens of daily impressions what she considers the most important. Hence the motives of loneliness and the lack of spiritual warmth are dominating.

The stagnation period films (1969-1985) on the school/university topic.

Place of action, historical, social, cultural, political, and ideological context

Features of the historical period when media texts were created, market conditions that contributed to the idea, the process of creating media texts, the degree of influence of that time on media texts.

The timeframe for the historical period of the "stagnation" has been defined conditionally from 1969 (increase of censorship and ideological control after the invasion of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia) to 1985 (M. Gorbachev's coming to power).

The main characteristics of this historical period:

- essential extirpation of the "thaw" tendencies (including the cinema industry), the actual rejection of Stalin's criticism against the backdrop of the growing expansion of the spectrum of solemn celebrations of Soviet-communist jubilees on a national scale;
- continuation of the exploitation of the official doctrine of the established common community of the Soviet people and the absence of class, ethnic, or racial problems; the possibility of peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist systems (in the framework of the so-called *détente* (policy of the lessening of tensions between the West and the East));
- maintenance of the ideological struggle with bourgeois states, militarization, military and economic support for pro-communist regimes in developing countries, armed intervention in Afghanistan;
- aggravation of tension with the People's Republic of China;
- increasing tension with the West (esp., the USA) in connection with the events in Afghanistan, Poland and the incident with the South Korean airliner shot down by a Soviet interceptor;
- "soft" struggle against dissenters: A. Solzhenitsyn, A. Sakharov, etc.;
- continuation of the industrialization (mainly heavy and military industry), construction of BAM (Baikal-Amur Railway);
- mass housing construction for the population;
- continuation of space exploration (including the first Soviet-American space project);
- end of the intensive struggle with religion;
- unusually swift change of the Soviet leaders: within a relatively short period of time from November 1982 to March 1985, one after another, the three General Secretaries of the CPSU died;
- another attempt of the education reform (Decree of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR "On the main directions of the reform of the general and professional school" of April 12, 1984 N 13-XI).

The so-called ideological struggle against the imperialist West was going on very intensely during the stagnation period. As a response to the attempt to liberalize socialism in Czechoslovakia in early January 1969, there was a secret Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On increasing the responsibility of the senior officers of the press, radio and television, cinema, culture and art institutions for the ideological and political level of all published materials and repertoire", 1969). It stated that in the context of the escalating ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism, "it is the task of journalists, writers, film directors and artists to oppose any manifestations of bourgeois

ideology, but propagandize the communist ideals, the advantages of socialism, the Soviet way of life, to analyze and expose various kinds of petty-bourgeois and revisionist trends. Meanwhile, some authors, directors, etc. depart from class criteria when assessing and covering complex social and political problems, facts and events, and sometimes they reflect the views, that are alien to the ideology of socialist society. There are attempts to assess the important periods of the history of the party and state in a one-sided, subjectivist way, and to criticize the shortcomings not from the position of communist and civic interest, but as outsiders, that contradicts the principles of socialist realism and communist journalism ... Some heads of publishing houses, television channels, cultural and art institutions do not take the proper measures to prevent the publication of ideologically erroneous works, they do not work well with the authors, they show compliance and political expediency in making decisions about the publication of ideologically perverse materials. ... The Central Committee of the CPSU considers it necessary to emphasize the special responsibility of the heads of organizations and departments and editorial teams for the ideological orientation of the published works" (Decree ..., 1969).

Of course, this decision could not but affect the cinema industry, so the practice of replenishing the list of films banned by the censorship continued, and ideological control of screenplays and the filming process intensified.

In the year of the 50th anniversary of the USSR, on January 21, 1972, the Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee "On Literary and Art Criticism" was issued, where, in unison with the above mentioned decree, it was argued that "criticism is still not sufficiently active and consistent in affirming the revolutionary, humanistic ideals of the art of socialist realism, the disclosure of the reactionary essence of bourgeois "mass culture" and decadent trends, in the struggle against various kinds of non-Marxist views on literature and art, and revisionist aesthetic concepts" (Resolution, 1972).

In the same year, 1972, the Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On Measures for the Further Development of Soviet Cinematography" (2.08.1972) was issued, where it was once again reminded that "cinema art is called upon to actively promote the formation of a Marxist-Leninist world outlook among the broad masses, to shape the spirit of selfless devotion to our multinational socialist homeland, Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, the assertion of communist moral principles, the irreconcilable attitude toward the bourgeoisie ideology and morals, petty-bourgeois remnants, to everything that prevents our progress" (Resolution On Measures ..., 1972).

Thus, in about three years, a series of resolutions were adopted concerning culture and ideology aimed not only at combating the harmful influences of the West, but also at propagating communist ideology. Trying to influence the formation of the worldview of Soviet youth, the country's leadership in October 1976 published the Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On working with creative youth", which also affected the cinema and other media.

However, apparently, some alarming signals about the real moods of the population (especially young people) that reached the Kremlin through the special services did not allow the CPSU ideological apparatus to relax. In April 1979, the Central Committee of the CPSU adopted a resolution "On the further improvement of ideological, political and educational work," which, in particular, stated that: "The communist party organizations, cultural bodies, ideological institutions and departments, creative unions, are assigned the mission to improve the ideological and political education and the Marxist-Leninist education of the artistic intelligentsia. They should constantly care for the upbringing of high ideology, citizenship, the development of creative activity of writers, artists, composers, theater and cinema specialists, and journalists. They must pay attention to the creation of new significant works of literature and art that talently reflect the heroic accomplishments of the Soviet people, the problems of the development of socialist society, used by our ideological opponents. They must intensify the activity of creative unions in analyzing trends in the development of literature and art" (Resolution, 1979).

Later on, similar to the previous documents, it was stressed that "imperialist propaganda ... is continuously conducting fierce attacks on the minds of Soviet people, striving to use their most sophisticated methods and modern technical means to poison their understanding with slander against Soviet reality, to tarnish socialism, to embellish imperialism and its predatory, inhuman policies and practices. Perverted information and biased coverage of facts, underreporting, half-truth and shameless lies - everything is put to use. Therefore, one of the most important tasks of ideological, educational and informational work is to help Soviet people recognize the whole falsity of this slanderous propaganda, in a clear, concrete and convincing manner to expose its insidious methods, to bring the truth about the world's first country of victorious socialism to the international community. It should always be remembered that the marginalization of the coverage of actual problems, lack of promptness, questions left unanswered, are beneficial only to our class enemy" (Resolution, 1979).

It was 1979 that was almost the final for a brief *détente* in political relations between the USSR and the West, *the cold war* began to gain momentum. Soon after the invasion of Soviet troops in Afghanistan (late December 1979), the jamming of the broadcasts of Voice of America and other Western radio stations in Russian on the territory of the USSR resumed (from August 20-21, 1980).

The power of Y. Andropov (years of life: 1914-1984) further exacerbated ideological confrontation and counterpropaganda: in June 1983, the Resolution of the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee "Actual Issues of the Party's Ideological and Political Work with Masses" was adopted.

The brief office period of K. Chernenko (years of life: 1911-1985) was marked not only by the escalation of ideological confrontation, but also by an attempt of the education reform (relatively stable in the 1970s). The decision about the reform was taken at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU in June

1983. K. Chernenko approved it and published the Decree of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR "On the main directions of the reform of the secondary and vocational school" (April 12, 1984 N 13-XI), which presupposed:

- return to the eleven-year secondary education;
- streaming high-school students into various advanced level classes (i.e. Language Arts, Science, Maths);
- the establishment of secondary vocational schools;
- limiting the number of students in a class to 25-30 people;
- increase of teachers' salary (Decree ..., 1984).

Again, as in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the task was "to radically improve the implementation of labor education, training and vocational guidance in the general education school; to strengthen the polytechnical, practical orientation of teaching; to expand significantly the training of skilled workers in the vocational training system; to implement the transition to universal vocational education for young people" (Decree ..., 1984).

However, in reality, the idea of labor training in schools (as it had happened in the first half of the 1960s), was very soon rejected: since 1988, vocational training in secondary school became elective, not obligatory. In fact, neither the teachers' salary, nor the prestige of the pedagogical profession really increased (the latter, by the way, was reflected in the films on the school topic).

It is clear that the Decree of the Supreme Council of the USSR "On the main directions of the reform of the secondary and vocational school" has to some extent been embodied in Soviet audiovisual media texts, but because of "perestroika" started in 1986, films, violating prior taboos of school representation in films, have appeared.

As for the direct reflection of political events (see Table 2), it barely appeared in the films on the school/university theme of the stagnation era: neither the Soviet-Chinese conflict nor the war in Afghanistan affected the "school" films in any way. The only truly politicized film was *The Diary of Carlos Espinola* (1976), depicting the international boarding school for children of foreign (often – Latin American) oppositionists. In the course of action, a schoolboy named Carlos learns that his father was sentenced to death for an opposition struggle (most likely in Chile) and (apparently) for pro-Soviet views.

*Table 2. Key dates and events in the USSR and worldwide in stagnation period (1969-1985): politics, economics, education, culture
(compiled by A. Fedorov)*

<i>Years</i>	<i>Key dates and events in the USSR and worldwide in stagnation period (1969-1985): politics, economics, culture</i>
1969	Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On increasing the responsibility of the executive managers of the press, radio and television, cinema, culture and art institutions for the ideological and political level of published materials and repertoire": January 7. The publication of the New Edition of the Third Program of the CPSU, that didn't contain promises to build communism in the near future.

	<p>Armed conflict between the USSR and China on Damansky Island: March.</p> <p>Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On measures for the further development of Soviet children's literature": March 26.</p> <p>The approval by the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR of the elective course for the secondary school "Fundamentals of the Cinema Art": April.</p> <p>The landing of American astronauts on the moon: July 20.</p> <p>Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the USSR on the measures for the development of color television in the USSR: August 9.</p> <p>Organization of preparatory courses at universities: August 19.</p> <p>The beginning of Soviet-American negotiations on the limitation of strategic nuclear weapons: Nov. 17.</p> <p>The exemption of A. Solzhenitsyn from the USSR Writers' Union: November.</p>
1970	<p>100-year anniversary of V. Lenin: April 22.</p> <p>Twentieth anniversary of victory over Germany in the Great Patriotic War: 9 May.</p> <p>The treaties between the USSR and Germany, Germany and Poland on the recognition of postwar borders in Europe: August.</p> <p>Adoption of the Charter of the secondary school: September 8.</p> <p>A. Solzhenitsyn is awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature: October 8.</p>
1971	<p>XXIV Congress of the CPSU: March 30 - April 9.</p> <p>Five hundred thousand people in Washington, D.C. and 125,000 in San Francisco march in protest against the Vietnam War - April 24.</p> <p>The United Kingdom accused about 100 Soviet diplomats of espionage - September 24.</p>
1972	<p>Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On Literary and Art Criticism": January 21.</p> <p>Visit of US President Richard Nixon to the USSR. Between the USSR and the United States, an agreement was signed on limiting missile defense and on the joint space program "Soyuz" - "Apollo": May 22-30.</p> <p>Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On measures for the further development of Soviet cinema": August 2.</p> <p>Trade agreement between the USSR and the USA: October 18.</p> <p>The 50th anniversary of the USSR: December 30.</p>
1973	<p>Armed insurgency in Chile. The President of Chile S. Allende was killed. General A. Pinochet came to power in Chile: September.</p> <p>War in the Middle East: October.</p> <p>Increase in world oil prices.</p> <p>The publication (in Paris) of the first volume of the anti-Soviet / anti-communist book of A.I. Solzhenitsyn "The Gulag Archipelago": December.</p>
1974	<p>A. Solzhenitsyn was expelled from the USSR: February 13.</p> <p>Visit of the US President Richard Nixon to the USSR. The agreement on restriction of underground nuclear tests is signed: on July, 3rd.</p> <p>The resignation of US President Richard Nixon: August 8.</p> <p>Visit of the US President J. Ford to the USSR: November 23-24.</p>
1975	<p>The Soviet Union's refusal to trade with the US in protest against the statements of the American Congress on Jewish emigration: January 15.</p> <p>End of the Vietnam War: April 30.</p> <p>The 30th anniversary of the victory over Germany in the Great Patriotic War: 9 May.</p> <p>Signing the USSR (together with 35 countries) of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe: August 1.</p> <p>Another break in the jamming of "enemy votes" (except for Radio Liberty) - as a result of the signing of the Helsinki Act.</p> <p>Joint Soviet-American space flight: July.</p> <p>A Russian nuclear physicist, and an activist for disarmament and peace A.D. Sakharov is awarded the Nobel Peace Prize: October 9.</p>
1976	<p>XXV Congress of the CPSU: February 24 - March 5.</p> <p>Reaching of the agreement between the USSR and the USA on the prohibition of underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes with a capacity of over 150 kilotons: on May 28.</p> <p>Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On work with creative youth": October 12.</p>
1977	<p>The Soviet icebreaker Arctica becomes the first surface ship to reach the North Pole - August 17.</p> <p>Opening of the Belgrade Conference on Monitoring the Implementation of the Decisions of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe: 4 October.</p> <p>The 60th anniversary of Soviet power: November 7.</p> <p>The Soviet National Anthem's lyrics are returned after a 24-year period, with Joseph Stalin's name</p>

	omitted.
1978	A military coup in Afganistan - April 27. Start of Islamic Revolution in Iran.
1979	Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On further improvement of ideological, political and educational work": April 26. The agreement between the USSR and the USA on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons: June 18. The 60th anniversary of Soviet cinema: August 27. The second coup d'état in Afghanistan, supported by the USSR: September 16. The entry of the USSR troops into Afghanistan, the beginning of the Afghan war: December.
1980	In response to the invasion of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, the United States suspended ratification of the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms, announced a boycott of the Olympic Games in Moscow and an embargo on the supply of modern technologies and grains to the USSR: January 4. Academician AD Sakharov was exiled to Gorky. By decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, he was deprived of the 3 titles of Hero of Socialist Labor, and by a decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR - the title of laureate Stalin (1953) and Lenin (1956) prizes: January 22. The Olympic Games in Moscow: July 19 - August 3. The USSR resumed jamming the broadcasts of "Voice of America" and other Western radio stations in Russian on the territory of the USSR: from August 20-21. Activity of the Solidarity movement in Poland.
1981	XXVI Congress of the CPSU: February 23 - March 3. Abolition of the US embargo on grain supplies to the USSR: April 24. The beginning of the production of neutron weapons in the United States. The signing of a contract between the USSR and Germany on the supply of gas to West Germany: November 20. Imposing the martial law in Poland: December 13. Statement by US President R. Reagan on the inadmissibility of Soviet interference in the affairs of Poland, the announcement of new sanctions against the USSR: December 29.
1982	Signing a contract between the USSR and France for the supply of Siberian gas: January 23. The British-Argentine armed conflict in the Falklands: March-April. Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On the creative links of literary and art magazines with the practice of communist construction": July 30. The death of Leonid Brezhnev: November 10, Yu. V. Andropov comes to power. Cancellation of the US sanctions imposed against the USSR in connection with the events in Poland: November 13. The 60th anniversary of the USSR: December 30.
1983	Resolution of the plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU "Actual issues of the ideological, mass-political work of the party": June. The government of Poland announces the end of martial law and amnesty for political prisoners - July 20. A South Korean civilian aircraft was shot down over the territory of the USSR: September 1. Y. Andropov's statement with a statement against the deployment of Pershing-2 missiles in Europe and the abolition of a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles: November 24.
1984	The conference on disarmament is opened in Stockholm: January 17. The death of Y. Andropov, K. Chernenko comes to power: 9 February. Decree of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR "On the main directions of reform of the general and vocational schools": April 12. Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On measures to further enhance the ideological and artistic level of motion pictures and strengthen the material and technical base of cinematography": April 19. Statement on the Boycott of the USSR Olympic Games in Los Angeles: May 8. The French President F. Mitterrand visits the USSR: June 21-23. The Soviet protest against the US military program "Star Wars": June 29. Visit of the member of the Politburo M. Gorbachev in the UK, his meeting with Prime Minister M. Thatcher: December 15-21.
1985	The death of K. Chernenko, Mikhail Gorbachev comes to power: March. The resumption of negotiations on arms limitation in Geneva: March 12. The 40th anniversary of the victory over Germany in the Great Patriotic War: May 9. Meeting of M. Gorbachev and Reagan in Geneva: November 19-21.

According to the authorities, the Soviet audiovisual texts in 1969-1985, related to school and university, were supposed to support the main lines of the then state policy in the educational, social, and cultural spheres, that is, to show that while maintaining common ideological guidelines, the Soviet system of education, upbringing and culture:

- cares about the inner world of a school student and focuses on the formation of a "comprehensively developed personality";
- the relationship between teachers and students remains democratic, to some extent creative;
- there are problem zones at school and university (criticism became especially visible in the first half of the 1980s, with the release of such significant works as *The Rescuer* by S. Soloviev, *Boys* by D. Asanova and *Scarecrow* by R. Bykov).

How the knowledge of real historical events of a particular period helps to understand the given media texts, examples of historical references in these media texts.

The Golden Watch (1968) and *Our Calling* (1981), features a positive view on the pedagogical experience of Soviet educators and the pioneer movement of the 1920s, however, these films no longer had such broad resonance as the thaw period film *Republic of ShKID* (1966). In the 1970s and early 1980s, the tendencies of returning to the Lenin's norms of life and the ideas of "good Bolsheviks" have already lost their appeal.

The films *The Big Break* (1972), *Translation from English* (1972), *Different People*, 1973; *The Diary of the School Principal* (1975), *The Key That Should Not Be Handed On* (1976); *Refutation* (1976); *The Rescuer* (1980) reflected the problems in the pedagogical environment, which to some extent echoed the message for self-criticism, contained in the reports of the CPSU congresses.

Social, cultural, ideological, and religious context

Ideology, directions, goals, objectives, world outlook, the concepts of the media texts' authors in the socio-cultural context; ideology, culture of the world, depicted in media texts.

In the era of "stagnation", the communist ideology (including the anti-capitalist theory of socialist realism) in the USSR continued to dominate, the film industry found itself under harder censorship than in "thaw" period, so the authors of most audiovisual media texts on the school-university theme were working within these strict frames, although every year the school and university subjects in Soviet cinema step by step won back new "permitted" territories.

In the films *Woodpeckers Don't Get Headaches* (1974), *Love at First Sight* (1975), *One Hundred Days After Childhood* (1975), *School Waltz* (1977), *I Ask to Accuse Klava K. Of My Death* (1979), *Love and Lies* (orig. *Vam i ne snilos*, 1980), *All The Way Around* (1981), *Cheating* (1983), etc. the theme of love relationships between school students was unveiled on the whole in a puritan way. However, such events as the triumphant march of rock music and the sexual revolution

sweeping western countries in the 1970s, touched upon popular culture in the Soviet Union, too. Thus, in *School Waltz* (1977), a pretty senior not only had sexual relations with her classmate, but was also pregnant (the situation had been absolutely impossible in the chaste cinema of the previous years). *Alyosha* (1980) featured a young teacher in the technical college falling in love with his seventeen-year-old student and proposing to her. Despite all the rigors of Soviet censorship, some films contained episodes exposing adolescent interest in sex: schoolchildren examined a low neckline of a good-looking teacher in binoculars (*We Used to Live Next Door*, 1982), a schoolgirl admired the nude figure of a young teacher taking the shower (*Good Intentions*, 1984).

While in the film *Little Confession* (1971) rock music was still a novelty, a few years later it sounded in many films about school/education (*Brother is the Whole Point*, 1976; *The Practical Joke*, 1976; *I Will Wait*, 1979, etc.).

The world outlook of the characters of the "school world" depicted in media texts

In general, the world view of the audiovisual media texts' characters featuring school and university storylines during the stagnation period, as in the previous decades, was optimistic, however, some anxiety about the morale of teachers and students (*The Diary of the School Principal* (1975), *The Key That Should Not Be Handed On* (1976), *The Rescuer* (1980), *The Chair* (1982), *The Boys* (1983), *Scarecrow* (1983), etc.). There were outstanding personalities, troubled with reflection and doubt among the characters (schoolchildren, students and teachers) (*Cross the Threshold, Translation from English, The Diary of the School Principal, One Hundred Days After Childhood, The Key That Should Not Be Handed On, The Traitor, The Rescuer, The Boys, Scarecrow*). But there were also new dramatic plot twists: in *Other People's Letters* (1975), an impudent high school student rudely interfered in personal life of the teacher who sheltered her, and in *Scarecrow* (1983) aggressive classmates harassed a defenseless girl.

At the same time, there was a mass production of "school" films, where the usual hierarchy of values dominated (communist ideology, collectivism, diligence, honesty, willingness to give a helping hand): *Yulka*, 1972; *Valka's Sail*, 1974; *Such High Mountains*, 1974; *Little Dad's Adventures*, 1979; *Sail, Ship*, 1983; *The Diary, The Letter and The First Grader*, 1984, *The Sun in Your Pocket*, 1984; *Watch Out - Vasilyok*, 1985, etc. It seems that the story of a reformed struggling school boy from the comedy *Malicious Sunday* (1985) could have been filmed in the late 1940s and 1950s. Such films generated a touching, pathetic intonation in relation to the school children characters (Gromov, 1981, p. 36).

Meanwhile, Soviet economy problems were highlighted on the screen more and more often. For example, *Translation from English* (1972) shows the excitement of schoolchildren about petty but deficit foreign merchandise (chewing gums and badges). The comedy *Crank from the 5B* (1972) features a shot taken at the department store and consumers' hype at the counter. In *Quiet C-Students*

(1980), one of the characters proudly declares that he waited for three years for his turn to buy the sought after car.

Structure and narrative techniques in these media texts

Schematically, the structure, plot, representativeness, ethics, features of genre modification, iconography, character characters of audiovisual media texts on school and university topic in the "stagnation" period can be presented as follows:

- *the location and time period in media texts*. The main location in films is school classes and corridors, schoolyards and flats; the plot is set mostly (if it's not a retro about 1920s) at the time when the film is made.

- *the environment typical for these media texts, household items*: the furnishings and household items of school films are still modest, however sometimes wealthy apartments are shown (*The Practical Joke, Grasshopper, The Chair, The Follower*).

- *genre modifications of school and university subjects*: drama, comedy, melodrama, less often - fiction;

- *narrative techniques, narrative bias*: positive characters are rarely idealized, and negative ones tend to be presented ambiguously too, although there are many relapses from the "soothing" cinema of the 1950s;

Typology of characters:

- *characters' age*: the age of schoolchildren is in the range of 7-17 years, however, teenage characters are most common; the age of other characters (teachers, parents, grandparents, etc.) varies, but adults but adults below 60 prevail;

- *education level*: corresponding school year for students, teachers presumably have a university degree, supporting characters can have any level of education;

- *social status, profession*: the financial situation of students is basically the same (although from the second half of the 1970s the material inequality of individual characters began to be more clearly indicated), they can be either from the families of workers and farmers, or from the intelligentsia. The parents' jobs are diverse.

- *characters' marital status*: school students, naturally, are not married; adult characters are mostly married, however, single teachers often appear on the screen (resulting in plot twists connected with the love relationships of male teachers with university or college female students);

- *appearance, clothing, physique of characters, features of their characters, vocabulary*: the appearance of the characters of school children and students in the films of the stagnation period is within the framework of the canons of the student's image of that time. The boys' hairdo changed in the mid 1970s: the western fashion for men's long hair no longer shocked the teachers.



A shot from the movie *The Practical Joke* (1976)

Schoolchildren in the films 1969-1985, as in the "thaw" period, did not exhibit fanaticism of their peers in the films of the 1920s -1930s, but on the whole they retained optimism. However, more and more often villain characters, who clearly had no chance of reformation, appeared on screen.

Teachers from the films of the stagnation period, like in the days of the late thaw, were increasingly confronted with doubts and sad contemplations. The distance between them and the students became more fragile (this was especially evident in the dramas *Other People's Letters*, *Traitor*, *Alyosha*, *4:0 in Tanechka's favor*, *Good Intentions*, *Almost Peers*). As for the appearance, now they could already afford some liberties in their clothes (for example, a suede jacket, a flirty scarf, in-style blouse and hairdo).



A shot from the movie *Quiet C-Students* (1980)

A significant change in the life of media characters and the challenge that the characters face (a violation of the usual life):

Option 1: among the next-door characters, schoolchildren who live a normal life, are those who for some reason do not fit into the standard framework of interpersonal communication and learning process, that is:

- they perform weekly at school and thus hold back the class' rating (*The Last "Fail" Grade*, 1977, *Quiet C-Students*, 1980, *Another Student's A*, 1982 etc.);

- try to dominate, subjugate their classmates, acting sometimes violently (*Kindness*, 1977; *Plead Guilty*, 1983; *Scarecrow*, 1983; *Leader*, 1984; *Games for Schoolchildren*, 1985, etc. .);

- stand out among classmates (in a good way or in a bad way) so conflict with the rest of the class and / or teachers (*Cross the Threshold*, 1970, *Little Confession*, 1971, *Oh, This Nastya*, 1971); *Translation from English*, 1972; *Crank from the 5B*, 1972); *Stunning Berendeev*, 1975; *Other People's Letters* , 1975; *What's Wrong With You?*, 1975; *The Practical Joke*, 1976; *Kindness*, 1977; *Once Upon a Time There Lived the First Grade*, 1977; *Flat with the Child to Rent*, 1978; *The Tuning Fork*, 1979; *Unfinished Lesson*, 1980; *Revision For the Exam*, 1980; *Lullaby for Brother*, 1982; *If to Believe Lopotukhin*, 1983; *Mascot*, 1983; *Scarecrow*, 1983, *The Morning Without Marks*, 1983; *The Leader*, 1984; *The Third One in the Fifth Row*, 1984; *Malicious Sunday*, 1985; *Different*, 1985);

- fall in love (*Boys*, 1969; *Yulka*, 1972; *Woodpeckers Don't Get Headaches*, 1974; *Love at First Sight*, 1975; *One Hundred Days After Childhood*, 1975; *School Waltz*, 1977; *I Ask to Accuse Klava K. Of My Death*, 1979; *Love and Lies*, 1980; *All The Way Around*, 1981; *Cheating*, 1983; *Overheard Conversation*, 1984, *Before the Snow Falls Down*, 1984, etc.).

Option 2: there are extraordinary teachers among faculty - those who also do not fit into the standard school framework, that is, they try to:

- resist the outdated and / or, from their point of view, incorrect methods of the school principal and / or teaching staff and collide with him / them (*Every Evening After Work*, 1973; *The Key That Should Not Be Handed On*, 1976; *Refutation*, 1976; *Kindness*, 1977; *Alyosha*, 1980, *Unfinished Lesson*, 1980, etc.);

- establish trust-based relations with the students, no matter how difficult it may be (*The Big Break*, 1972; *The Key That Should Not Be Handed On*, 1976; *The Traitor*, 1976; *Kindness*, 1977; *The Tuning Fork*, 1979; *Alyosha*, 1980; *Unfinished Lesson*, 1980; *4:0 in Favor of Tanechka*, 1982; *Good Intentions*, 1984; *Almost Peers*, 1984; *Men Are Men*, 1985).

Solving the problem:

Option 1 (student-centered):

- "correct" characters (schoolchildren, teachers, parents, other adults) return non-conformist and / or students in love to ordinary life by individual and joint efforts (*Translation from English*, 1972; *Yulka*, 1972; *Kindness*, 1977; *The Last "Fail" Mark*, 1977; *The Tuning Fork*, 1979; *Quiet C-Students*, 1980; *All the Way Around*, 1981; *The Morning Without Marks*, 1983);

- "odd ones out" school students keep their belief, because they do not comply to educational/parental influence (*Cross the Threshold*, 1970; *Other People's Letters*, 1975; *The Practical Joke*, 1976; *Love and Lies*, 1980; *The Leader*, 1984).

Option 2 (teachers-centered):

- unconventional teachers triumph (*Translation from English*, 1972; *Kindness*, 1977; *Quiet C-Students*, 1980; *4:0 in Favor of Tanechka*, 1982; *Good*

Intentions, 1984; *Almost Peers*, 1984), or (as in *Every Evening after Work*, 1973; *Other People's Letters*, 1975; *The Key That Should Not Be Handed On*, 1976; *The Traitor*, 1976; and *Alyosha*, 1980) the result of their effect on students is ambiguous.

The transformation of the gender aspect within the school/university theme in cinema is notable. In the 1960s - the mid 1970s, the on-screen teacher was often a man (*Mishka, Serega and I*, 1961; *The Fallen Angel*, 1962; *Come Tomorrow*, 1962; *The First Teacher*, 1966; *The Republic of Shkid*, 1966; *The Literature Lesson*, 1968; *We'll Live Till Monday*, 1968; *Cross the Threshold*, 1970; *The Big Break*, 1972; *Translation from English*, 1972; *A Teacher of Singing*, 1972; *Yulka*, 1972; *The Diary of the School Principal*, 1975; *One Hundred Days After Childhood*, 1975). But in the late 1970s - early 1980s, due to the actual state of things, images of female educators, often single, lonely and disturbed, appear: *Other People's Letters*, 1975; *The Key That Should Not Be Handed On*, 1976; *The Traitor*, 1976; *The Practical Joke*, 1976; *Flowers for Olya*, 1976; *Flat with the Child to Rent*, 1978; *French Lessons*, 1978; *The Tuning Fork*, 1979; *Love and Lies*, 1980; *Quiet C-Students*, 1980; *Lullaby for Brother*, 1982; *Scarecrow*, 1983, *Good Intentions*, 1984; *The Third One in the Fifth Row*, 1984; *Men Are Men*, 1985);

The gender aspect in cinema on the school topic culminated, in our opinion, in the film *Men Are Men* (1985). A pompous pioneer complains to the teacher that boys in her class perform poorly and hold the whole class back, so that she wishes a separate education returned. The male part of the class takes this as a challenge and literally starting the next day boys impress the whole school both by exemplary behavior and by excellent grades.

Conclusions. One may agree that most of the films dedicated to school during the stagnation period in the USSR were based on typical stereotypes that to some extent reflected life-like patterns: the emergence of non-fitting-in teachers, their opposition to the routine; a non-standard student, an intelligent student who often conflicts with a class and a doctrinal teacher and does not always find an ally represented by an intelligent mentor or a peer (Mamaladze, 1977, pp. 75-76). But the thesis about the isolation of the screen school from real school life has been refuted by storylines, conflicts and characters of such debated and remarkable films as *Other People's Letters*, *The Diary of the School Principal*, *The Rescuer*, *Scarecrow* and *Games for School Children*.

Summing up, the analysis of the films of the stagnation period (1969-1985) about school/university showed that on the screen:

- the education/ formation process went beyond the previous strict framework for the preservation of rigid communist landmarks, and the anti-religious orientation was no longer imposed;
- the storyline was not directly linked to key international political events, although to varying degrees they were dependent on domestic political attitudes;
- the main story clashes were built on the opposition of non-ordinary teachers and students with stagnation, bureaucracy, mediocre authorities /

colleagues / class. The problem zones (economic crisis, disappointment and fatigue, professional "burnout" of teachers, bureaucratism, pragmatic cynicism of students, teenage cruelty, etc.) were not concealed;

- schoolchildren in the films 1969-1985, as in the "thaw" period, did not exhibit fanaticism of their peers in the films of the 1920s -1930s, but on the whole they retained optimism. However, more and more often villain characters, who clearly had no chance of reformation, appeared on screen;

- the activity of students, that used to be mostly directed to the outside world, even more than in the 1960s, in the stagnation period began to touch upon their inner world (*Oh, this Nastya*, 1971; *Spring Flips*, 1974; *Woodpeckers Don't Get Headaches*, 1974; *One Hundred Days After Childhood*, 1975; *Other People's Letters*, 1975; *French Lessons*, 1978; *The Rescuer*, 1980; *Scarecrow*, 1983);

- the relations between teachers and students have become more democratic, in some instances even reaching back-slapping terms;

- the prestige of the pedagogical profession has begun to decline in the eyes of students and general public;

- images of female teachers, often lonely and anxious, began to prevail;

- income and property differentiation increasingly manifested itself;

- there were changes in the appearance of students and teachers, it became more casual; in a latent form, the motif of female sexuality gradually emerged;

- stories about university students (*We Have Not Covered It*, 1975; *Troublemaker*, 1978; *Grasshopper*, 1979; *I Will Wait*, 1979; *Since We've Been Together*, 1982; *My Little Wife*, 1984; *Valentin and Valentina*, 1985; *How Young We Were*, 1985) unlike the "thaw" analogues were practically devoid of intellectual disputes, and were densely immersed in the genre element of melodrama and / or comedy. On the whole, the love theme in the cinema about school/university was generally delivered with the melodrama accents;

- since the mid-1970s, the color image has led to an increase in the entertainment aspects of films.

5. Soviet films about school and university of the "perestroika" period (1986-1991)

Keen researchers of films on school and schoolchildren G.A. Belyaeva and V.Y. Mikhailin argue that "the emergence of the school genre was due to the need of the Soviet power elites in updating the tools which they embodied the communist project with and carried out the necessary work to create profitable and acceptable to the viewers matrices, with which the latter could build their own projective realities. In this sense, the customer or the agency, forming the system of expectations necessary for the emergence of the genre is two social groups: the actual Soviet power elite (and the closely related cultural elites) form the "commission" directly, solving very specific mobilization tasks. However they are guided by a very definite set of projective realities, compatible with the positively and negatively colored personal expectations of a "common Soviet man", who, in this way, is also directly involved in shaping this commission" (Belyayev, Mikhailin 2015, p. 551). Aside from the fact that the authors clearly confuse the terms "genre" and "theme" (a film genre isn't its theme, but there may be overlap; so any topic, including school, can be features in different genres), it is quite possible to agree with the rest. However, it was true before the "perestroika" period, when a lot of films about the school and university broke the former Soviet "mobilization agenda": the communism project was rejected, the former idealized screen world of school and university collapsed.

First Western cinema, and a little later – Polish and Hungarian cinema in the 1970s, broke the previous censorship bans and disclosed striking themes of minors' violence, drug addiction, child prostitution, sexual relations not only between students, but also between school teachers and students. Thus the generation gap eternal problem was tinted with new and shocking colors.

With an understandable delay, Soviet cinematography joined this tendency only in the perestroika period, although in the first half of the 1980s it seemed that the *Boys* (1983) and *Scarecrow* (1983) marked the top bar of the censorship permissible representation of youth in the Soviet cinema.

So, in the drama *Arsonists* (1988) a special school for girls aged 15-16 was graphically shown. The action of the first half of the film is transferred from the toilet to the punishment cell, from the shabby barn to the dark closet. Violence, drugs, cruelty, in a spiritually sanctimonious state shell accompanied with the song "*My address is not a house or a street ...*". When a youthful teacher, well aware of the mores of the school's population, prefers not to notice the fresh blood on the mirror in the bedroom for twenty people. When the strong take pleasure in bullying the weak. The first part of the film features some strong episodes. And the main character – the leader of the vocational school's class – is presented by the authors unusually harshly, giving no hints for sympathy, without traditional scenes of reformation and hope.

In our opinion, the second part of the film looks weaker, when a girl, having escaped from the "educational institution", makes her way to Central Asia. A lot of episodes seem superfluous and protracted, and, probably, the picture would only have benefited if the authors had deepened their investigation into the characters and relationship in the special school.

Even more shocking, especially compared to Soviet films about children of the 1950s and 1970s, was the *Government Facility* (1989). The film had a terrifying ending: a 15-year-old orphan killed a man as a revenge for his girlfriend, raped by him. But it was also a vengeance for his ruined childhood, for his friend's drug overdose, for the hypocritical slogans of adults, for the social indifference, for the wretchedness of his life. Only five years earlier Soviet people enjoyed watching a sentimental *Orphanage's Headmistress* (1983), where the caring and affectionate heroine performed by N. Gundareva sincerely tried to create a home comfort for her disadvantaged foster pupils.

But in 1989 the very name of the film *Government Facility* sounded like a severe and ruthless accusation. There's nothing to do about it: by the beginning of the 1990s, almost the entire country turned into an unfriendly and uncomfortable state house, whose inhabitants were doomed to humiliation of human dignity, discomforts and stresses, poverty and lack of freedom; the orphanage, as a water drop, reflected all the vices and misfortunes of Soviet life.

"The headmistress" of the government facility was played by G. Polskih. Previously she had played a lot of charming, good mothers. But here her character, the head teacher of the orphanage, is far from educational problems. G. Polskih played an administrative appendage of the government mechanism of foster children's management.

At the same time, she is not at all a monster, at times, she can talk to someone heart to heart. She has quite good relationship with her colleagues. She is not too strict. She may scream with the power of the fire alarm, but she settles the nerves quite quickly, too.

By the way, this feature was pointed out by the authors very accurately. The system of interrelations in an average educational institution made school and orphanage's employees develop an ability to bring oneself almost to hysterics (outwardly) with absolute coldness and indifference (internally). G. Polskih's character values the facade of well-being in the first place. For its sake, she is ready to turn a blind eye to anything. The film gave a kind of sociological snapshot of the life of the "captives" of orphanages, calling for mercy, compassion, changing the community for the kinder way.

In the film *Made in the USSR* (1990), the usual secondary school became a model of a totalitarian state. A trivial story about a mysterious theft of a VCR (curiously enough, a VCR and a video camera used to be some of the most common objects of theft in "perestroika" films about the school, but today's young audience probably needs a special explanation on the prestigious value of video or branded jeans during perestroika) turns into a grotesque and gloomy farce, when

the acting director terrorizes students and teachers as a dictator. Young "patriots" punish their peers "dissidents", joining the ranks of the "pioneer-yugend", and a school laboratory turns into a torture room. The sinister and bitter satire of this film was undoubtedly inspired by the anti-utopias of G. Orwell and E. Zamyatin, but, oddly enough, it does not seem outdated even today.

However, perhaps the most pessimistic view of school problems was in K. Muratova's *Asthenic Syndrome* (1989): in mainstream cinematography "the director would know exactly who is good, who is bad, who is right, who is wrong. If the teacher is not talented, then it's OK for the students not to listen to him; or vice versa: they are loafers and hooligans, if they do not listen to their teacher ... Muratova has a different view; people generally do not care at all who is right, who is wrong, what is going on here or elsewhere: is there anyone here" (Anninsky, 2006, p. 78-79). Here the students are busy with anything (eating, looking at obscene pictures, chattering, etc.), but not the subject matter. Here, a teacher, tormented by such a pedagogical process, can easily fight a high school student right during the lesson, and in the end of the film simply fall asleep forever.

It was during the perestroika years that the previously poorly accentuated topic of material inequality was sharply outlined in the films about school.

For example, analyzing the drama *Temptation* (1987), V.S. Ivanova persuaded the readers that it "inherited the best traditions of our school film: careful attitude to the youngest, the conversation is not at different levels, but on an equal footing, because even the smallest creature running around you is a person. In all the high sense of the word. That is, he, she may be already bad, and already good, but they entered life, society, they have a sum of claims, but also a sum of promises. ... Yes, others say, it is necessary to give the injection of adult life to children as early as possible - I do not know if it is so. but let's all the same do this gradually. With anesthesia. And in any case, with love. Otherwise it's a shock. Otherwise, scrap. As in *Temptation* (Ivanova, 1990, p. 152).

At the beginning of the film *Temptation* it seems that the tenth grade student Zhenya is an elder sister of Lena (*Scarecrow*, 1983). Firstly, as Lena, she's new in class, and secondly, she falls in love with the cleverest and the most handsome and popular guy. But most importantly - she is a strong personality. But while Lena finds the strength to oppose the crowd one versus all, Zhenya is craving to win a place under the sun of the school elite. Zhenya's and Lena's classmates, if different from each other, it is only by age. The circle of interests they have, in fact, is the same. But the film's directing is deprived of lyricism and semitones.

At pre-perestroika times, the authors would simply have to expose the character possessed by the "thirst for a beautiful life". However, *Temptation* is different. The problem is not about Zhenya dreaming of being accepted to "upper society" at her new school. The drama of the heroine is that she fell victim to the double morality of the society, an imaginary equality of opportunities. When the camera is mercilessly showing the fierce fight of Zhenya with her classmates after they exposed her fictitious elitism, the authors' position is clearly emphasized.

If *Temptation* had been produced in the beginning of the 1980s (actually, the script by Yuri Klepikov was written for Dinara Asanova), it would undoubtedly have produced a shock effect, even more than *Scarecrow*. But at the box office in 1988, along with other "exposing" picture, Zhenya's story was received without any special public resonance.

In 1991, the theme of schoolchildren from "high society" was continued by the film *Darling Ap* (screen version of the story by G. Mikhasenko). E. Stishova wrote that this film priori asked for critical reproaches in the varnishing of reality. Severe critics had a lot of remarks. Children's Versailles, arranged by the director in the pavilions of the Belarusian film studio, was a nice change to people, exhausted by perestroika. Teenagers dressed in tuxedos with bow ties at a classmates' birthday party, girls dressed up in haut couture gowns, the americanization of interiors and conversations, the rejection of everyday truth in the name of Beauty was, of course, an attempt for poetics, polemical in relation to the symbol of faith of the modern screen, pretending to reflect "life in the forms of life itself". To the critic's taste, there was not enough author's presence in the film, irony could be barely read, which is why the system of conventions, consciously chosen by the director, can be perceived as the relict thinking of the times of socialist realism, and not at all like a fairy tale movie, deliberately dropped out of social coordinates, deliberately abandoned psychology and connotation. *Darling Ap* manifests a certain intention of the film process, ready to form in the direction. It's the break with ideology, in the place of which any mythology will do - from Hollywood to the ancient one (Stishova, 1992, p. 135).

We must pay tribute to the perspicacity of E. Stishova: the proportion of films that got rid of connotations and psychological underpinning became noticeably larger in Russian cinema both in the 1990s and in the 2000s, affecting the school theme, too.

Perestroika cinema about schoolchildren has also broke old sexual prohibitions. Virtually, university teacher-university student affairs (albeit puritanically shown) were possible in Soviet cinema (*Grasshopper*, 1979), but the sexual relationship between school teachers and high school students was taboo (although there might be a hint of it, for example, in the melodrama *The Story of the First Love*, 1957).

It started small: in the drama *Come What May* (1986), the zealous head teacher accused an innocent school dance production in the propaganda of "lecherous break dance," and an extraordinary high school student called his young teacher a beauty and declared his love in front of the whole class.

However in *Work on Mistakes* (1988), one of the key scenes of the film was a seduction attempted by a school girl of her teacher (the teacher, though, resisted); schoolchildren mocked a classmate, who's still a virgin being 16. Scenes of seduction (although unsuccessful) of teachers are also present in the films *Joys of the Youth* (1987) and *Slap in the Face that Never Happened* (1987).

The drama *The Doll* (1988) boldly violated the last censorship bastion, featuring (no details) the sexual relationship between a female schoolteacher and a male high school student. Against the backdrop of the flow of perestroika revelations and turbulent political events of the late 1980s, *The Doll* did not cause a sensation. Someone grumbled, but press reacted calmly – as to the usual fact of life, transferred to the screen (Gerber, 1989). To a greater extent, the film proved to be interesting because of the different highlight: exhausting sports work from early childhood leaves not a second of childhood, turning a living girl into an elastic doll. The fairy tale ends, the doll gets ill and is no longer of interest to the state sport committee. She used to be a princess, but becomes a Cinderella, she has to start all over again in a new class. And she does so according to the principles developed by professional sport: twice two makes only four (Gerber, 1989, p.7).

In the perestroika period, the storyline of an extraordinary university / school student was developed again (*Come What May*, 1986; *Work on Mistakes*, 1988; *The Whistler*, 1988; *The Jester*, 1988; *Puppy*, 1988; *Darling Ap*, 1991, etc.). One can probably agree with the opinion of A. Romanenko, voiced by her in 1989: no matter how bitter it is, but still we must admit that the inner life of a young man remained for decades closed not because our grown-up children are so complicated and closed for us, but because the art was afraid to look at their features, to describe their morals, to listen to a sincere confession. Because it would require new ways of analysis, and civic courage, and awareness of the fact that the film may not be allowed on the screens. Too strong were obstacles for such films and books, the whole period of a person's maturing was missed. Now the art has begun to make up for lost time, but it does it sometimes feverishly and hurriedly, going only the upper layer of life deep. Because life that has gone ahead requires new forms of communication, and new tools for analysis, philosophical equipment, sociological thinking, and the publicist's gift. ... A decade ago, three points of view on the current generation of young people were widely popular. The first argued that our youth is wonderful, heroic, almost burning with enthusiasm. The second focused on negative phenomena in the youth environment. They even exaggerated their scale. Still others ironically lamented: two thousand years ago people used to complain about the youth's moral degeneration, nothing new about that. Meanwhile, no one was able to penetrate into the real essence of the issues bothering young people, to feel the guilt and responsibility of the older generation, to understand the role of that social atmosphere that reigned in the seventies and influenced the spiritual warehouse and the attitude of the young. Today, the problem of youth has become the key one in life and in art. ... It is not surprising that keen interest, which was caused by the films offering a new level of truth in the conversation about youth (Romanenko, 1989, p. 43, 46).

Despite the acuteness of many "perestroika" films, the most debated film, where the main character was an offbeat schoolboy, was *Plumbum, or a Dangerous Game* (1986). Ruslan Chutko, nicknamed "Plumbum" is a young assistant of the police, using for the sake of "high" goals any means - betrayal,

blackmail, lies, violence. But the authors of this dramatic parable do not make him a disgusting monster. Yes, Ruslan meticulously and pedantically interrogates his father-poacher, reveling in his incorruptible authority. But the audience can see some human, even children's feature. But the line of Ruslan's parents is schematic: his mother is only interested in sentimental songs, fashion and figure skating on TV, and his father – in fishing in the wrong place. These are not alive characters, but signs, symbols of superficial slip in life. Other characters are somewhat hyperbolized too. Earlier works of A. Mindadze and V. Abdrashitov did not contain such obsessive symbolism and frank didacticism. However in *Plumbum* almost every episode is translated unambiguously.

Apparently, given the relatively small box-office success of their previous works (*The Word in Defense*, *The Turn*, *The Fox Hunt*, *The Train Stopped*, *Planet Parade*), the authors decided to get own back by making a spectacular picture, aimed at disputes. In order for the film to become more understandable and easier to read, they intentionally chose to simplify the characters, to repeat the symbolism, to add suspense. Perhaps, it made sense in terms of building a bridge between popular culture and more complex works of art. *Plumbum* just became such an link.

However, in the second half of the 1980s, the main character, Plumbum caused drastic disagreement among the audience. Some considered him a hero, others - a scoundrel. Some saw him as a role model, others angrily exposed his ignoble actions.

Film critics' opinions differentiated, too. For example, A. Romanenko wrote: "Today the screen exposes the stereotypes of our thinking, explodes the usual patterns and approaches to analysis. According to generally accepted indicators, the hero of the film by V. Abdrashitov *Plumbum* – a teenager Ruska – can quite claim the role of a hero. An excellent student, a public figure, an obedient son. But if one correlates Ruska's world with universal moral values: mercy, love – all his qualities begin to grow smaller and are seen as if in a different light. The knowledge he has mastered is just information that cannot become the basis of human culture, the relationship with parents is a ritual, the struggle against the criminal world is a way to test one's self, a self-assertion. Everything is turned inside out, the polarity is being reversed (Romanenko, 1989, p.44).

A. Gerber believed that Vadim Abdrashitov and Alexander Mindadze's film does not reassure or cheer. Some people might even humble with its impartial truth. She anticipated the irritation of the viewer, who is used to treating art as a well-groomed cemetery in the summer months, where everything is quiet and simple – "neither friends, nor enemies can be seen", as she puts it. However other audiences will say that this is not our boy, not our criminals, not our problems, it's disgusting, sick, pathological. The author argues that all of us, one way or another, are contaminated with this sickness, and on the screen we see an open form, with obvious symptoms. As a society, we have not yet thought about the destructive

power of social activity, not backed by moral ideals, devoid of moral guidelines. Abdrashitov and Mindadze have (Gerber, 1989, p.124).

This opinion was challenged by M. Kuznetsova: "I'm infinitely sorry for the boy named Plumbum. I'm tormented by the question: is it right with an unmercifully almighty author's will to load an incredibly heavy weight onto the immature shoulders of a child? All the sad experience of disappointment in people, piles of lies, which a person by the age of forty goes through... multiplied by talent, impassivity of the film director about the most painful moral issues of our time and the nearest past, - all this causes controversy, rejection and – worst of all – misunderstanding. I'm afraid that the younger generation can perceive Plumbum as an example to follow" (Kuznetsova, 1989, p.130).

S. Shumakov was even harsher in his assessment: "If the authors of *Plumbum* set themselves the task of waking up the viewer, make him think about the destructive power that the right words can be charged with, what threatens society and people, especially the young, the principle that the goal always justifies the means, – then the authors have achieved their goal. The film certainly hits the mark. It is watched, it is argued about, it touches everyone, including those who do not want to admit it. ... In essence, we are dealing with a trap, an intellectual labyrinth, which it is very easy to get into, but it is almost impossible to get out of it.

The parents' hypocrisy turns into a total imitation of life. Aspiration of their son by any means to reunite the word and the deed turns this life into a dangerous game. Both ways are bad. Where is the way out? The authors do not know. This is not surprising. They faced one of the fundamental questions of our history, culture, social life. ... The authors of the film *Plumbum, or a Dangerous Game* pushed us into the sphere of speculative constructions and abandoned us there. Get out, they say, as you want. We opened the box, showed it, spotlighted it, and it's up to you to decide. But we can not decide, because there is no image of the human soul in the film. We have no one to feel compassion for, so, there is nothing for our morals. A cold, distant glance, that has no sympathy, kills all life in the picture... And in the end the authors' become captives of their own game. Ruslan Chutko shamelessly manipulates people. It's immoral. But, while proving this to us, the filmmakers themselves did not notice the way they manipulated the hero, lost their moral reference point and found themselves in Plumbum's situation" (Shumakov, 1989, p. 131-134).

Two years later the theme of an unconventional personality of a school pupil was presented by the director A. Eshpai in a more aesthetic perspective in his film *The Jester* (1988). The main character Valentin is a nice guy, an honors pupil, a son of a professor, a researcher specializing in Japan studies. Valentin's film forerunners, who did not want to put up with the surrounding evil, tried to defeat it with its own weapon (*Plumbum*), escaped into the world of rock music (*The Burglar*), furiously and hopelessly took revenge (*The Blackmailer*), or sarcastically played a simple-hearted mask of a folklore Ivan the fool (*Courier/ Messenger*

Boy). Valentin chooses a different form of confrontation and self-affirmation, perhaps a more sophisticated one – his biting jests stick into a person's self-esteem. Breaking the narration (based on the story of Y. Vyazemsky) about Valentin Uspensky's life with the subtle vignettes of the chapters, Andrei Eshpai was in no hurry to convict his hero with a guilty verdict. Valya is smart, charming, witty. His "jesters" at first are completely harmless and even justified in their own way. Isn't it fair to play a trick on a self-confident handsome teacher who humiliated a student in love with her? Or to give a verbal injection to a shop assistant, whose rudeness is truly boundless? Valya has a solid philosophical justification for his jests. But, alas, his jests are becoming more and more aggressive. The game gradually turns into a disease. Valya "creates a kind of a space of general buffoonery around him, contempt for others, which is difficult to break out of" (Khlopyankina, 1988, p. 14).

At first glance, it seems that the visual imagery of the film is too refined for the genre of a quite dramatic comedy. Mists, greenish-pastel colors, luminosity of interiors, unclear fading of bizarre dreams. However, it is surprisingly in harmony with the image of the protagonist, with his low-key, but good manner of dressing, with his outward invisibility, hiding an unshakable confidence in his abilities and powers.

In fact, Valya has only one worthy opponent – a Maths teacher, an ironic skeptic and a brilliant professional. He even resembles Valya in some ways – independent in his judgments and actions, witty. He is the only person, who Valya's tricks won't go down with. Only he can unravel the jester's philosophy. The actor's charisma of I. Kostolevsky suited the role well. To the authors' credit, they were not tempted to offer a trivial solution to the conflict in the form of reformation of the main character by a talented teacher. The question of Valentin's future remains open.

Cinema of the reformation period reinforced the critical attitude towards the teaching profession. One after another, miserable portraits of unhappy women teachers, whose salary was 20-30 dollars per month, appeared on screen. Thus, the drama *Homo Novus* (1990) featured high school pupils bullying their depressed, gloomy teacher (I. Kupchenko). Moreover, they went as far as kidnapping her only son...The film meticulously depicted details of the characters' boring, dark life. To make the effect more powerful, the authors used black-and-white film, perhaps feeling themselves as cold surgeons operating on a tumour.

School pupils from the drama *Dear Elena Sergeevna* (1988) displayed the similar attitude to their naive teacher. To tell the truth, the story of an appalling blackmail that students initiated to get better exam marks, was presented unconvincingly in the film. Moreover, abstract, constructed image of an idealist teacher deprived the screen character of life authenticity (Sumenov, 1989, p.15). It was hardly believable that a teacher in her forties over all the years of her teaching experience had not got to know her pupils. It was also doubtful that an impudent son of a big boss, a straight "A" student, who was going to enter MGIMO

university, decides on the criminal act: in real life he would find a safer and more effective way to achieve his goal.

Images of male teachers in perestroika films were as well not positive. For example, director V. Derbenev totally relied on the talent of I. Smoktunovsky in the screen adaptation of V. Tendryakov's novel *60 Candles* (the film had a gloomy title *Black Corridor*, 1988). Smoktunovsky plays a history teacher recalling his far from ideal career. But actor's efforts were not backed up by the script and directing. Literally every shot is too straightforward and didactic. "*No, you are not a villain, you're worse, – his ex pupil tells the teacher. – A villain simply violates the rules. But the one who sincerely believes that a white lie is necessary for the humankind, that person makes his meanness a rule. You are not a villain, you are an evil idea!*"

The teacher's image is absolutely low leveled in K. Muratova's film *Asthenia Syndrome*, where the teacher Nikolai Alekseevich teaches an English class as if in the desert, in a class where pupils are busy with what not, but not the subject of the lesson. Dethroning of the teacher's image, that had started quite harmlessly, since the rethinking of the theme in *We'll Live Until Monday*, reached its logical end (Shipulina, 2010).

Against such a background, Perestroika films about school often featured teachers' phrases like:

- *What if they jump on your head? (Work on Mistakes);*
- *Oh my God, when will I finally retire and get rid of these criminals? (The Doll);*
- *I don't know if there is a borderline that you (pupils) will not cross (Dear Elena Sergeevna).*

On the wave of easing censorship's bans during Perestroika, some cinematographers thought that it was rather simple to make a film about school. Their formula was: a new sensational play/ novel or a short story used as a scenario basis, dialogues updated with sharp phrases from the current press (about the commodity and food deficit, about the low standard of living of the working people, etc.), and a popular actor invited to play the leading role. Alas, they often forgot a "trifle", which, probably, would not even be worth mentioning if it did not distinguish art from kitsch: artistry. But without it, any, the most beautiful slogans remain just newspaper headlines. Without it the audience is going to see ridiculous theatrics, falseness and overacting, only reinforcing the contrived scenarios.

Something of the sort happened to the drama *On the Outskirts, Somewhere in Town...* (1988), which became anemic, deprived of the author's pain, sluggish collection of cliché situations that were moving about from one "school film" to another in the late 1980s. A tormented teenager associates with shadowy personalities. A "progressive" teacher tries to pull the poor fellow out of the mess. No doubt, such situations do happen. The idea of the film is humane. But the attempt is in vain, since the cast is failing, the script is weak, as well, as director's

work. Instead of sincerity and pain, a bad theater and a primitive chronicle reign here ...

N.M. Zorkaya in her article published in the year of the release of another revelatory film – *Puppy* (1988) wrote that this "picture is serious, bitter, and tough. It makes one doubt if a praised "glasnost" really triumphed in our lives. In the village where the action takes place, it is unlikely that it will ever triumph. A sixteen-year-old boy, the film protagonist, pays the ultimate price for telling the truth. Without sparing us, the spectators, adult people, the screen unveils the mechanism of isolation and revenge, which throws out the one who dared to say out loud what everyone knows but keeps silent about. This is the only fault of the incautious truth-seeking school pupil, who is only supported by a very young idealist teacher – too fragile support!" (Zorkaya, 1989, p. 14). In fact, we can agree that in those episodes where the director gave way to improvisation, the story of a truth-loving high-school student who decided to write an expository letter to the central newspaper takes the breath of life. But these episodes, alas, are rare. A surface-deep publicist scenario was composed, essentially, of the "seamy side" stamps: drinking, orgies in a dormitory, corruption, fights, etc. Let's add here the inexpressive acting. All this taken together negated the critical pathos of the film.

However, one should bear in mind that the cinematographic process is one of the most inertial, from the script concept to its screen release, it often takes more than one year. Hence it is clear that a considerable number of films that came out during perestroika period, had been made according to the patterns of the previous epoch (*The White Horse is not My Grief*, 1986; *Hello, Gulnora Rakhimovna!*, 1986; *Leaf Fall in Summertime*, 1986; *Malyavkin and Company*, 1986; *A Very Scary Story*, 1986; *Examination for the Headmaster*, 1986; *We Are Your Children*, 1987, etc.).

Thus, in the comedy *Malyavkin and the Company* (1986), the pioneers are delighted with a personal computer, they search for a missing dog, collect paper for recycling, save a drowning man, and in the finale perform a heartfelt song "Sing, my youth". In the drama *We Are Your Children* (1987), students of the vocational school eagerly go to work in a rural cowshed. And *Examination for the Headmaster* (1986) was just about the only feature film that directly responded positively to the school reform of 1984: the main character of this picture is a young teacher who came to a rural school charged to be a true proponent of pedagogical progress.

Among such late comings was a semi-detective melodrama *A Slap in the Face, That Never Happened* (1987).

A seventeen-year-old boy, contrary to the title of the picture, gives a sonorous slap to his former classmate (a girl), who, out of jealousy, gave a teacher a "compromising document" – a photo of a timid kiss of two high-school students. The boy in the picture was the one she was in love with, the girl was her more successful rival. As a result, the young headmaster calls the police, insists that a

criminal case must be initiated against the boy, and the innocent photo is declared nothing less than pornography.

Is it possible to imagine such behavior of a teacher in a Soviet school? Certainly. For example, in a school in 1937 or 1947. Back then, in fact, because of tenth graders' kiss, at times, urgent Komsomol meetings were convened, or politically incorrect school paper article could result in much serious sanctions.

However, the action of the film *A Slap in the Face, That Never Happened* takes place in the second half of the 1980s, when both school and schoolchildren had very different problems. When cases of intimate relations between high school students did not seem sensational, because the problems of drug abuse and other substance abuse were on the agenda. Compared to this, the sterile world of the film seemed archaic and false at that time. Moreover, the actor's pinch (in gestures, facial expressions, intonations), noticeable literally in every episode, plus the negligence of visual techniques, the banality of *mise-en-scène* and montage.

Perhaps, to a lesser extent, but also rather archaic was *Work on Mistakes* (1988), based on the story of Y. Polyakov. The film was about a young journalist and a teacher of the Russian language and literature who was looking for a manuscript of a writer repressed in 1937. He got a difficult class of students that was led by an irresistible and spoiled "A" pupil, the daughter of a big boss. Maiden love, rivalry, search of a case with the manuscript, stolen from the teacher, a seduction scene, - all this makes the audience involved, although one can feel some things stretched or artificial. For example, why does this versatile group easily become helpful pathfinders searching for a novel that disappeared in the 1937 when the author was arrested? Why does the teacher easily give up, capitulate, throwing his case into the fire? (Zorkaya, 1989, p. 15).

It should be noted that *Work on Mistakes* was not the only film plot that the politics directly entered. Politically, *The Whistler* (1988) concept was quite sharp, as the beginning of the film featured the scene of the recruitment of a first-year student by a KGB officer. However, later the authors, as if frightened of their "perestroika" courage, changed the situation: the recruiter was not a real agent, but the rector's son. But the leader of the underground circle of students was presented as an ideological fighter against the authorities and organizer of student protests.

An individual place in the "school series" of perestroika period is occupied by few films, the action of which took place in the 1920s and 1930s. On the one hand, we have to admit that the author of the brilliant film about teachers and schoolchildren of the 1920s *The Republic of ShKID* (1966), G. Poloka was not able, as they say, to set foot in the same river twice. *Our Calling* (1981), as well as *I am the Leader of the Outpost* (1986) were a pale shadow of his ShKID story. On the other hand, a notable event in the second half of the 1980s was the screen adaptation of the novel *Tomorrow Was the War* by Boris Vasilyev (1987), which first touched upon the theme of Stalin's repressions of the 1930s in the context of school theme. In this drama, young high school students come across manifestations of human betrayal, deception, hypocrisy (which at the state level

has already led to the planting of a system of denunciations, arrests and quick massacre (Kudryavtsev, 2006).

The perestroika period films (1986-1991) on the school/university topic.

Features of the historical period when media texts were created, market conditions that contributed to the idea, the process of creating media texts, the degree of influence of that time on media texts

The timeframe for the historical period has been defined conditionally since 1986 (the beginning of the "perestroika" processes after Mikhail Gorbachev's coming to power) up to 1991 (when the Soviet Union was liquidated by proclaiming the independence of the former Soviet republics).

The main characteristics of this historical period:

- the proclamation of M.S. Gorbachev's policy of "restructuring and glasnost", pluralism, democratization and improving socialism (including holding free elections with alternative candidates);
- the official condemnation of the communist regime's crimes and the rehabilitation of about a million of innocently convicted, and dissidents;
- the gradual abandonment of ideological struggle and the withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan, the proclamation of a disarmament policy;
- a course towards the gradual abolition of censorship bans and the free exchange of specialists and ideas with the West;
- a new "perestroika" impulse to continue the exploitation of the official doctrine of the established common community of the Soviet people and the absence of class, ethnic, national, racial problems in the USSR; the possibility of peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist systems (against the background of improving political relations with the U.S. and western European countries);
- an attempt to open the way for private cooperation, i.e. to partially revive the trends of the Soviet "new economic policy" of the 1920s;
- economic (largely due to a steep drop in oil prices) and the ideological crisis that eventually led to an attempt at a conservative coup d'etat in the summer of 1991;
- the disintegration of the Soviet Union in late 1991;

Table 3. Key dates and events in the USSR and worldwide in perestroika period (1986-1991): politics, economics, education, culture (compiled by A. Fedorov)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Key dates and events in the USSR and worldwide in perestroika period (1986-1991): politics, economics, culture</i>
1986	XXVII Congress of the CPSU: February 25 - March 6. Accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant: April 26. V Congress of USSR Cinematographers: a film director E.G. Klimov was elected the chairman of the USSR Cinematographers Union: May. Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee. "On disadvantages of buying and distributing foreign films": June 4. The threefold drop in world oil prices (from \$29 to \$10 per barrel), which sharply intensified the economic crisis in the USSR: June.

	<p>The announcement of M. Gorbachev that "perestroika" has begun: June. French President F. Mitterrand visits the USSR: July 7-10. M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan meet in Reykjavik: October 11-12. Opening of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Vienna: 4 November. The return to Moscow of the nuclear physicist and activist for human rights and peace A.D. Sakharov from a 7 year exile: December 23.</p>
1987	<p>M. Thatcher's visit to the USSR: March 28-April 1. The abolition of most western radio stations' jamming on the USSR territory: May 23. The unauthorized flight of the German amateur pilot M. Rust from Hamburg (via Helsinki) to Moscow (illegal landing on the Red Square): May 27. The 70th anniversary of Soviet power: November 7. Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Washington. The signing of the treaty on the elimination of medium-range nuclear missiles: December 1-10. M. Gorbachev was declared Person of the Year by <i>Time</i>. Low world prices for oil, contributing to a further decline in the economy of the USSR and the standard of living of its population.</p>
1988	<p>The beginning of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan: May 15. M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan meet in Moscow: May 29 - June 2. Chancellor of Germany H. Kohl visits the USSR: October 24-27. French President F. Mitterrand visits the USSR: November 25-26. The abolition of jamming the radio station "Free Europe" on Soviet territory: November 30. Visit of M.S. Gorbachev in New York (UN). His statement on the reduction of the Soviet armed forces and the beginning of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe: December 6-8. Low world prices for oil, contributing to a further decline in the economy of the USSR and the living standards of its population and to the rising desire of some citizens to (now authorized) emigrate.</p>
1989	<p>The end of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan: February 15. George Bush Sr. becomes the US President. Numerous meetings of M. Gorbachev with world leaders (including US President George W. Bush) and his statement on further disarmament. The literary magazine "New World" was the first one in the USSR to publish a book by A.I. Solzhenitsyn "The Gulag Archipelago": July. The 70th anniversary of Soviet cinema: August 27. The fall of the Berlin Wall begins: November 9. The overthrow of T. Zhivkov's regime in Bulgaria: November 10. The victory of the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia: November 24. The victory of the anti-communist opposition in the elections in Hungary: November 26. The victory of anti-communist forces in Romania: December. A.D. Sakharov's death: December 14. Further decline in the economy of the USSR and the living standards of its population, and the growth of emigration.</p>
1990	<p>Consent of the USSR to the unification of Germany: January 30. XXVIII Congress of the CPSU: July 2-13. The USSR gives consent for united Germany to join NATO: July 14-16. Numerous meetings of M. Gorbachev with western countries leaders. Mikhail Gorbachev is awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.</p>
1991	<p>The war in Kuwait between the US and Iraq: January 16-19. World oil prices remain low, which leads to a further decline in the economy of the USSR and the living standards of its population. the Warsaw Treaty after 36 years of military alliance of Central and Eastern Europe states with the USSR disestablished: July 1. The attempt of a coup d'état, organized by the conservative part of the leadership of the USSR: August 19-21. The actual disintegration of the USSR: December 8. Voluntary resignation of Mikhail Gorbachev from the post of the President of the USSR, transfer of power to Boris Yeltsin: December 25. Official disintegration of the USSR: December 26.</p>

How the knowledge of real historical events of a particular period helps to understand the given media texts, examples of historical references in these media texts.

Soviet audiovisual texts of 1986-1991 on the school and university, according to the authorities, were supposed to support the main lines of the then state policy in the educational and socio-cultural spheres, that is, to show that the Soviet system of education, upbringing and culture, while maintaining common ideological guidelines:

- has some challenging issues in education and upbringing, but is being reformed and is capable of changing for the better;

- the teacher-pupils relation continues to be democratic, to some extent creative.

However, these tendencies were characteristic mainly of the initial stage of "perestroika".

At the final stage of perestroika, the absence of state censorship and ideological vacuum resulted in filmmakers' focusing on the acute painful issues of school / university and society.

Social, cultural, ideological, and religious context

Ideology, directions, goals, objectives, world outlook, the concepts of the media texts' authors in the socio-cultural context; ideology, culture of the world, depicted in media texts.

In the perestroika era, the communist ideology in the USSR continued to dominate (although it was gradually criticized by the opposition), but the film industry was under less censorship, than in the past, so school and university themes in Soviet cinema very quickly entered previously forbidden plot territories.

The world outlook of the characters of the "school world" depicted in media texts

The world view of the characters was increasingly losing its optimism, some films contained shockingly graphic scenes. Films based on the normal Soviet hierarchy of values (communist ideology, collectivism, diligence, honesty, willingness to help people in need) became history. More and more often the screen was reflecting life realia. For example, the films *Avaria - a cop's daughter* (1989), *Government Facility* (1989) and *Made in the USSR* (1990), were factually based on cases of soulless bureaucracy, lies, violence, substance abuse and other vices of society including school.

Structure and narrative techniques in these media texts

Schematically, the structure, plot, representativeness, ethics, features of genre modification, iconography, character characters of audiovisual media texts on school and university topic in the perestroika period can be presented as follows:

- *the location and time period in media texts.* The main location in films is school classes and corridors, schoolyards and flats; the plot is set mostly (if it's not a retro) at the time when the film is made.

- *the environment typical for these media texts, household items*: the furnishings and household items of school films are still modest, however oftener than before wealthy apartments are shown (*Come What May*, 1986; *Temptation*, 1987; *Work on Mistakes*, 1988; *The Whistler*, 1988; *Darling Ap*, 1991, etc.);

- *genre modifications of school and university subjects*: predominantly – drama; filmmakers in the second half of the 1980s, seemingly, decided that a comedy genre was absolutely inappropriate in the hard, incriminating "perestroika film flow";

- *narrative techniques, narrative bias*: positive characters are rarely idealized, and negative ones tend to be presented ambiguously too;

Typology of characters:

- *characters' age*: the age of schoolchildren is in the range of 7-17 years, however, teenage characters are most common; the age of other characters (teachers, parents, grandparents, etc.) varies, but adults but adults under 60 prevail;

- *education level*: corresponding school year for students, teachers presumably have a university degree, supporting characters can have any level of education;

- *social status, profession*: the financial situation of students is basically the same (although the material inequality of individual characters began to be clearly indicated), they can be either from the families of workers and farmers, or from the intelligentsia. The parents' jobs are diverse.

- *characters' marital status*: school students, naturally, are not married; adult characters are mostly married, however, single teachers also appear on the screen (resulting in plot twists connected with the love relationships of teachers and students);

- *appearance, clothing, physique of characters, features of their characters, vocabulary*: the appearance of the characters of school children and students in the films of the perestroika period is within the framework of the canons of the student's image of that time, which was by far more free than in the 1970s.



Students: a shot from the movie *A Slap in the Face, That Never Happened* (1987)

Schoolchildren in the films 1986–1991, unlike the "thaw" and "stagnation" periods, have a rather pragmatic life vision, related to material prosperity, or, on

the contrary, are in deep depression. Screen teachers often put up with the idea that it is impossible to reform a "bad" student. Perestroika period teachers are even more melancholic than in the films of stagnation period. The professional distance between them and the students becomes even more fragile (that is vividly illustrated in such films as *Come What May*, 1986; *Temptation*, 1987; *Work on Mistakes*, 1988; *The Doll*, 1988; *Dear Elena Sergeevna*, 1988; *Avaria- a cop's daughter*, 1989; *Homo Novus*, 1990). Like in films during stagnation period, some screen faculty wear rather casual clothes.



Young teacher: a shot from the movie *The Doll* (1988)

A significant change in the life of media characters and the challenge that the characters face (a violation of the usual life):

Option 1: among the next-door characters, schoolchildren who live a normal life, are those who for some reason do not fit into the standard framework of interpersonal communication and learning process, that is:

- the behave abnormally, sometimes steal (*Come What May*, 1986; *Haunted House*, 1987; *Blackmailer*, 1987; *The Doll*, 1988; *The Whistler*, 1988; *Avaria -a cop's daughter*, 1989; *Government Facility*, 1989; *Made in the USSR*, 1990, etc.);

- try to dominate, subjugate their classmates and/or teachers, acting sometimes violently (*Plumbum of the Dangerous Game*, 1986; *Haunted House*, 1987; *Work on Mistakes*, 1988; *The Doll*, 1988; *Dear Elena Sergeevna*, 1988; *Government Facility*, 1989; *It Happened by the Sea*, 1989; *Homo Novus*, 1990, *The Window*, 1991);

- stand out among classmates (in a good way or in a bad way) so conflict with the rest of the class and / or teachers (*Come What May*, 1986; *Plumbum of the Dangerous Game*, 1986; *Work on Mistakes*, 1988; *The Doll*, 1988; *Dear Elena Sergeevna*, 1988; *Puppy*, 1988; *The Jester*, 1988; *Dear Ap*, 1991, etc.);

- fall in love (*Come What May*, 1986; *The Slap in the Face that Never Happened*, 1987; *Temptation*, 1987; *Work on Mistakes*, 1988; *Dear Ap*, 1991, etc.).

Option 2: there are extraordinary teachers among faculty - those who also do not fit into the standard school framework, that is, they try to:

- resist the outdated and / or, from their point of view, incorrect methods of the school principal and / or teaching staff and collide with him / them (*White Horse is not My Grief*, 1986; *Examination for the Headmaster*, 1986, etc.);

- establish trust-based relations with the students, no matter how difficult it may be (*Hello, Gulnama Rahimovna!*, 1986; *Leaf Fall in Summertime*, 1986; *Examination for the Headmaster*, 1986; *We are Your Children*, 1987; *The Doll*, 1988; *Work on Mistakes*, 1988; *Accomplice*, 1990, etc.).

Solving the problem:

Option 1 (student-centered):

"odd ones out" school students keep their belief, because they do not comply to educational/parental influence (*Come What May*, 1986; *Plumbum or the Dangerous Game*, 1986; *Work on Mistakes*, 1988; *The Doll*, 1988; *Dear Elena Sergeevna*, 1988; *Avaria- a cop's daughter*, 1989; *Dear Ap*, 1991);

Option 2 (teachers-centered):

- *unconventional teachers triumph* (*Hello, Gulnama Rahimovna!*, 1986; *Leaf Fall in Summertime*, 1986; *We are Your Children*, 1987), *lose* (*Slap in the Face that Never Happened*, 1987; *Temptation*, 1987; *Work on Mistakes*, 1988; *Dear Elena Sergeevna*, 1988; *Avaria- a cop's daughter*, 1989; *Asthenia Syndrome*, 1989, etc.) or (as in *The Doll*, 1988) *the result of their relations with students becomes ambiguous...*

We agree with N. Sumenov: a lot of films about school and the youth were limited only to ascertaining acute problems, hence the straightforwardness of oppositions arose: often young film authors held elder generations responsible for the troubles of the young, and older film creators blamed the youth (Sumenov, 1989, p. 53).

Conclusions. Summing up, the films of "perestroika" period (1986-1991) on the school-university theme showed that:

- the education / upbringing process has lost its previous strict storylines, in many respects has lost its communist landmarks;

- school and university have acute problem areas (crisis, disappointment and fatigue, professional "burning out" of teachers, stagnation, hypocrisy, lies, bureaucracy and authoritarianism, pragmatic cynicism of students, teenage cruelty, underage sexual activity, etc.);

- the activity of a student / student again became more directed toward the outside world than to the inner world;

- appropriate distance in the teacher-student relationship has become more fragile (familiarity, sexual relation, or its provocation); in the films *Work on Mistakes* (1988) and *Asthenic Syndrome* (1989), male teachers even fight with high school students in class or in the school corridor;

- the prestige of the pedagogical profession in the eyes of students and the public has fallen even lower; in accordance with the real state of affairs, female teachers' images (often lonely, unsettled) came to the forefront;

- the main conflicts of plots were built on the opposition of non-ordinary teachers and students with stagnation, bureaucracy, mediocre bosses / colleagues / peers.

Actually, one can probably assume that the exposing "black series" of the perestroika cinema (where the youth theme was one of the most prominent ones) served a kind of "mobilizing purpose", only at the time it was not the orientation of "Soviet power elites in the renewal of the tools which they embodied the communist project with" (Belyaeva, Mikhailin, 2015, p. 551). Conversely, a Western-oriented part of the Soviet ruling elite used "uncensored" cinematography as one of the levers for the gradual liquidation of socialism (Razzakov, 2013, p. 404-405). On the other hand, it is possible not to attach special importance to this "conspiracy" assumption, believing that Soviet cinematographers spontaneously walked in the wake of political and socio-cultural changes of the "perestroika" era. After all, we should not forget that by the end of the 1980s a paradoxical situation arose in the USSR when the state continued to finance film production, but in the actual absence of censorship, filmmakers could produce all that they wanted, practically ignoring the opinion of the leading bodies of the CPSU and the government.

6. Russian films about school and university (1992-2017) *

We agree that "only the most inconsiderate, uninviting and conservative Russian viewer can now state that in our country there is no children's and teenage cinema. A revolution has been taking place on this front for a long time, both bold debutants and venerable pros work here, large budgets are purposefully allocated for this purpose, and the popularity of any finished products among its audience acquires" (Ukhov, 2017). It's another matter, what is the quality of this film / television product on the school and university topic, and what are the trends in it.

Deprived of the ideological and moral guidelines of the socialist era, Russian films on the school and university theme, taken after the collapse of the USSR, underwent a number of quantitative and genre transformations:

- after the dramatic rise in the number of such tapes during the perestroika period in the Russian "low-picture era" of the 1990s, there was an equally sharp decline, provoked by the almost total displacement of domestic products from cinemas by Western films and the difficult economic situation in the country that caused a reduction in film production in general;

- in the 21st century, along with the revival of the Russian film production, a kind of reformatting of the tapes about the school and university from the cinematic to the television show happened: modern multiplexes began to focus on spectacular action movies and full-length animated pictures (shot mostly in 3D), so the producers preferred to switch stories about schoolchildren, students and teachers on the television audience;

- the dominant of the dramatic genre, customary for the cinema of the Soviet school and university, replaced the realm of comedy in the 21st century (mostly "long-running" series).

There have also been changes in the casting: if in the Soviet times the roles of schoolchildren was basically performed by the schoolchildren themselves (*Welcome, or No entry, By the windows go trains, Call, open the door, Transitional age, The woodpecker's head doesn't hurt, Scarecrow*, etc.), then in the Russian TV series of the XXI century almost became the norm, when professional actors from twenty to thirty years play the roles of schoolchildren. Apparently, producers and directors believe that 1) many months (and many serials are shot for several years) shooting with a tough, exhausting work schedule is too much for real schoolchildren; 2) in connection with the rather slippery plot situations of a sexual and lexical nature, laid down in the script of modern films about the school, try to hedge, in order to avoid accusations of "corrupting" the under-age performers on the set.

* this chapter was written with the participation of E. Huston

Comedy

Of the seven Russian films about the school and university, filmed in the 1990s, three relate to the comedy genre. And the short films of S. Bagirov *Equality* (1993) and *Rypkin's Love* (1993), rather, resembled the good old *Patchwork*, however, with grotesquely negative images of teachers (especially vulgar and insignificant in *Rypkin's Love*). But the series *ABCD Ltd* (1992-1994) already affected the capitalist tendencies, which replaced the "developed socialism". Perhaps it was a kind of reaction to gloomy perestroika films, where boarding school life often resembled a prison ... It should also be noted that the post-Soviet issues of *Patchwork* also quickly mastered the attributes of the bourgeois world, turning in one of the issues an English teacher into ... a stripper .

The comedy continued to be the main genre of Russian cinema about the school and university theme and in the 21st century: of the 86 films on this subject, 35 were shot in a comedic manner.

It all began with a simple situational comedy *Dormitory* (2001), built according to American standards, which became a sketch for the comedies about student life that followed: *Theater Academy* (2002), *Merry Company* (2003), *Students* (2005), *Touched* (2005), *Students-2* (2006), *Students International* (2006), *Univer* (2008-2011), *Univer: Open Doors*" (2013), "*Univer: New Dormitory* (2011-2016), *Philological Faculty* (2017). By the way, never before the student topics did occupy such a prominent place in the Soviet and Russian cinema / television repertoire. By rejecting the gloomy interpretations of the educational process that prevailed in perestroika years, Russian TV series competed with each other in terms of sexually and funny scenes, mockery of teachers' corruption and general old-age mockery. For example, in the *Touched* (2005) student jokingly at first imitated his "self-immolation", and then with the same enchanting success engaged in fake urination in front of a shocked university professor.

All these student comedy series are built in the spirit of the well-known to everybody phrase "from session to session the students live cheerfully": the university itself is given a minimum of screen time, but in detail and with enthusiasm it is told about student rallies, parties, love adventures and other amusements.

Naturally, among the entertaining students there must be a certain "botanist", that is, contrary to the story, a student immersed in studies, whom his friends (neighbours in the dormitory) are trying to convert into their hedonistic faith. Likewise, images of female students are arranged: among the smart and flirtatious intriguing beauties (one of which is a stereotypically stupid blonde), there often appears the figure of an honest and modest girl ("blue stocking", "gray mouse"). Sometimes (for example, in *Students International*) on the screen appear students-foreigners (from Africa, China, etc.). Teachers in such serials are given a secondary role of retrogrades, bribe-takers / schemers or objects of love of cute female students. Humour in these films, as a rule, unpretentious and flat, and vocabulary every year becomes more coarser and vulgar. The music in these series

is often associated with a specific year of release of the series on the screen, since it includes hits of fashionable pop bands during the relevant time period. In order not to contact young and inexperienced debutants, the creators of serials often invite to the role of students actors (especially men) older than thirty years. Artistic bar of this kind of works, as a rule, is lowered already at the level of design, after all it is not about "piece goods" intended for cinemas and / or festivals, but about daily displays of multi-series television production.

Many serials on the topic of school and university are free adaptation or direct versions of foreign television production. For example, one can notice similarity of the concept *Philological Faculty* (2017) with the American *Big Bang Theory*: the authors "copy and bring to maximalist extremes both storylines and characters and the output is extremely exaggerated *Big Bang Theory*. The creators are well aware and similarities ... , therefore already in the pilot series they protect themselves from all attacks by a single phrase from those of *Philology Faculty*: "This all reminds me of the *Big Bang Theory*." However, the recognition of plagiarism is far from a reason to forgive him "(Golubev, 2017). We completely agree with the fact that "from the same *Univer* of the sample of the first season, *Philological Faculty* if different, then purely cosmetic. Yes, the scenery is no longer three cardboard walls, yes, the picture is richer and, yes, the soundtrack is more fashionable, but in general the circuits of the series are similar – and Lena ... not too far away from Allochka "Pipets" from *Univer*. Guys without a special fantasy, but effectively disintegrated according to archetypes: one is a self-assured "Kazanova" – a failure, the second does not get out of online games and in our reality is oriented with variable success, the third is a typical "main character", that is, neither meat, nor fish" (Khokhlov, 2017). Against this background, are shown in bold strokes played ironic swearing person (taboo language in *Philological Faculty* , is however, bleeped out) Prof. Gudkov and his ex-wife, who is also a educator in this university.

D. Golubev reasonably concludes that "Russian television in development has been stalled for some time – the viewer is not trying to lure something new and unusual, he is being fed again and again exactly what is being hijacked, and no matter with which grimace these products are absorbed ... *Philological Faculty* just serves as a confirmation of this opinion: the TV channel simply rolled out to us a slightly modernized, rejuvenated and changed version of the *Univer* (Golubev, 2017).

Comedy on a student theme, shot for cinemas, were made, of course, a bit more quality television series. So *Freshman* (2002) tells the story of bored student flirting with masturbating at night assistant professor, not wanting to put her top three in the exam...

In any case, all these comedies are unlikely to target intellectual students and an educated adult audience. Rather, their authors want to make them laugh at schoolchildren (from those who have not fully gone online) and the older audience, but with a low threshold of media inquiries...

Comedy (mainly – also television) about the school life was also a lot: a series of anecdotes about the ten-year mischief (*Vovochka*, 2000-2004), unpretentious stories about high school students (*Lessons for Security of Life*, 2000-2005; *Potapov, to the board!*, 2007), diligently imitating not the best Soviet films of the Soviet Children's and Youth Films Studio.

Not any higher in terms of artistic quality, in our opinion, turned out to be built according to the standards of American sitcoms for children *Fun during the break* (2007-2008) – 33 series of 5 minutes. Rating success with the audience was *Ranetki* (2008-2010) – a simple musical comedy about high school students performing in a rock band.

How did these comedies try to make the audience laugh? Here are two typical examples. The series *Lessons for Security of Life* (2000-2005) shows a lesson in biology on "Fertilization". Schoolgirls first perceive this material with embarrassment, but after a conversation with a psychologist they dress in miniskirts, do their make-up and with dashing coquetry brilliantly answer the lesson, this time embarrassing the shy teacher ... In the dramatic comedy *School No. 1* (2007) the problem of mutual relations comes to the fore with high school students from rich and ordinary families, true, with an emphasis on parties, shopping, sex, etc. Senior students, as is customary in most Russian TV series of the XXI century, were played by actors aged 21 to 30 years, which also did not add credibility to the plot.

The film by V. Menshov *The Practical Joke* (1976) was watched in the first year of the rent by 34 million viewers. However, his remake of the same name, made for television in 2008, did not receive a special resonance, perhaps because of the fact that in 1976 Menshov's schoolchildren "answered ethical questions with varying degrees of complexity and timelessness (is it permissible for the sake of general goals to sacrifice the principles? and should the students earn by playing a game at weddings?) and generally decide how to live on. In Kudinenko's in 2008 ... in general, nothing is decided." (Lyashchenko, 2008). Money, sex, domination in one's peer circle ... In the *The Practical Joke* (2008) "the girls painted in gloss and the hanging out guys do not cause the slightest feeling that they need something more from life" (Derenkovskaya, 2008).

Perhaps the most dashing Russian comedy from school life was the series *Physical Education Teacher* (2014-2017), where D. Nagiyev with a cynical foul played a bandit dismissed by the "underworld boss" named Foma, who tries to enter the confidence of the boss's child in the guise of a physical education teacher with his help to return to the "business".

Of course, *Physical Education Teacher* is "a fairly standard by the form of a through net. ... a large part of it is based on references to Western comedies – to *Freaks and Nuts*, to *Bachelor Party in Vegas*, to *Rock School* and so on" (Sobolev, 2014) and, by and large, is an inverted plot of the legendary comedy *Gentlemen of Fortune* (1971), where, the director of a kindergarten by the will of fate is compelled to pretend to be a bandit...

Foma on the screen is natural bull "straight from the 1990's, communicating exclusively in "thieves' slang" and used to solve problems by breaking doors and breaking skulls. This is witty, funny and accurate already in itself, but Nagiyev goes further and gradually turns a funny caricature into a voluminous portrait of a difficult and certainly charming man. The way Foma is extinguished, faced with the problems of children, with the need to seek a common language with a girl who intellectually looks down on him, and generally with life outside the "big business", is played really brilliantly - in semitones, supposedly random sights, nervous grins" (Khokhlov, 2014).

However, the ardent supporters of this series go even further, arguing that "from something as crude as the material on which *Physical Education Teacher* is based, there has never grown something so native to all, without exception, the inhabitants of one eighth of the land. ... *Physical Education Teacher* is not just a native thing, but also beyond incredible cleverness, subtle, fascinating and sincerely touching the soul. A classic two-sided novel of upbringing, in which those who according to all the usual laws of the genre had to be re-educated, eventually become re-educated not completely, but remain hostages simultaneously of their own stupidity and hopeless domestic problems"(Sobolev, 2014).

On the other hand, the situation in itself, when an arrogant bandit, who by fate has become a school teacher by fake documents, becomes a positive character against the background of "sucker" teachers and their corrupt district headmistress, is, in our view, a rather sad phenomenon, although symptomatic for modern Russian television, in the pursuit of ratings for a quarter of a century, fond of stories about bandits, thieves and other evil spirits...

To some extent, we can also say that the authors of *Physical Education Teacher* learned well the lessons of the cheeky comedy *Bitter!* (2013). A. Dolin believes that the film *Bitter!* (2013) "opened some secret door in the minds of the public, legalizing the most shameful – and at the same time having allowed to laugh at it or be proud of it, depending on someone's tastes. Achieving such a level of frankness and screen truth in combination with the reckless humour has shocked many. *Bitter!* in a purely Russian spirit, combined touching with the disgusting, and terrible – with the most native. He also patented the genre of the "holiday film", a ritual action where the plot recedes in front of the pure alcoholic euphoria of unity – the transformation of a number of frustrated individuals into a community, which with some caution can even be called people"(Dolin, 2014).

And here is the comedy *Graduation Party* (2014), where eighteen-year-old schoolchildren are played by actors who are already over twenty, went even further: thanks to the recklessness of the plot about the graduation party in the provincial school, "sterile New Russian comedies with their obsessive "kindness" they lost their innocence ... Well, humour cannot and should not be extremely kind. ... With sexual content – the lack of it was always the weak point of the generally

powerful Soviet cinema tradition about high school students – in *Graduation Party* everything is all right"(Dolin, 2014).

On May 5, 2014, amendments and additions were introduced to Federal Law No. 53 of the Russian Federation "On the State Language of the Russian Federation" (dated June 1, 2005). (Changes ..., 2014), according to which, from July 1, 2014, the film "containing obscene language" ceased to be issued a rental certificate, and when television showed films of past post-Soviet decades containing obscene language, such words started to "bleep out". The comedy *Graduation* was released on October 9, 2014 and became one of the first Russian films, which took into account the changes in the legislation of May 5, 2014: despite all the general rudeness of the lexicon in the film, there is not one real swear word. As a result, it turned out to be an "easy movie, with a terrible force lacquering reality. Of course, real high school students with their brains boiling from hormones and burst outs, one must think who mostly swear and live inside their rather tough showdowns. But this is not the *School* of Valeria Gai Germanika, it is a film of the kings of TNT, a channel not scandalous (as it seems to the elderly and fierce zealots of morality), but simply serving the petty bourgeoisie to laugh at it" (Korsakov, 2014).

Of course, "the sophisticated viewer will see in the film" ears "of various films – here is the unforgettable Soviet classics *You never dreamed* (its authors in *Graduation Party* quoted right up to the jump in the window!), And the Hollywood comedy *I can not wait* (From which a trio of juvenile rappers with Seth Grin at the head is borrowed), and a little John Hughes (the final phrase of the protagonist Demian is distinctly given by Bender from the *Breakfast Club*), and, of course, the *Project X* with the school's rampant get-togethers. It is interesting that these things are not perceived as impudent borrowing, but rather give an additional charge of positivism because of the joy of recognition"(Khokhlov, 2014).

For all that, the opinions of the critics about *Graduation* were polarized. Some thought that "the eternal theme of doublethink and hypocrisy with which adolescents enter into a spontaneous conflict in the *Graduation Party* was solved extremely successfully (Dolin, 2014), but "in the dialogues there are a lot of good jokes ... in general *Graduation* is a head above all that we shot in the genre of youth comedy over the past twenty years – and, most of all, despite the tough age rating, it remains a film quite "right" and useful for young people. Yes, in the finals high school students will arrange a rowdy, but this is the most strained part of the film. Because Generally *Graduation Party* is not exactly about this, but about responsibility, about entering into adulthood, about how to find a common language with those who cannot be understood as it seems. And about that childhood passes, but remains with us forever" (Khokhlov, 2014). Others were sure that this is "an ideal picture for people who do not like to think about cinema. After viewing the head is clean, clear and does not contain a single question to the creators or the surrounding reality. ... Wherever it was possible to bend the stick, the creators of the *Graduation Party* bent it. Yes, in schools, what does not happen

only, and graduation parties are celebrated with modern 11-grades in a way that many of us did not dream about, but you do not need to paint them all with the same brush. ... One can feel for a mile that *Graduation Party* is the desire to earn as quickly as possible on a gullible spectator. ... A clumsy comedy about 11-graders, full of platitudes and clichés"(Loshakova, 2014).

No doubt, *Graduation Party* is filled with stereotypes in the spirit of *Univer*, but there are newfangled (for Russian cinema, of course) politically correct trends. For example, one of the graduates to get away from a trip to study in Holland, admits (deceitfully) to his father in his unconventional sexual orientation ... And the father responds in the same manner.

However, for all its frivolity *Graduation Party*, in our opinion, is far from audiovisual ease of the comedy series *After School* (2012). Judging by the name of this film, its authors "with their intellectual fiction and irony, modern speech, love for pop and genre games, were to stylistically oppose Germanika (the director of the acclaimed series *School*, 2010 – authors), exploiting documentary style and life-likeness. ... Of course, the series is primarily addressed to young people: for them there are music, clips, dialogues, jokes, sports, constant connection of the story with social networks and videos on *YouTube*. But still the film is for families. For a simple reason: the parents of heroes are 35-40 years old, for them it is all the same integral part of life" (Lubarskaya, 2012).

From the very first shots the series *After school* carries with its intricate clip-type visual series, stop frames, solarization, styling under TV interview, parody, funny letters of the character-schoolboy to the actor and director Nikita Mikhalkov, the atmosphere of an endless carnival. It is clearly seen that although "the authors have studied not only the range of interests of Russian high school students, but also the recipes for the success of American consumer goods" (Bednov, 2012), the theme touched by the series is not at all empty – "this is the place of man under the sun, regardless of age, and his mentality, and the relationship of husband-wife-child, and the creation of idols, and friendship is not friendship, and even the eternal dilemma of "being or seeming" (Kuzmina, 2012, p. 5).

Is it shown (in orientation to the audience of "hipsters"?) On the first channel at midnight, the series *After school* caused the expected polemic in the press (Bednov, 2012; Kuzmina, 2012; Lisitsyna, 2012; Lyubarskaya, 2012; Narinskaya, 2012, etc.), but because of its original "elitism" did not cause such an outbreak of spectator passions as V. Gai-Germanika's *School*.

In the second half of the tenth years of the 21st century, another characteristic tendency of the comic genre on the school theme was clearly identified: stylization for the best examples of Soviet cinema about children and adolescents of the 1960s and 1970s.

So A. Karpilovsky made a trilogy called *Private Pioneers'* (2012-2017), initiated by the stories written in post-Soviet times by M. Seslavinsky. However, this "is not a parody, no banter, and certainly not agitation. It's just a memory of

something very naive and very light" (Alenushkina, 2013). The first two films of the trilogy take place in the Soviet province of the second half of the 1970s. Unlike the "film standards" of the XXI century, the role of schoolchildren here played real schoolchildren, not cinema faculty students. Brilliantly chosen by the director, the young performers of the leading roles, thank God, "do not possess modern cine-puppet beauty and ideal diction, they are real and alive, and therefore organically fit into the space of the film, provoking sincere sympathy and a desire to empathize. Not for example, the chairman of the school council – the sleek upstart Bykov – is caricatured as serious, he is an intermediate link between the warm, sincere child's soul and the stiffened heart of an adult, the allegory of that transitional state that turns an open child into a blindly devoted builder of communism"(Kotov, 2015).

In the first part on the screen is a touching story about how the boys save a dog from death, in the second no less typical for a teenage movie the story of the first love. And with the exception of some minor details (for example, in the second series one of the schoolchildren from pranks makes the bust of Lenin look like a dashing Indian), it's easy to imagine these stories on Soviet screens of the *100 Days After Childhood* (1975).

Actually, this is precisely what "strains critics, and all this is liked by the audience who gave the film the prize of their sympathies. Such two sides of the barricades are in the cinema and in the whole society. Some people feel sick at the very thought that there was something good in the USSR, others remember this well as if they were coming to a clean source. The film falls into the very heart of the split. You look at it and suddenly you find yourself in a world where there are clear coordinates: what is good, and what is bad. What is commendable and what is embarrassing. Children do not hang around yards with a cigarette, but something is rehearsed, something is discussed. They argue. Sincerely they want to be useful to the country, and Gaidar with his Timurovites marches ahead. Critics of the movie consider this action as stupefying, his fans – upbringing. Critics say: it's all lies. Fans: that's how it was. All according to the proverb: you want to be happy – be it. And really: how else could a country where there is nothing good, write good books, write talented music, win in a big war and first go out into space? Yes, the film shows a world where people have a purpose in life – self-improvement. And then the comparison comes by itself: what is the best way: to grab the cash and run away? And there comes nostalgia for something more real. As the eternally oppositional author wrote in polemical fervour: "We had a great epoch" (Kichin, 2013).

As a result of all this a tactful and intelligent "timeless story of friendship, honour and mutual assistance, relevant for young people of any generation, has turned out. The destructive anti-capitalist battles and selfless struggle with the bourgeoisie take place here only in the amateur scenes of the play, played by the sixth "B" (Kotov, 2015).

Another successful stylization for Soviet school movies was the comedy *Good Boy* (2016), which became the winner of the film festival "Kinotavr". As M. Trofimenkov rightly noted, "the good and harmful children who meet melodramatic relationships in adults are the same typical heroes of the Soviet "new wave": from Vitaly Melnikov's *Mom got Married* (1969) to *Children as Children* (1978) by Ayan Shahmaliyeva. If you recall the later, still soft versions, but already versions of the youth riot, then in the memory emerges *Courier* (1986) by Karen Shakhnazarov. The fact that Oksana Karas's film evokes such associations makes him an honour" (Trofimenkov, 2016).

Of course, even here the strict voices of critics immediately came to the conclusion that the *Good Boy* is "essentially a collection of jokes that are not even discussed and sometimes even conflicting with one another, which are not reduced to nothing but a general optimistic message" (Korsakov, 2016).

But we fully agree with V. Khlebnikova that in genre determinism, light jokes and the lack of didactics of the *Good Boy* "read the desire to entertain the viewer, provide the mass audience with that comfort zone that the intellectuals regularly, although not quite at the right place, call to leave. *Good boy* achieves this goal with the help of the stylization of Soviet children's cinema in the mid-1970s and early 1980s, who either forcedly or voluntarily "did not notice" reality and its mismatch with propaganda and embodied the utopian ideal of a carefree and prosperous existence for several generations of compatriots, often identified with the norm. The model of ideological quarantine, a sterile zone free from subtexts, hints, social and political topicality, is being modelled. The space thus cleared is given in the *Good Boy* chamber, alien to the vivid artistic effects and, as a rule, the confirmation of the basic norms of behaviour. In the *Good Boy*, as the norm, not the most popular in the country emancipation of personal choice from the influences of the family and the community is claimed, personal responsibility for actions of their own, and not of the neighbour or the organization, and thus the mirror emancipation of other people from oneself. Moscow is immersed in an eternal golden age in the *Good Boy*. There are no vulgar signs of the sociological context of 2010-2016. This Moscow takes sunbaths, basking in the light of an artificial day, which replaces the artificial night of cinematography of zero. Here they live by the river, as if on the sea, do not know the transport collapses and costs of sleeping urbanization, the interiors with antique furniture are spacious and light, windows – greens, spires and vistas, the eternal and prosperous noon of the world. ... Students are not drug addicts, not Nazis or hipsters, participate in dance battles, but can also polka, independently learn Chinese ... Authors of *Good Boy* pragmatically stop the time so that its annoying features and radical physiognomy do not distort the classic plot of the personality formation, they didn't imposed on him the character of youth revolt and the world denial. About that and speech, that a mature person assumes reality not because he cannot change it, but because his transformational efforts are directed mainly at oneself" (Khlebnikova, 2016).

But then V. Khlebnikova clearly does not pay attention to the fact that, unlike the *Private Pioneers*, there are a lot of scenes in the *Good Boy* that are absolutely impossible in the Soviet cinema of the 1970s: the teacher of English watches with her student *Nine ½ Weeks* (1985), balancing on the brink of erotic contact with a young character; director of the school leads all the same "good boy" in an underground casino, and a maniac-exhibitionist, adoring publicly to perform a small need, runs around the district.

However, despite all these "innovations", the *Good Boy* is on the territory "between the movie of good mood and the problem teenage drama about the school", here "a surprisingly lively and nice atmosphere, although the action under the scenario takes place in an ordinary Moscow school, where one immediately wants to be admitted and spend there all the time. Teachers, even the head teachers and the director himself-in the performance of the inevitably charming Mikhail Efremov – are strikingly liberal: there is no depressing or ideological obligation among the subjects. And growing up children think more about the knowledge of the world and, worst of all, about sexual education: for example, the main character hesitates between a pretty girl and a young teacher, and the film will never fall down beyond a dangerous border, with all its atmosphere of unobtrusive flirting. In short, a cute movie that has nothing to do with life and reality is absolutely irrelevant: really good and not even fake – just blissful" (Dolin, 2016).

At sunset of thaw, a fantastic comedy *Wake of Mukhin!* (1967) appeared on screens, where the main hero from the USSR of the late sixties was transferred to the year 1837 to protect Alexander Pushkin from the fateful duel. Authors of the fantastic comedy *To Save Pushkin* (2017), on the contrary, send Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin from 1837 to Moscow 2017, but the schoolchildren are also trying to dissuade the great poet from a duel with Dantes. Despite a number of critics noted (Arkhangelsky, 2017; Potapova, 2017; Ukhov, 2017) of merits (lightness, sincerity, humour, interesting and topical detective and satirical plot, dynamics and intrigue, unexpected, witty finale), the film failed at the box office, unable to withstand competition with Western blockbusters. Probably, its appearance in the TV format would be more appropriate, and then the target audience would have a much greater chance of understanding that "our everything" here is not a figurative but an aesthetic value. A guest from the past the authors show the invariance of the meanings of words honour, duty, respect, responsibility, truth, politeness, tact. Of course, these concepts have been polished for two hundred years, but their inner strength has remained the same, and it is important to understand it at a young age" (Ukhov, 2017). In addition, in *To Save Pushkin* ridiculed "thirst for glory and ubiquitous media, when any news is immediately on the screen to confirm or debunk, and every second student gets the opportunity to run his own video blog using improvised means" (Potapova, 2017).

Much greater public success fell to the share created by the American recipes of the fantastic comedy *Ghost* (2015), where a ghost in the bright performance of Fedor Bondarchuk gives lessons on the male education for a

schoolboy played by the star of *Private Pioneers* and *Good Boy* Semion Treskunov.

Dramas

The post-Soviet period dramas narrated about school life in three ways.

Firstly, these were the pictures that largely inherited the traditions of socially and critically biased "perestroika" films of the second half of the 1980s.

The closest to "perestroika" motives was *Teacher in law* (2007). Here, the "thief in law", having learned that he has a cancer, and little of life is left, decides to do at least something good and ... is getting a job as a literature teacher in a provincial school. The story line resembles the *Teacher of Physical Education* string, but it's not a comedy, it's a drama: there's a whole heap of gloomy genre going on, as there is a whole gang of high school students-drug dealers with whom the reformed thief enters into a deadly duel ... Despite the topical theme of drugs in educational institutions, the level of reliability in this drama is clearly underestimated, and impudent schoolchildren, who are engaged in "drug", are depicted too grotesquely to be psychologically convincing.

Sexual (however, submitted very gently) motifs of "perestroika" movies were played in the drama *Let's Make Love* (2002), where with a noticeable amount of irony was told the story of a student trying to part with his protracted virginity.

In P. Todorovsky's drama *What a wonderful game* (1995) socio-political motives came to the fore. The film unfolded in the cold winter of 1951, when students of one of the Moscow universities decided to play a joke on their neighbours in a hostel: they secretly connected the microphone to the radio receiver and on behalf of the Kremlin they transmitted a message about the abolition of censorship and residential registration, a fivefold fall in prices and many other joyous events. The payoff did not take long to wait: the "instigators" were arrested and shot in the cellars of the Ministry of State Security... As in the previous films of the director (*Military Field Love* and *Encore, more Encore*), it was again a retro-style drama with impregnations of comedy. It is a pity only that this time the script did not have the bulk of the characters and the original plot moves. Throughout the action of the film students play jokes, make love, make noise, drink vodka, etc. etc., but after the end of the session, you can hardly recall what exactly one student is different from the other: except that he was a shy person with glasses, and the other was a giggly fat man. The characters at the level of the *Military Field Love* in the *Game* ..., alas, there is no trace, although good actors do everything possible to give their characters at least some kind of personality... And the very situation with the draw on political theme looks more like from the times of the Nikita Khrushchev' thaw than from the harsh Stalinist times, when people sometimes were afraid to publicly tell even quite harmless jokes. Still, the fear of 1951 was significantly different from the fear of 1957 or 1959 – the times of so-called "good hopes"...

Much more successful turned out another retro tape – *Tender Age* (2000). Its director, Sergei Soloviev, used his "perestroika achievements", making a kind of cocktail of poetic style of the *100 Days After Childhood* (1975) with the ironical drive of *Black Rose ...* (1989) and *The House under the Starry Sky* (1991). Talking about the school life of the first half of the 1980s, S. Soloviev, not trusting in the "seriousness and drama of the story told, largely based on the true facts from the life of fellow practitioners and his son's friends, as if afraid to look boring, saturates the action with repeated divertissements (sometimes sinful on the part of taste)" (Kudryavtsev, 2007). But in general, all the shocking "late perestroika" scenes (well, perhaps, more "advanced") were in place: the teacher cursing American expansion, smashed his head with a brick because of the loss of the USSR of the Cold War. Schoolchildren smoked and looked at photos in the porn magazine. The chemistry teacher fainted at the sight of the student, who appeared in the nude at the height of her lesson. A little later, there was a bold scene of sex pioneer and the same "chemist" (ironic greetings to *Doll* in 1988). And (oh, God!), The naked pioneers had sex in the pool...

But here's what is typical: in 2001, having received the main prize of festival "Kinotavr", *Tender Age* for all its shocking reality did not provoke any outrage of the public. The main reason for this was the fact that the film was actually ignored by mass rent, filled with American entertainment pictures. But there were also reasons for another property: Russia only recently began to recover from the economic shock of 1998 and was still in the field of the officially oriented to the West (cultural) policy of "permissiveness".

A softer retro variant (this time the life of Soviet students in the 1970s) was presented in the drama *The Vanished Empire* (2007) by K. Shahnazarov. Along with criticism of the Soviet system, notes of restrained nostalgia were felt here: "The Soviet empire was taken from Shakhnazarov at flight, in thinning, in half-decay – in the most attractive form, when its vices were not so obvious; when she softened, slowed down, passed into oblivion, when everyone was already hypocritical and lied. But there was movement in it, perhaps it was growing up, there were concepts of good and evil – and in the ensuing timelessness everything was levelled off" (Bykov, 2007).

Secondly, these were films about the present, but close in style to the Soviet cinema of the 1970s. For example, a series about the school life *Simple Truths* (1999-2003), the action of which unfolded in one of the Moscow's schools. Contrary to perestroika gloomy genre, there were a lot of good high school students and teachers in the *Simple Truths*, there were almost no scabs and bed scenes with "nudity". In a similar vein, but this time with a focus on the ecological theme (a biology teacher with her students struggling with the pollution of nature) was posed *The Adult Life of a Girl Polina Subbotina* (2008). The *Village Teacher* (2015) also fits in well in this row. In this "socialist realistic" drama, an astonishingly similar (and outwardly and character traits) to the charming Shurik from the famous Soviet comedies of Leonid Gaidai, a graduate student of the

pedagogical faculty and a history teacher, Lev Sergeevich comes into conflict with the retrograde of the director and sent to teach in a rural school. And there he soon won the respect of high school students, and the love of the local beauty.

Thirdly, these were films about the school and university, taken from the new Russian moral paradigm of the 21st century, that is, instead of the strict moral guidelines of Soviet "developed" socialist realism and the "perestroika" (and continuing "perestroika") social criticism, the films with characters without humanistic ideals, living in a world of money, violence, sex and entertainment, to which the authors are emphatically neutral, treating them as guinea pigs, came out on the first plan.

The most revealing of such films types was the drama *Everyone will die, but I'll stay* (2008). The characters of this film live "according to the laws of pride: the strong dominate, the weak are humiliated and thrown out of the habitual circle. Emotions are polar" – either rapture or malicious anger. Nobody, for example, has seen the mink surmise, philosophize, fall into a reflection. What can we say about a simple high school student? The nymphs of Germanika are cracking down on rivals with instinctive cruelty, and a jar of alcohol is rejoicing in the same way as the Whiskers who found a delicious worm found under the stone. The animals eat grass, the children smoke it" (Belokurov, 2009).

The director of the film, Valeria Gai Germanika, clearly wanted to prove to the whole world that she would finally say "the whole truth about the modern school". So in her tough tape, ninth-graders smoke, drink wine, have sex, adore obscene gestures and slang vocabulary ("shorter", "damn", etc.), swear (in fact, without "bleeping out": tape removed for six years before the strict amendments to Federal Law No. 53 "On the state language of the Russian Federation" adopted in 2014 (Changes ..., 2014)), attempt suicide and then go to a disco.

Here are just a few characteristic phrases, which are pronounced in the film by 15-16-year-old schoolgirls:

- *It would be nice if all adults died!*
- *Lucky – she was fucked by a whole company of soldiers!*
- *Let there be a disco, and I will have a boyfriend!*

You can probably agree with the fact that Gai Germanika – "a real evil demiurge, who pulls the thread. And at the bottom of the handle stupid, ridiculous and pathetic, in general, a creature called a "teenager", torn by galactic dimensions of narcissism and a huge desire to squeeze the brain with a juicy pimple. Alas, these strings pointlessly point to young creatures who do not yet know that everyone will die without a trace, and put on their t-shirts "Parents, fuck you!" (Kulikov, 2008).

And here it is difficult to agree that the tape, thanks to the "flying camera" of the operator, "included the very same air and light, without which the film could only pass through the category of "youth gloomy". Because, in fact, after deducting this air and this light, we would be offered several important and, most importantly, fresh news: there is no love, there is no hope, there is no faith; adults –

goats, children – bitches; everyone will die, but I'll stay" (Fanailova, 2009). In our opinion, *Everyone will die ...* returns precisely to “perestroika” gloomy, but without the characteristic humanistic pathos, replacing it with cynical naturalism.

However, even this naturalism is very specific. Is it possible to take seriously the film *Everybody will die and I'll stay* as the most truthful post-Soviet film text about a modern school and schoolchildren, if 15-16-year-old characters are played by experienced actors from 22 to 28 years old?

So we are not inclined to share the enthusiasm of the researchers of the creative work of V. Gai Germanika who say that "we have a director who does not doubt the reality, does not submit to it, does not load it with reflections, does not blunder it, says that in this reality it is possible to live and, consequently, to shoot about her non-abstract, clear cinema" (Gusyatskiy, 2009), answering the "important question" (Volobuev, 2008).

About the film *Everyone will die, but I'll stay* (2008) argued mostly professionals – film critics and culturologists, it had no wide rental. But about the television series of V. Gai Germanika *School* (2010), shown in prime time on the Russian first channel, argued already "the whole country". In fact, it was a lighter version of the previous film directed by the producer, deployed for several dozen episodes: "In fact, the series *School* is quite vegetarian. Nothing in the ideological sense is extraordinary in it, no radicalism, protest moods. In comparison with the programs-mischief's channel NTV (*Pure confession, Especially dangerous!* or *Emergency*), "pearls" of Sunday prime, the series *School* is just a pioneer morning performance. Except for an informal visual and behavioural context" (Dondurei, 2010). In fact, this is a series is "a one-to-three version of *Everyone dies...*, but without a filthy language, tits and an director of the photography is worse... Even the inevitable game of give-away with the TV audience, very cleverly framed. Each time they go playfully to the point at which something very indecent should begin, and when the spectator begins to get an epileptic fit from surprise, they also play back playfully: a collision with a teacher who has fallen on a girl is brewing, and then the teacher takes up the pedophile, the potential gay line looms (very timidly) and then, no, sorry, it seemed to you. In the first series there is a charming moment, this method is illustrative: the girl writes a word on the glass ... and as soon as she writes the a swear word, but the grandfather enters at the beginning of this act"(Volobuev, 2010).

Again, obscene gestures, rough slang vocabulary (but already due to evening TV shows without foul rough language), sex and suicide of schoolchildren. Plus exposing teachers who are bribe takers and retrogrades.

Here are just some of the characteristic, humiliating human dignity of students, teachers' phrases from the *School*:

- *You are not a person, but a nonentity.*
- *Why are you so stupid?"*

And again, despite the mobile camera, which removes "under the document", the disagreement with the age of the performers of the roles of ninth-

graders: only one of the actors at the time of filming (2009) was 18 years old, the rest from twenty-one to twenty-four. And they play 15-16-year-olds... However, other analysts saw their advantages here: "It's embarrassing that the ninth-graders play huge foreheads for 22 years, but, firstly, you quickly get used to it (in *Beverly Hills 90210*, for example, the actors were almost thirty, and that's OK), and secondly, they play in a naturalistic way: their young heroes are dull, limited, inhibited, close, nervous. And delightfully tongue-tied!" (Gordeev, 2010).

The authors of the *School*, relying on previous developments, refer to "spontaneous, idolatrous worldview, offer undiluted, concentrated being", promise "recipients a shelter from the painted in local colours heroes" cardboard "TV installations – youth soap operas, solved in the genres of the romantic comedies and sitcoms" (Sputnitskaya, 2016, p. 24), although for all this V. Gai Germanika "one cannot avoid the monotony, inevitable for the format of tightening, savouring the same type of conflicts, dotted manner of filing images. Often, getting carried away with the technique of shooting, perspective interpretation of the character, she jumps into tedious ordinary life description (Sputnitskaya, 2016, p. 25).

Y.A. Bogomolov wrote about the *School* very accurately: "The art in this series is just so much that the viewer could imbue with the drama of the situation – and not just in the school environment. Simply for many, including for aesthetically advanced viewers, the language of this artistic expression is unaccustomed. Not because it is so new in principle. He is unaccustomed in the format of the so-called "serial product". The mobile camera is not used. It's like a movie from a mobile phone. Not in the rules of the format – the super size of plans, exacerbating the subjectivity of the view of what is happening, the rapid patter of dialogues, kaleidoscopes and the compactness of the plot motifs. ... The level of authenticity taken in the framework of the frame of reality is also unaccustomed, which, however, is not simply mechanically transferred to the screen, but impressively, figuratively processed and submitted. At the same time the intervention of the director, operator, artist in the "picture" is minimal. That is why the illusion of improvisation of the current of the spied life arises. ... an acquaintance with the wrong side of the average school shocking: the exclusion of students, the helplessness of teachers, the smoking of drugs, the hormonal problems of young children and adolescents, etc. ... They say that the Germanika series is a crooked mirror. Maybe. But let me note that the crooked mirror not only distorts the beautiful features of beautiful phenomena, it sticks out defects, flaws of what is not very fine, and especially that which is very ugly. This is exactly what the *School* did, both in relation to the school itself and in relation to today's social order" (Bogomolov, 2010).

For all that, one cannot but admit that "this series does not reveal anything new on the material. Germanika shoots a movie about what she knows well, even the school and the interiors are the same as in her first film *Everyone Dies and I'll Stay* (Karakhan, 2010). *School* did not become an opening for a sophisticated audience in media culture. But for the audience of the mass, not familiar with the

previous tapes of Gai Germanika, nor with many other Russian and foreign films about the school and schoolchildren (among which were very sharp, we recall, for example, *Tender Age*), the television show *School* kind of revelation, shock. But there are two more reasons for the noisy reaction of the public: "First, the entertainment specifics of our television have been disrupted. This work is not only in its artistic level several orders of magnitude higher than traditional serial production, but also quite different in its aesthetics. The second is the violation of the taboo of the genre resolution of various conflicts on the television screen" (Razlogov, 2010).

Many spectators "were struck and indignant at the fact that the show goes on prime time on the main TV channel of the country. Many interpreted this move as an official statement of the state. ... Summing up, all opinions can be divided into four groups: a) the demonstration of children who drink and smoke propagates such behaviour among pupils, making it normal, legitimate, corresponding to the "spirit of the times"; b) there is a corruption of the younger generation, its zombification, since it is so much easier for the government to subordinate it, but it does not seem to be against it; c) the series is an attempt to draw attention to the problems of the school, albeit not in the most reasonable ways; d) all these are intrigues of the First Channel, which, like air, needs high ratings" (Paisova, Dementieva, 2010). Moreover, the head of the Moscow department of education O. Larionova spoke against the show *School* on the First Channel, stating that "on the Internet there were sharply negative reviews of teachers and parents and students for this program," created in the year of the teacher in Russia (The series ..., 2010).

We believe that critics of the *School* managed to feel the main feature of the author's position in the series: moral relativism, which was clearly recorded by the sociologist D.B. Dondurey (1947-2017). He noted that the minuses of the *School* "are obvious and already fixed: tendentiousness in the selection of material, no one teaches anything, the lack of minimal intellectual requests from heroes, flat-footed drama" (Dondurei, 2010).

But against this background, D.B. Dondurei was able to distinguish the most, perhaps, the most important: "*School* is a sample of producer's creativity in all its components. ... The main thing in this project is an experiment with the accumulated, but not yet realized, feeling of long-resolved freedom with its borders, corridors, horizons and also with the latest, though not obvious, technologies for promoting modern virtual products. *School* probes the soil of impending or, rather, ripening content changes, not so much foreseeing how many are exploring here possible ideological twists and turns. The series diagnoses and fills the emptiness formed in recent years in the "picture of the world" that has settled on TV, shakes the habitual grid of the serial chewing gum and status (regardless of the outcome and claims) screenings. He touches on the problems and those realities of our life, which recently could not be touched. Or did it only seem to us? Who could have imagined that the sixteen-year-old heroine would curiously unwrap, feel the condom received from her mother as a gift twice a day at the main

point of distributing the "meanings of life", under the supervision of grandmothers and junior students? This is a slap in the face of Russian public taste. To look at numerous murders, at dismemberment it is possible, and at a condom – you will go blind. Who could imagine that a bribe to the teacher, the seduction of a young teacher or teenage cooperation with pornographic sites will be imposed on the proscenium of a multimillion-dollar tele-forum? Is it decent to include such weekdays in the domestic series or only – and more abruptly – in the program *Let them say* or *Maximum*?" (Dondurei, 2010).

Another lighter version of the film *Everyone dies, and I'll stay* was drama *The Roof* (2009): pupils sell drugs, smoke and fight in the toilet, teenage girls look at pictures of the Kama Sutra, and the director writes with a felt-tip pen on the student's forehead "I'm a freak." The main characters of the *The Roof* are three girlfriends: "learn in school, fall in love with a newcomer, smoke quietly, sing songs on the roof and from this very roof are going to jump. Parents of girls, who do what they can, work, change each other, and think little about their daughters"(Khrustaleva, 2009). In *The Roof* there is no swear words, but there is a moral of the social order: "Parents! Do you know what your children are doing?"

Released on the screen four years after school, *Class correction* (2014) appealed not just to the fate of ordinary pupils, but pupils with disabilities. Like in films of Gai Germanika, the schoolchildren were played here by actors from twenty to twenty-five years old, which again can be explained by the fact that there are very risky scenes in this drama: for example, when violent classmates rape the main character – a disabled schoolgirl. For all that "there is not a single obscene word from the screen, and not because the prohibiting law appeared recently. The author consciously set himself a rigid framework: not to "play Germanika", not to try to confirm the authenticity of what is happening with dirty vocabulary"(Lyubarskaya, 2014).

In the professional environment, the *Correction Class* (2014) was met ambiguously, in fact, two opposite interpretations were proposed: 1) "This is the flagship of the "new wave", a masterpiece of realism (all as in life!), a sob of teenage despair and "Scarecrow XXI century"; 2) This elegant postmodern trick, grotesque, own universe, glowing giraffe and the output of a young talented provocateur into the territory of Balabanov and Trier" (Kuvshinova, 2014).

The hot supporters of the film considered that the *Correction Class* is, of course, gloomy, but "far from full immersion in decay and despair. Most of the picture the viewer looks with pain, with fear, with experience, but also with hope. With a light feeling, with a sense of some higher justice, even if expressed in the fact that boys and girls with physical defects are also happy in their own way. ... love, hatred, stupidity, betrayal, rage and fear are shown by bare nerves. The disabled are as vulnerable as the outside world, they are so vulnerable in the inner world" (Ukhov, 2014), and here "you begin to think about the insecurity of each and every one, in the order of self-defence giving birth to aggression ... about the total depressiveness into which any business has fallen, and before all school"

(Kichin, 2014); and "the *Correction Class* is not strong just with cinephiles, but a phenomenal ability to find a common language with the audience, making it laugh and touching it in earnest"(Dolin, 2014).

Opponents were sure that the *Correction Class* is a brilliant trickery, a story that was not told, but they wailed through the voice of beggars in the subway. Everything is conditional there, as in folklore crying ... Tverdovsky entered the world of cinema context on a limousine with a convertible (but wheels from a wheelchair) and confidently rushes forward under the whistling and wooing of others" (Shakina, 2014). Moreover, M. Kuvshinova is convinced that "Tverdovsky from ignorance of the chosen subject, from misunderstanding, what is provocation, brutality, betrayal, a miracle, but from the desire to show all this as if he raises before the viewer the signs *Provocation!*, *Revitalization!*, *Betrayal!*, *Miracle!*, And when it comes to the notice *Author!*, he demonstrates in the TV fragment of his own short film *Dog's joy* and puts into the mouth of one of the heroines a remark: *Why shoot like children strangle themselves?*" (Kuvshinova, 2014).

It seems to us that the film is an artificially constructed anthropological sketch "based on" the "black series" of "perestroika" films about the school and the first films of Germanika, where the story of the collective rape of a schoolgirl by her classmates remains completely unpunished, where the brutalized mothers fiercely fight in the director's office high school students, where the natural intonations of the dialogues, inconsistent speech of the characters creates the illusion of "truth."

Equally polar opinions were sparked by another drama on the school topic – *Geographer Burned the Globe* (2013), the authors of which transferred the story of the novel of the same title, written in 1995, to the 21st century. The plot of the film is simple: a heavily drinking provincial middle-aged biologist from desperation settles in school to teach geography and, confronted with a difficult class, tries to earn schoolchildren authority. At the same time, "everything that happens in the film is categorically wrong. The teacher, who should set an example, drinks, directly tells everything to children what he thinks about them. He even risks their lives, for which he faces a criminal punishment. And at his home everything is also wrong: he allows his wife to love a friend, seeking consolation from a colleague-teacher, secretly loves a student. And the students in the school are wrong: they are brave, they dare, and, it seems, they do not learn anything"(Kichin, 2013).

Arguments in favour of the film: "the conscious adherence to the Russian literary and cinematic tradition", "empathy", "spiritual enlightenment", "liveliness and amusement", "vitality", "a call for love for one's neighbour", etc.

Examples:

1) "Whatever one may say, Veledinsky's film is flesh from flesh and school dramas like *We'll Live To Monday* or *Dear Elena Sergeevna*, and the tragedy of unfulfilled lives, the first of which comes to mind *Autumn Marathon*. The image of teacher Sluzhkin is imbued with that very favourite "once-intelligentsia" with erudition, a romantic attitude, the ability to subtly joke, it is difficult to curse and

beautifully deny women. It's strange, but with all the repulsive components, Sluzhkin is sympathetic, it's easy for him to empathize, his uneasy position forces him to scroll through his own actions, and it's always difficult to create such a screen character that almost any viewer can try on himself" (Ukhov, 2013);

2) "But most of all, he attracts non-petty character in the way he relates to our literary and cinematic tradition going from Onegin and Pechorin to Ivanov and Treplev and then to the heroes of *Duck Hunt*, *Flight in Dream and in Reality*, *Autumn Marathon* and other "superfluous people for rendezvous", with which he was immediately compared, noting mainly their undoubted similarity, although, the difference is no less significant. All the listed persons in one way or another had a romantic aura – in the largest Pechorin, in the least – Buzykin from the *Autumn Marathon*. Sluzhkin, on the other hand, is essentially unromantic and not even tragicomic, but rather a comic hero, but not in the usual sense of the word, but in the way Chekhov used it with his plays" (Matizen, 2013);

3) "Alas, the profession of the teacher is considered a dead end. What the main character himself admits. A story about a real man? Of course not. The edification of youth – do not be like him? Also not. Or maybe a new upbringing novel? In which pupils are brought up by teachers. Yes there is simply life. Clamped in the confusion of human prejudices and unfulfilled desires ... But – albeit not always, but still – bursting loose, triumphantly throwing up arms and saying: but still we have something to live for. Let's for a moment. For the sake of such moments and live. And this life – in most situations ridiculous, ridiculous, not exemplary and unlucky – but leaving hope for spiritual enlightenment"(Govorushko, 2013);

4) " *Geographer Burned the Globe* is a surprisingly lively and funny film in which even imperfections and roughness go in plus. After all, this is, in the final analysis, a love story, with which deviations from the canons of beauty and truth are only beneficial. And this is a test for modern Russian viewers on the ability to enjoy the normal everyday cinema about real people like you and me "(Dolin, 2013).

5) The *Geographer*... managed to glorify the one who lives here, these days, and does nothing at all. It turns out that "nothing" in the end turns out to be the only possible strategy – but only for those who want to love the whole world, not to be a pledge of happiness to anyone, and to continue to hope that the world will love it in return"(Kuvshinova, 2013).

Arguments against the film: "turbidity," "lifelessness," "fiction," "no movie," "a cake with cream," "indecent sensitivity and fearfulness of the authors," "blunders," "ashamed to look," etc.

Examples:

1) "Forgive me for a ridiculous verbal allusion, but I need to despair to give out an ambitious turbid melodrama for a revelation, and so taken so lifeless that it was necessary to release immediately on TV" (Hoffmann, 2013).

2) "Director Veledinsky climbs out of the skin to make his film appealing to the simplest viewer: he sends to the Soviet classics about men searching for the meaning of life, cleans the source from all painful monologues, leaving only jokes with jokes, tensely peers into the eyes of a good artist Khabensky . But his Sluzhkin remains a fiction, a non-existent representative of a non-existent generation, which does not develop at all, does not grow, which really does not need anything. The movie turns out the same. That is, nonentity" (Ruzaev, 2013);

3) "The whole movie looks like a cake with cream. ... There is a feeling that the creators of the *Geographer* – people with quite a decent creative reputation, who ten years ago were a vigorous and brave front flank of Russian cinema – just grew old and became indecently sensitive and timid. The formula of Gogol: "love us black," which always worked in our art, it seems to them too risky, it is much safer to shoot another fairy tale for adults – even if it's a sin against the truth" (Zaretskaya, 2013);

4) "There is no portrait of the "hero of our time", because there is no hero, and there is no time as such: all his signs to the middle of the film because of the critical mass of various blunders simply become dead scenery. There is no drama, and there is not even a tragicomedy, because laughing at how a teacher gets drunk with the main school bully and reads rap becomes inappropriate and boring. And what is there? Never mind. There is a film that almost from the very beginning (Sluzhkin fights in the train with a policeman to the song "I'm free") is a shame to watch. In addition to the first episode, please, just a nonsense, a couple of shameful ones: the moment with the decantation of birch juice in a bottle of brandy, and the scene in the bathhouse – a schoolgirl in love with the teacher groans naked at the stove (for some reason one feels more awkward for the young actress), the teacher lashes himself with bath brooms until the blood – apparently, expelling the lustful demons" (Artamonova, 2013).

In our opinion, the *Geographer* like the *Correction Class*, looks like a secondary product, nothing new to add to either the development of the "school theme" or the tradition of stories about "unnecessary people"...

In the phantasmagoric drama *The Clinch* (2015) the teacher of the Russian language and literature "cautiously, clasps the shoulders with a cheap jacket, strives to slip unnoticed. ... He is not attracted to a long-time unloved wife ... neither an 18-year-old son who clearly lost any respect for his unsuccessful father ... nor a standing apartment waiting for repairs, torn to the bare concrete walls" (Lyubarskaya, 2015). But he is not some romantic from "sixties": he sees in the window how "the older students beat the younger one, but he will not rush to save anyone. In the booth of the service toilet, a prelude to a sexual act is performed, and the teacher will not do anything either, he slams the door, shouting in his heart: "Was there no other place?" ... school – the ideal topic for demonstrating hypocrisy, deceit, falsity, boredom of life and hopelessness of existence. The school is, apparently, a serious mental shock for future filmmakers and subsequently serves as a source of "black inspiration," the forge of a nightmare"

(Argangelsky, 2015). True, further the plot of *The Clinch* goes away from the school in the direction of surrealism and absurdism, and, consequently, from the subjects of our research.

But in *Teacher* (2015), almost all the action of the film takes place in the school class. At first, it seems that we are dealing with serious dramatic problems: "here are the eternal relationships of the older and younger generations, the trampling of moral standards, the degradation of society and youth, the large-scale problems in Russian education, and the social stratification of society" (Nikolaev, 2015), "all relevant topics of the man in the street connected with the school, here and Ukraine with the US, here and culture with education, there are bandits with guards", but soon the *Teacher* turns into a farce. ... turns into some kind of skits" (Ukhov, 2015).

Studied by the life, a story of an elderly the wonderful actress Irina Kupchenko, who played once the most important pedagogical images in the Soviet cinema (*Aliens Letters*, 1975), plays here. However, in the *Teacher* the authors of the film put it in the same uncomfortable and false position that was in another talented actress – Marina Neelova in the perestroika film *Dear Elena Sergeevna*: an elderly and seemingly experienced teacher behaves with schoolboys the way as if for the first time in her life she was in the classroom and knew practically nothing about the intellectual level and morals of modern students. And in this class, the authors managed to collect amazing characters - "boors, loafers and hippies. Even excellent pupils and good guys under the influence of an unusual situation begin to demonstrate their exceptional egoism and anger. However, to perceive all this for some reason should be something natural and easily transformed into something healthy with the help of a wave of a magic bar. The amazing thing: just a few tens of minutes of communication abounding with mutual threats and insults – and such a universal Stockholm syndrome reigns that the viewer becomes uncomfortable" (Sosnovsky, 2015).

A similar exaggerated falsity, supplemented by the cost of replacing the German play into the Russian film, also appears in the much more professionally made *Pupil* (2016). This drama shows the "breakdown of the veils with the overwhelming Russian citizen of despair hilariously competing in aggressiveness with anti-clericalism. Here, in the office of the headmistress, a Russian flag must necessarily stand – in order to demonstrate the pseudo patriotism that pervades everything. And certainly – inverted, stressing: for this all, nothing but sycophantic behaviour, not worth it. If the school has a priest, then his watch will occupy about a third of the screen, and speech and habits will to testify the criminal past, and not so recent. The director, the head teachers, the "teachers" are nasty, screaming aunts (and the dull teacher of the physical culture, yes), in the classroom they tell about the positive aspects of Stalinism, and in the evenings, at the bottle, they howl awful low-grade songs. Brainless cops and guards are ready, having used all the swear words with all their heart, to cross themselves at anything that resembles a cross ... "The pupil" does not invite to reflect on the problems of the current Russian

society, as claimed by its author. Instead, the viewer is given the opportunity to inflame his anger" (Sosnovsky, 2016).

This story about a high school student who uses religious extremism as a tool for rebellion, then and again, the cues and plot details that betray the western origin of the original slip through. ... The main misfortune of the *Pupil* in the other is that it is a warning film, not a film-study. The picture does not analyze the soul world of a guy who becomes a religious fanatic, does not show his inner struggle, does not give him the right to doubt and hesitate" (Ivanov, 2016).

M. Trofimenkov rightly writes also about the secondary nature of the *Pupil*: "Something like this the world has already seen half a century ago. In dozens of other films, other teenagers – from English and Polish to Japanese – also demonstrated their genitals. They also smashed their too-bourgeois sleeping-rooms and beat the adult overseers on the spot with paradoxical aphorisms. They brought condoms to school and dreamed of automatic bursts from the abdomen to cleanse the land of adult totalitarian pigs and peer conformists. Then it was called a youth riot against triumphant hypocrisy: teenage hooliganism should be admired" (Trofimenkov, 2016).

On the other hand, one should probably listen to A. Dolin's opinion: "The film is straightforward and even didactic, it is a kind of visual (even too much) demonstration of all the dangers of religion, private or organized. However, the artistic merit is much stronger than the rare shortcomings. *Pupil* – the film primarily about fanaticism and "insulting the feelings of believers", but is also about the modern education system, anti-Semitism, homosexuality, hypocrisy, all forms of totalitarianism. In this sense, the *Pupil* is absolutely a political picture, and the second such in Russia for all the recent time was never ever shot before" (Dolin, 2016).

Films by V. Gai Germanika, dramas *Geographer Burned the Globe* (2013), *Teacher* (2015) and *Pupil* (2016) told about ordinary schoolchildren from ordinary schools, choosing from them for the most part the least socially protected. But the authors of the series *Barvikha* (2009) and *Golden (Barvikha-2)* (2011), which were shot according to American recipes, turned to the existence of an elite school where senior high school students usually learn. Like Gai Germanika, the role of schoolchildren was performed by professional actors. In *Barvikha* they were shot at the age of 20 to 29 years, and in *Golden* – even older. Having redesigned the American TV series *Veronica Mars* (2004-2007) and *Gossip Girl* (2007-2012), the authors of *Barvikha* designed stereotypes for the films about the "golden youth" of characters: Lovelace and his rustic friend, "Cinderella", trying to deceive into "higher society", the queen of the class and her retinue, and, of course, a charming and honest guy who, though rich, is responsive. The plot of the series revolves around such key concepts as friendship, love, envy, jealousy, sex, booze, deception and meanness. All this is filled with the same steady moral relativism as Gai Germanika, only softly, glamorous and without claims to the author's statement.

Approximately in the same spirit, however, without the exaggerated glamour of *Barvikha* and pedalized sexuality (including homosexuality) of the series *Physics or Chemistry* (2011), the series *High School Students* (2006-2010) was made.

Melodramas

In the 1990s, a lot of films were filmed, retrospectively comprehending the relatively recent past. Among them was the melodrama *American* (1997) by D. Meskhiev. Earlier, Dmitry Meskhiev (*Cynics, Over Dark Water*) was considered a skilled stylist and one of the leaders of the new director's generation. However, *American* has caused his image considerable damage. And all because Meskhiev has lost, as they say, in his field. Instead of a nostalgic retro-melodrama about the love affairs and everyday affairs of Russian teenagers of the early 1970s, in our opinion, a carelessly cut and poorly crafted hand-crafted piece was produced. Of course, the authors of the film did not forget to dress their young heroes in their trousers and flap them with Beatles' styled hair. But for more they were not quite ready. The atmosphere of the 1970s in the *American* does not exist. It seems that the director, without a long thought, simply copied (primitively and without inspiration) the older generation's film memories of his post-war childhood. But, alas, what was admired in *Dudes* (1977) or in *Freeze-Die-Resurrect* (1989) in the interpretation of Meskhiev looked like a dull stamp.

By "average" patterns, many other "school-university" melodramas are also cut. It is clear that at the heart of melodramatic stories on the school material – love affairs, sometimes quite risky. Hence the even greater caution of the film-makers in relation to the age of the performers. So in the *Beloved Teacher* (2016) the eleventh-grader falls in love with the recent graduate of the pedagogical college, who came to teach at his school. For the reasons mentioned above, the actor was chosen as the amateur schoolboy of 22 years, which put the authors of the series before the choice: to invite a girl of the age corresponding to the graduate of the university (23-24 years) to the role of teacher, or, in order to avoid equalizing the age parameters of the actors, take an older actress. We stopped at the second option: the performer of the role of the young teacher in the year the serial was released on the screen was 33 years old.

It is clear that this kind of age casting from the very first shots destroyed the credibility of the plot of the series, especially since further it did not give special reasons for serious reflections (what is worth one scene of an attempt to rape the teacher at the graduation party by one of the friends of the main character). By the way, on the scene of rape (this time one of the graduates of the school), and the plot of the nondescript series *And the balloon will return* (2013) is also constructed.

In a boring melodramatic vein on the screen incarnated love stories of older characters: in *The Price of Love* (2013), a married university teacher falls in love with a twenty-year-old boy, in *Work on Mistakes* (2015), a schoolteacher meets

after many years with a man who once abandoned her; in the *White Crow* (2011) a provincial from the pedagogical school becomes a victim of the machinations of his treacherous mother-in-law; in the *Children under 16 ...* (2010) there was a poorly supported scenario-based student love triangle, rightly received negative reviews of criticism (Nefedov, 2010; Favorov, 2010), since "the viewer sees instead of beauty the mannerisms of performance, glossy pretentiousness and blatant vulgarity" (Yushchenko, 2010).

In the melodramatic series *Teachers* (2014), the well-known TV talk show *We chat* quarrels with the leadership of the channel, loses work and ... gets a job at the provincial school as a teacher of literature (oh, this does not give a rest to the filmmakers on the school topic stories about the drastic change in the status of their characters, for the time being, it had nothing to do with pedagogy: let us recall at least *Teacher in Law* and *Teacher of Physical Culture*. It's clear, at school, a recent TV star meets a modest beauty-teacher. But not only her: the glamorous English teacher has already put her eye on him, and two smart high school students are arguing which one of them will seduce him (why one of them reads A. Kuprin's *Sulamith* and rushes to the teacher with kisses, and the other tattooed on her breast and undress in front of him in the school room: do not worry, the roles of these schoolgirls were performed by twenty-year-old actresses). Against this background, everything in the classroom is like that of modern filmmakers: schoolchildren drink, smoke, have sex (see *Barvikha*, *Golden*, etc.).

In the melodrama *Freshman* (2016), too, a reception with a character turned upside down: a pretty young mother easily passes the entrance exams to the Institute of International Relations instead of her 18-year-old daughter and soon falls in love with an impressive assistant professor. The advantage of this film, in our opinion, is that it does not pretend to be a presentation of the "life of the university", but plays the romantic feelings unassumingly.

Among the melodramas about students and schoolchildren the greatest resonance was caused by the film *14+* (2015). Contrary to the unspoken film rules of recent decades, the young actors of this picture are not 20-25, but actually fifteen. And the value of the film is "not in dramatic conflicts. This is a very simple film about love, from which it is impossible to come off and which then is difficult to forget. Just in it (a rare case, especially in Russian cinema), absolutely everything is done right. The main thing in *14+* is a surprisingly light and natural intonation, with which the story is told. If you look for roughly similar films about teenagers, perhaps the *A Swedish love story* by Roy Andersson or even Truffaut's *Les quatre cents coups*, released in 1970 and 1959, may come to mind, respectively. Teenagers, can, and vary depending on epoch and the countries – the genuine tenderness with which they are looked at by directors does not change. The whole film sounds lively human speech – and after that dialogues in a lot of other Russian paintings and serials begin especially painfully to cut the hearing"(Korsakov, 2015).

In fact, in *14+* there are "dialogues" "torn from the language", precise reactions-wins, an elastic rhythm, many funny moments. The vitality of young performers, their non-professionalism (adolescents play teenagers) is relevant ... The girls here are absolutely adults (gin and tonic, dates, risky outfit, innocence and vice in one young body); boys are very kids (bolts, Lego, clockwork robots, T-shirts with the Simpsons, and they do not sell beer in the store). Incomplete-inexpensive rips over the topic of the lesson – "monomials", pray to the image of brother Danila Bagrov and in battles with hooligans imagine themselves as Supermen and Spider-Man. Ordinary children at the age of adulthood"(Malukova, 2015).

On the other hand, while watching, our "consciousness sinks at a time when adults with their problems were stupid and incomprehensible, and their own problems were the only important ones, when nothing further from tomorrow existed, and the heart beat more strongly from love experiences than from fear of being beaten. It is likely that such a metamorphosis will not happen to everyone. Someone *14+* just seems implausible and tense. But even it does get into resonance with the frequency of mental vibrations, this does not at all promise a positive effect. Imagine if you were immersed with a head to where it's warm and good, and then dragged back into the hostile environment by the scruff. Imagine that someone rudely and unceremoniously dug into your intimate experiences and put them on public display. Sensation is not pleasant, leaving behind a very strange feeling, a mixture of nostalgia and devastation" (Litovchenko, 2015).

It would seem, "this is exactly what you can only dream about: that Russian cinema, steeped either in arthouse snobbery, or in commerce" below the plinth, "turned its face to the audience, to the viewer, to real life. And he learned to dissect this life in modern artistic rhythms and intonations" (Plakhov, 2015).

And so, despite all this, the *14+* became the source of an action of angry protest: the authors of the melodrama accused the authors of propaganda for alcoholic beverages, teenage sex and paedophilia and in the corruption of minors. On the site change.org, a petition titled "Banning the film *14+*" in 2015 collected about two thousand signatures (Petition ..., 2015). Here are just some of the comments posted on this site: "I urge you to ban the movie" *14+* "at the box office and to bring its creators to account for promoting the early onset of sexual activity, corrupting children. The people who allowed the Ministry of Culture to sponsor this film must be punished" (G. Rebenchuk, Kazakhstan); "We need films that call for children to strive for chastity, virtue, moral conduct! And this film simply cannot be watched by teenagers!!!" (I. Kolobova, Russia) (Petition ..., 2015).

Such storms did not cause either *Tender Age* or *Everyone will die, but I'll stay*, and this despite the fact that in *14+* there is neither a swear language, nor explicit sexual scenes, nor cruel episodes of violence. And the film was shot "already in a fundamentally different era than *Gai Germanika*. Much has been banned, and almost all bans are met: ... a night meeting of lovers is shown with chastity, worthy of the Soviet standards. But surprisingly, *14+* is a rare film in

which falseness and conventionality are not felt in depicting the life of adolescents, and piercing it, especially closer to the finale, warmth and kindness do not turn into treacle. ... It is hardly the first time in our cinema that the film convincingly showed that, whether we like it or not, today the teenager's adult life begins on the Internet. However, another thing is shown: the virtual world does not give either real detente or experience: sooner or later you have to prove yourself "in real life" (Plakhov, 2015).

So why are not cheeky TV series about schoolchildren, filled with sex (one *Physics or Chemistry* is worth), namely, the modest melodrama *14+* caused such a storm of anger of the "working masses"? The answer to this difficult question is found in A.S. Plakhov's article: "Indeed, from the standpoint of radical art, the" *14+* "style is traditional, if not conservative – and this is absolutely justified by the goals and objectives of the picture. If she were more avant-garde, she would not have had a rent or scandal at all, nobody would have known about her except for a group of film critics. But the hysteria that has unfolded around this particular film allows us to make broader conclusions about culture and society as a whole. Even six months or a year ago we were on another level of rapid fall into the pool of the collective unconscious. Then it seemed that the main enemies of free creativity are in power institutions and institutions: it was there that the initiatives of absurd prohibitions were developed and from there. Today, after the prohibitive genie was released from the bottle, we fell even deeper: initiatives come from below – and this is evidence of a new stage of cultural democracy in Russian" (Plakhov, 2015).

Thrillers

Unlike the detective, the thriller belonged to genres practically forbidden in Soviet cinema (especially in school-themed films). Therefore, the appearance in the post-Soviet space of the thriller *Serpent Spring* (1997) was unexpected for those times.

... In a small provincial town appeared serial maniac. His victims are young women, so that there is every reason to worry about the fate of a beautiful trainee who came to the local school ... Director Nikolai Lebedev in the debut film proved to be a diligent admirer of the work of Alfred Hitchcock. He was not at all interested in the realities of the Russian provincial and school life of the 1990s. The screen world of the *Serpent Spring* is a kind of action-packed chess game with masked figures, where the nervous tension of the spectators is confidently pumped from episode to episode. The director demonstrated a good mastery of the profession, using the well-known actors E. Mironov and O. Ostroumova in an unusual role. Almost all the characters in the film are flip-flops, hiding some secrets and vices.

About ten years later A. Strizhenov made the mystical thriller *Yulenska* (2008), where the teacher of literature fell into the gothic atmosphere of the gymnasium, where strange and terrible things happened. Of course, not only the history of the unlucky teacher, first of all, it is "the story of a very smart girl who

said the first word at two months, learned to read at a year and a half and at ten does not know what to do yet, and because it falls under several articles of the Criminal Code" (Maslova, 2009).

In the film there are obvious hints at the story of the myth about Orpheus, tales of the *Snow Queen* and *Suspiria* by D. Argento. However, "despite the obvious similarity of history with *Suspiria*, *Yulenska* "is not a Russian copy of Dario Argento. This is Jesse Franco, only faster and ironic and with three layers of gloss. Rich Carroll texture – pigtailed, golf clubs, T-shirts, the girl strangles the squirrel – politically corrected by distracting scenes of a healthy heterosexual character" (Koretsky, 2009).

The western story lining is most evident in the mystery series *Closed School* (2011-2012), the remake of the Spanish *Black Lagoon* (2007-2010), the events of which take place in an elite boarding school. As in most other Russian TV series, the tenth grade is played by actors between the ages of 24 and 30. *Closed School* was submitted to the media "as the first mystical series about teenagers in Russia. But despite her success with the Russian TV audience, the creators of the series did not take into account the important options for copying. It has a melodramatic canon, but there is no expression of the original source. Authors ... choose advertising-optimistic intonation, tend to purism ... Despite the relishing of skulls, episodes of a mysterious stay in the world of the dead do not cause fear. Really terrible moments at copying lose sharpness. But the reasons for the popularity of the *Closed School* – just in its usual, predictable, unpretentious manner» (Sputnitskaya, 2016, p. 60).

Fantasy

In fantasy films, the theme of the school and the university naturally falls into the background. Well, only with the exception of some school episodes, where the main characters in *Ghost* (2015), where the teenager, thanks to his communication, gets a man's education with a ghost? Even less school is in the *Attraction* (2017), where the students of high school are trying to help out poor aliens from the misfortune. *Dolly the sheep was angry and died early* (2014) – a story about a student who came from Russia in the 21st century in the Soviet 1980s – also not about the university, but about love and about the fact that the student "destroys the past in order that he realized that his father was a world man and that he realized how strong and cheerful was friendship at a time when young people did not live in computers and cell phones. ... "The image of the 1980s is imbued with ironic nostalgia. The director with delight and humour recalls Komsomol discos, vodka with soda, exams on scientific communism, trips by big companies on small cars, marching songs to guitar, crosses in gas masks, fights of "urban" and "village", queue for sausage" (Ivanov, 2014).

And quite a rare genre bird in the post-Soviet school-student subjects was a musical, which, however, does not detract from the merits of the brilliantly stylized V. Todorovsky *Hipsters* (2008).

*Russian films of 1992-2017 on the theme of school and university
The place of action, historical, socio-cultural, political, ideological, context
Historical context (dominant concepts: "media agencies", "media / media categories", "media representations" and "media audiences").*

Features of the historical period of creation of media texts, market conditions that contributed to the idea, the process of creating media texts, the degree of influence of events of that time on media texts.

The time frame of this historical period has been defined by us since 1992, that is, from the time when the Russian cinematographic production arose after the collapse of the USSR.

The main political, economic, cultural, educational characteristics of this historical period are presented in Table 1.

Table 4. Key dates and events in Russia and the world in the period 1992-2017: politics, economics, culture, education (compiled by A.V. Fedorov)

<i>Key dates and events in Russia and the world in the period 1992-2017: politics, economics, culture</i>	
1992	<p>The beginning of economic reforms (in particular - the abolition of state regulation of prices in Russia, privatization (voucher) state property) of the new Russian government, which led to a sharp fall in the rouble rate with the shortage of products and goods for the first time (this year a large number of Russian citizens only the operations of purchase and sale of imported goods have made millions of capitals, some of them for reasons of prestige, friendly ties, but most importantly - to "wash" the shadow funds, investments were made in the movie business).</p> <p>Freedom and expansion of the scale of religious activity.</p> <p>A sharp increase in the flow of emigration of Russians to the West.</p> <p>Visits of the Russian President Boris Yeltsin to the United States: February, June,</p> <p>External harmony of political relations between the US and Russia.</p> <p>The adoption of the US by the pro-Russian "Act for Freedom Support" (Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets), which created the basis for economic assistance by the weakened crisis of the Russian economy.</p> <p>Adoption of the Law "On Education": July 10.</p> <p>Law of the Russian Federation No. 3612-I "Fundamentals of the Legislation of the Russian Federation on Culture": October 9.</p> <p>The Minister of Education of the Russian Federation at first remains appointed in 1991 E.D. Dneprov (1936-2015): until the 4th of December.</p> <p>E.D. Dneprov was the organizer and head of the school reform, based on the principles of the 1988 concept, which was aimed at de-ideologizing, democratizing and updating the national education.</p> <p>Under his leadership, the law "On Education" was prepared, private educational institutions began to open.</p> <p>The new Minister of Education of the Russian Federation was appointed Tkachenko: since December 23.</p> <p>As well as E.D. Dneprov, E.V. Tkachenko showed himself as an adherent of humanization and democratization of education, advocated a differentiated education.</p>
1993	<p>Bill Clinton becomes the US President: January 20.</p> <p>Meeting B.N. Yeltsin and B. Clinton in Canada: April 3-4.</p> <p>The Moscow International Film Festival (1993, July), perhaps for the first time in its history, experienced a shortage of viewers: crowds of thirsty "extra tickets" in dozens of metropolitan cinema halls are a thing of the past. Satisfied with tasty and forbidden in the old days Western films, the mass audience preferred to watch movies on TV and video (already at home, and not in the video rooms that had survived the last few days), not being tempted by the amazing colour reproduction of the festival "kodak" or the loud names of the filmmakers.</p> <p>The publication of President BN. Yeltsin decree No. 1400 on the dissolution of the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Council of Russia: September 21.</p> <p>The breakthrough of the cordon around the House of Soviets of the Russian Federation, the seizure by the group of armed supporters of the Supreme Council of the building of the Moscow mayor's office and the</p>

	<p>attempted armed seizure of the television center Ostankino: October 3.</p> <p>The dispersal of the rebels with the help of troops entered into the center of Moscow: October 4.</p> <p>A live broadcast of the rebellious White House (the building of the Supreme Council) in Moscow by the American television company CNN, undertaken by Russian special forces units and tanks: October 4.</p>
1994	<p>US President Bill Clinton's visit to Russia: January 12-15.</p> <p>The first joint Russian-American space shuttle program.</p> <p>The withdrawal of Russian troops from Germany: from September 1.</p> <p>Visit of the President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin in the US: September 27-29</p> <p>The beginning of the first war in Chechnya: December 11-31.</p> <p>Beginning of a sharp drop (roughly halved compared to 1992) of Russian film production, caused by the fact that private investors stopped using cinema as a tool for money laundering, and the state had no financial means to support the film industry in the midst of the economic crisis.</p>
1995	<p>Meeting of US and Russian political leaders in Moscow, which adopted six joint statements, including the irreversibility of the process of reducing nuclear weapons: May 10.</p> <p>Meeting Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton in Canada: June 16.</p> <p>Capture of hostages by Chechen terrorists in Budennovsk hospital: June 14-19.</p> <p>Meeting B.N. Yeltsin and B. Clinton in the US: October 23.</p> <p>The opening in Moscow of the first in Russia cinema with real multi-channel sound Dolby – "Kodak-Kinomir" (by the beginning of the XXI century in the capital there will be about fifty of them, and halls with new equipment will appear in all large and medium-sized Russian cities).</p>
1996	<p>Meeting of B.N. Yeltsin and B. Clinton in Moscow: April 21.</p> <p>Presidential elections in Russia, where B.N. Yeltsin in two rounds with great difficulty defeated the leader of the Communists G.A. Zyuganov: June 16 - July 3.</p> <p>Minister of Education of the Russian Federation appointed V.G. Kinelev: August 14th.</p> <p>At his post, V.G. Kinelev paid special attention to the introduction of information technologies in the education system.</p> <p>Beginning of the introduction of Bachelor's and Master's programs in Russia: since August 22.</p> <p>Federal Law No. 126-FZ "On State Support for the Cinematography of the Russian Federation": August 22.</p> <p>The end of the first war in Chechnya - Russia and Chechnya - sign a peace agreement. The withdrawal of Russian troops from Chechnya begins: August 31.</p>
1997	<p>President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin, NATO Secretary General, NATO Heads of State and Government sign the "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation" in Paris: May 27.</p> <p>The production of Russian films, intended for rental in cinemas, reached the post-Soviet minimum - 43's.</p> <p>Gradual growth of film production will begin in Russia only since 2001.</p>
1998	<p>Minister of Education of the Russian Federation appointed A.N. Tikhonov (1947-2016): February.</p> <p>Meeting B.N. Yeltsin and B. Clinton in Birmingham: May 17.</p> <p>Sharp collapse of the rouble in relation to world currencies, default: August 17.</p> <p>US President Bill Clinton's visit to Russia: September 1-3.</p> <p>Minister of Education of the Russian Federation appointed V.M. Philippov: September 30th.</p> <p>During his leadership, the program "Modernization of Russian education for the period until 2010" was developed (and later approved by the Government of the Russian Federation, which included the development of new standards for general secondary education, primary, secondary and higher vocational education, the introduction of a multi-talent system for assessing students' knowledge, support for the Bologna Convention by education, the introduction of the Unified State Exam.</p> <p>US air strikes against Iraq: December 16-19.</p>
1999	<p>The gradual increase in world energy prices, which triggered the growth of the Russian economy, continued until August 2008.</p> <p>The conduct of the US and NATO military operation in Yugoslavia, aimed at protecting the Albanian enclave in Kosovo.</p> <p>The beginning of the second war in Chechnya: September 30.</p> <p>Meeting B.N. Yeltsin and B. Clinton in Istanbul: November 18.</p> <p>B.N.'s resignation. Yeltsin from the post of President of Russia: December 31.</p>
2000	<p>Election of the official receiver of Boris B.N. Yeltsyn - V.V. Putin: March 26th.</p> <p>B. Clinton's visit to Russia: June 3-5.</p> <p>The death of the Kursk submarine: August 12.</p> <p>Meeting V.V. Putin and B. Clinton in the United States. Adoption of the Joint Statement "Initiative for Cooperation in the Sphere of Strategic Stability": September 6.</p> <p>The beginning of a gradual increase in film production in Russia.</p>
2001	<p>US President becomes George Bush Jr.: January 20.</p>

	<p>The first meeting (Ljubljana) of the US President George W. Bush. and the President of Russia V.V. Putin: June 16th.</p> <p>Aviation attacks in New York and Washington: September 11.</p> <p>The US starts the war in Afghanistan: October 7.</p> <p>Visit of V.V. Putin in the US: November.</p> <p>The concept "Modernization of Russian education for the period until 2010": December 29.</p> <p>The tangible growth in production of Russian television series and television films began (from fifty in 2001 to three hundred by the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century).</p> <p>Thanks to the financial support of the state, the number of films gradually increased (although many of them practically did not go to the rental because of their low commercial potential and / or quality), made for cinemas. As a result, since the beginning of the 21st century, film production has grown about three times compared to 2000.</p>
2002	<p>Visit of US President George W. Bush. to Russia: May 23-26.</p> <p>Creation of the NATO-Russia Council: May 28.</p> <p>Denunciation of the US treaty on the limitation of anti-missile defense: June 13.</p> <p>Capture of hostages by Chechen terrorists in the House of Culture during the musical performance "Nord-Ost" in Moscow: October 23-26.</p> <p>Visit of US President George W. Bush. to Russia: November.</p>
2003	<p>The US starts the war in Iraq: March 20.</p> <p>Visit of US President George W. Bush to Russia: May 31 - June 1.</p> <p>The signing of the Bologna Convention on Education by Russia: September.</p> <p>The meeting of George W. Bush. and V.V. Putin in the US: September 26-27.</p>
2004	<p>The Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation appointed A.A. Fursenko: 9 March.</p> <p>During his leadership, the development of new standards for general secondary education, primary, secondary and higher professional education, support for the Bologna Convention on Education and the Unified State Examination (USE) was continued.</p> <p>Capture of hostages by Chechen terrorists to the school in Beslan: September 1-3.</p> <p>The first official visit of Russian President V.V. Putin in the US: November 13-16.</p> <p>The victory of the "Orange Revolution" in Ukraine: November-December.</p> <p>Election of the pro-American V.A. Yushchenko: December 26.</p>
2005	<p>Meeting Presidents George W. Bush. and V.V. Putin in Bratislava: February 24.</p> <p>Terror acts in the London Underground: July 7.</p> <p>Iran's resumption of the uranium enrichment program and the rejection of negotiations with the EU.</p> <p>The beginning of the "Iran crisis": August 8.</p> <p>Meeting Presidents George W. Bush. and V.V. Putin in the United States: September 16.</p> <p>Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 803 "On the Federal Targeted Program for the Development of Education for 2006-2010": December 23.</p>
2006	<p>"Gas crisis" between Russia and Ukraine: January 1-4.</p> <p>Statement of the President of Russia V.V. Putin on the end of the counter-terrorist operation in Chechnya: January.</p> <p>US Vice President R. Cheney in his speech accuses Russia of using its natural resources as a foreign-policy weapon of pressure, of Russia's violation of human rights and of its destructive actions in the international arena: on May 4.</p> <p>The G8 summit in St. Petersburg: July 14-17.</p> <p>Federal Law "On Information, Information Technologies and Information Protection" No. 149-FZ: July 27.</p>
2007	<p>Political conflict between the US and Russia over the US intention to deploy a missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic.</p> <p>Statement by US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates that the US "should have been prepared for a possible armed conflict with Russia": February 8.</p> <p>Speech V.V. Putin at the Conference on World Security in Munich, sharply criticizing US foreign policy: February 10.</p> <p>Signature of V.V. Putin's decree "On the suspension by the Russian Federation of the Treaty on Conventional Arms in Europe: July 14.</p>
2008	<p>Dmitry Medvedev was elected President of Russia: March 2.</p> <p>The meeting of George W. Bush. and V.V. Putin in Sochi: April 5-6.</p> <p>World oil prices reach a new peak - over 140 dollars per barrel: July.</p> <p>Armed conflict between Georgia and Russia, connected with South Ossetia and Abkhazia: August 8-16.</p> <p>The fall of world oil prices (4.6 times, first to \$ 100 per barrel, and then lower - to \$ 30), the collapse of the key credit and banking consortiums of the United States as the beginning of the worst economic crisis</p>

	<p>since the 1930s, especially tangible in the dependent on oil exports to the Russian economy: August-December.</p> <p>A sharp fall in the rouble's exchange rate against world currencies: August-December.</p>
2009	<p>US President becomes B. Obama, the beginning of a "reset" of US-Russian relations: January 20.</p> <p>Another "gas crisis" between Russia and Ukraine: January.</p> <p>World oil prices rise to \$ 70 per barrel: June.</p> <p>The first visit of US President Barack Obama to Moscow, his meeting with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev. Medvedev and Prime Minister V.V. By Putin: July 6-7.</p> <p>US President Barack Obama announces the cancellation of the US decision to deploy anti-missile defense systems in Poland and the Czech Republic: September.</p>
2010	<p>The President of Ukraine was V.F. Yanukovich: February 25th.</p> <p>The signing by President of the United States of America B. Obama and President of the Russian Federation D.A. Medvedev treaty on the limitation of nuclear weapons: April 8.</p>
2011	<p>Turns and uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa (Egypt, Tunisia, Libya).</p> <p>Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 61 "On the Federal Targeted Program for the Development of Education for 2011-2015": February 7.</p> <p>The beginning of the first mass protest actions of the Russian opposition: from December 4.</p> <p>Federal Law of the Russian Federation No. 436-FZ "On protecting children from information that is harmful to their health and development": December 29 (entered into force on September 1, 2012).</p>
2012	<p>President V.V. Putin: May 7th.</p> <p>The Prime Minister appointed D.A. Medvedev.</p> <p>Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation appointed D.V. Livanov: May 21st.</p> <p>In his post, D.V. Livanov (through the introduction of annual monitoring of HEIs) carried out a broad company of reducing the number of higher education institutions in Russia, tried to combat plagiarism in the scientific sphere and advocated the introduction of scientometric indicators of the activity of university teachers and researchers. With him continued a permanent change in university standards.</p> <p>Federal Law No. 139-FZ "On Amending the Federal Law" On Protection of Children from Information Harmful to their Health and Development "and Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation on the Limitation of Access to Illegal Information on the Internet": July 28.</p>
2013	<p>Renunciation of Pope Benedict XVI from the throne: February.</p> <p>The beginning of broadcasting of Public TV of Russia: since May, 19th.</p> <p>The beginning of street protests and armed clashes in Kiev: from November 21.</p>
2014	<p>Winter Olympic Games in Sochi: February 7-23.</p> <p>The actual removal from power of Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich: February 22.</p> <p>Accession of the Crimea to Russia: March 1.</p> <p>The inauguration of the President of Ukraine P.A. Poroshenko: June 7th.</p> <p>The beginning of the military conflict in the Donbass: since April.</p> <p>The beginning of the sanctions of the West (in response to the events in the Crimea and the East of Ukraine) against the Russian Federation: since March.</p> <p>The beginning of Russia's response to the West: March 20.</p> <p>Amendments and additions to Federal Law No. 53 "On the State Language of the Russian Federation" (of June 1, 2005): May 5 (the introduction of amendments and additions to the force from July 1).</p> <p>The beginning of Russia's response food sanctions against the West: August 6.</p>
2015	<p>Establishment of the Eurasian Economic Union: January 1.</p> <p>Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 497 "On the Federal Target Program for the Development of Education for 2016-2020": May 23.</p> <p>The beginning of the Russian military operation in Syria: September 30.</p> <p>Crisis of relations between Russia and Turkey over the shot down of Russian military aircraft Su-24 on the border of Syria and Turkey: from November 24.</p>
2016	<p>Results of the referendum in the UK: the British voted for the country's withdrawal from the EU (Brexit): June 23.</p> <p>Attempt of military coup in Turkey: July 15-16.</p> <p>The Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation appointed O.Y. Vasylieva: on August, 19.</p> <p>D. Trump election as US President: November 8.</p>
2017	<p>The official entry into office of US President D. Trump: January 20.</p> <p>The signing of D. Trump of the law, providing for the imposition of additional sanctions against Russia: August 2.</p>

Russian audiovisual texts of 1992-2017 on the subject of the school and university, unlike Soviet times, were no longer controlled by the state, and therefore could not coincide in their tasks with the main lines of state policy in the educational sphere, which officially supported:

- combination of private and public property of educational institutions;
- modernization of the education system, introduction of new information technologies, distance education;
- development and implementation of new standards for all educational levels;
- introduction of a multi-point system for assessing students' knowledge;
- development of normative per capita financing for general secondary education;
- The Bologna Convention on Education,
- Unified state examination in schools;
- reducing the number of "inefficient" universities;
- the fight against plagiarism and poor scientific research;
- fighting corruption in educational institutions;
- Introduction scientometric indicators of the activity of university teachers and researchers.

The degree of influence of these official trends on films about the school and university, as reality showed, was indirect. Certainly, in a number of cinematographs, the activity of private schools was shown, on the screens (especially in the tapes of the 21st century), modern computers appeared in the classrooms, sometimes in the dialogue of films there could be talk about the Unified State Exam and plagiarism. From time to time there were film episodes related to pedagogical corruption. However, in general, films about the school and university were not concentrated on the educational process, but on the interpersonal and love relationships of the main characters.

How does the knowledge of real historical events of a particular period help to understand the given media texts, examples of historical references in these media texts?

Of course, the knowledge of historical events helps to understand post-Soviet films on the topic of school and university. For example, the analysis of the political and socio-cultural situation of the last years of the Stalinist regime allows for a better understanding of the author's concept and the plot of the drama *What a wonderful game* (1995), and the knowledge of the historical events of the 1980s-1990s gives the key to understanding the film by S. Soloviev *Tender Age*"(2000). A lot of historical references are contained in such films as *The Disappeared Empire* (2007); *Hipsters* (2008); *The Institute of Noble Maidens* (2010-2011); *Private Pioneers'* (2012); *Dolly Sheep was angry and died early* (2014), *I am a teacher* (2015), and others.

2. *Socio-cultural, ideological, ideological, religious context (dominant concepts: media agencies, media / media categories, media representations and media audience).*

Ideology, directions, goals, objectives, world outlook, the concepts of the authors of these media texts in the socio-cultural context; ideology, culture of the world, depicted in media texts.

In the post-Soviet era, communist ideology (including anti-capitalist theory of socialist realism) and atheism in Russia lost their dominant positions (although the communist faction throughout the post-Soviet years occupied dozens of seats in the State Duma), and cinematography was deprived of censorship. Therefore (especially before the entry into force in 2012 of the Federal Law No. 139-FZ "On Amending the Federal Law "On the Protection of Children from Information Harmful to their Health and Development" and certain legislative acts of the Russian Federation on the issue of restricting access to unlawful information in the Internet "and changes and amendments to Federal Law No. 53" On the State Language of the Russian Federation"(2005) – from July 1, 2014) in films on the school-student topic, one could find an abundance of sexual scenes (*Physics or Chemistry*, 2011), and obscene vocabulary (*Everyone will die, but I'll stay*, 2008). The world view of the authors of many media texts about the school and university was extremely tolerant of such factors perceived in the Soviet negatively as egoism, snobbery, greed, lies, domination based on threats, physical violence, teenage sexual relations, smoking, drinking (and in some cases – even light drugs (see, for example, the series *Physics or Chemistry*), etc. Wealth, sexual pleasure and entertainment largely determined the culture of the world depicted in Russian media texts about school and the university of the XXI century (*School number 1*, 2007; *Barvikha*, 2009; *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Teacher of Physical Education*, 2014-2017; *Philological Faculty*, 2017 and others.).

The world view of the characters of the "school world", depicted in media texts

In general, the world view of the characters of audiovisual media texts on the theme of the post-Soviet school and university was optimistic (although in many cases directed to the world of entertainment and sex), however, pessimism often arose due to feelings of loneliness, poverty, hopelessness and hopelessness of life, professional " (*Teacher in Law*, 2007; *Everyone Dies and I'll Stay*, 2008; *The Roof*, 2009; *School*, 2010; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Teacher's Day*, 2012; *Geographer Burned the Globe*, 2013; *And the balloon will return*, 2013; *Correction Class*, 2014, *I will not return*, 2014; *Clinch*, 2015; *Teacher*, 2015, *Pupil*, 2016, etc.). Among the characters (schoolchildren, students and teachers), bright personalities still stood out, but they were much less inclined to meditation and doubt, but were ready for active actions on the "love front" (*Hipsters*, 2008; *Barvikha*, 2009; *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Teachers*, 2014; *Beloved Teacher*, 2016; *Freshman*, 2016, etc.

At the same time, a small number of films were filmed on the school and university topic, which largely inherited the traditions of Soviet cinema, where the "old-fashioned" hierarchy of values dominated (diligence, honesty, willingness to help good or backsliding people): *Simple Trues* (1999-2003); *The Disappeared Empire* (2007); *The Adult Life of the Girl by Polina Subbotina* (2008), *Private Pioneers'* (2012); *The Mother's Diary of the First-grader* (2014); *Dolly Sheep was angry and died early* (2014); *Village Teacher* (2015), *Ghost* (2015); *Good Boy* (2016); *To Save Pushkin* (2017), etc.

Structure and methods of narration in these media texts (dominant concepts: media / media categories, media technologies, media languages, media representations)

Schematically structure, plot, representativeness, ethics, features of genre modification, iconography, character characters of audiovisual media texts of school and university subjects of the post-Soviet era can be represented as follows:

- *the place and time of the action of media texts*. The main place of action: classes, auditoriums, corridors, yards, apartments, private mansions; The duration of the action is mostly (if not retro) the year of filming of a particular film;

- *the environment, everyday objects typical for these media*: the furnishings and objects of everyday life of films sometimes remain, as in the Soviet times, modest, but more and more often elitist educational institutions, apartments and houses of the provided layers of society are shown (*Barvikha*, 2009; *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Closed School*, 2011-2012; *Teachers*, 2014, etc.);

- *genre modifications of school and university subjects*: comedy, drama, melodrama;

- *(stereotypical) methods of depicting reality*: positive characters rarely show up in an idealized version, and negative ones too, as a rule, are presented ambiguously, although there are relapses from times of socialist realism.

Typology of characters (character traits, clothing, physique, vocabulary, facial expressions, character gestures, the presence or absence of a stereotypical manner of representing the characters in these media texts):

- *the age of the characters*: the age of schoolchildren is in the range of 7-17 years, however, there are more frequent characters-senior pupils; the age of students is generally in the range of 18 to 25 years; the age of the remaining characters (teachers, teachers, parents, grandparents, etc.) can be any, but adults up to the age of 60 prevail;

- *level of education*: for schoolchildren and students corresponds to the class and course of study, teachers presumably graduated from universities, the formation of other characters can be of any level;

- *social status, profession*: the financial situation of students is highly differentiated, they can be both from poor families, from families of businessmen, rich officials. The professions of their parents are in a fairly diverse range.

- *the marital status of the characters*: schoolchildren, naturally, are not bound by marriage; students in general are also not in a hurry to get married; adult

characters are mostly married; but teachers, on the contrary, are lonely (the latter is increasingly becoming an occasion for plot twists connected with the loving relationships of teachers / teachers with students);

- *appearance, clothes, physique of characters, features of their characters, vocabulary*: the appearance of the characters of schoolchildren and students in the films of the post-Soviet period is beyond the strict framework. This can be a form of elite private educational institution, and free clothing.

A shot from the film *School* (2010) gives an idea of the appearance, clothes, and physique of post-Soviet schoolchildren.



School (2010)

Schoolchildren and students in the Russian films of 1992-2017, unlike similar characters of Soviet films, speak with the help of rough slang, sometimes even obscene vocabulary, although, of course, there are films where it does not exist, or almost none (for example, *Private pioneers*, 2012).

Teachers from the films of the post-Soviet era, as a rule, are no longer intellectuals; the respectful distance between them and the students is practically broken (this was especially evident in such films as *School* (2010); *Physics or Chemistry* (2011); *Geographer Burned the Globe*, 2013; *Teachers* (2014); *Clinch* (2015); *Teacher* (2015); *Beloved Teacher* (2016); *Teacher of physical education* (2014-2017); *Good Boy* (2016), etc. But now they can already afford many (free) liberties in their clothes.

A shot from the film *Physics or Chemistry* (2011) reflects the appearance, clothes, physique of the characters-educators of the post-Soviet years.



Physics or Chemistry (2011)

A significant change in the life of media characters and the problem that has arisen (a violation of the usual life):

Option number 1: among the characters, schoolchildren / students living a normal life, are those who for some reason do not fit into the standard framework of interpersonal communication and learning process, that is:

- try to dominate, subordinate students to themselves, while acting with cruel methods (*Teacher in Law*, 2007; *Barvikha*, 2009; *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011, etc.);

- stand out among other students with their eccentricity (both with a plus sign and with a minus sign) and because of what they come into conflict with the class and / or teachers (*School*, 2010; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Correction Class*, 2014; *Pupil*, 2016, etc.);

- fall in love (*Rypkina's Love*, 1993; *Let's Make love*, 2002; *The Disappeared Empire*, 2007; *School No. 1*, 2007; *Hipsters*, 2008; *Barvikha*, 2009; *Children under 16 ...* (2010); *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Private Pioneers'*, 2012; *Geographer Burned the Globe*, 2013; *Dolly the Sheep was angry and died early; 14+*, 2015; *Beloved teacher*, 2016; *Philological Faculty*, 2017, etc.);

Option number 2: among ordinary characters-teachers, there are non-ordinary – those who also do not fit into the standard school framework, that is, they try:

- to resist outdated and / or, from their point of view, incorrect methods of the director and / or teaching staff and come into conflict with him / them (*Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Teacher of Physical Education*, 2014-2017; *Village teacher*, 2015 and other);

- Establish a particularly trusting relationship with students, although sometimes it is very difficult (*Simple Truths*, 1999-2003; *Teacher in Law*, 2007; *The Adult Life of the Girl by Polina Subbotina*, 2008; *School*, 2010; *Physics or chemistry*, 2011; *Geographer Burned the globe*, 2013; *Teachers*, 2014; *Teacher of Physical Education*, 2014-2017; *Village teacher*, 2015; *Teacher*, 2015; *Beloved Teacher*, 2016; *Pupil*, 2016; *Good Boy*, 2016; *To Save Pushkin*, 2017, etc.).

Solution of the problem:

Option number 1 (student):

- "correct" characters (schoolchildren, students, teachers, teachers, parents, adult acquaintances) return individual and / or loving students to ordinary life by individual and joint efforts (*Teacher in Law*, 2007; *Teacher*, 2015, etc.);

- non-standard students remain with their beliefs, because they do not succumb to pedagogical / parental influences (*Touched*, 2005; *Everyone will die and I'll stay*, 2008; *Hipsters*, 2008; *Yulenska*, 2008; *Barvikha*, 2009; *School*, 2010; *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Correction Class*, 2014; *Pupil*, 2016, etc.);

Option number 2 (pedagogical):

- Unconventional teachers gain a victory (*Teacher in Law*, 2007; *The Adult Life of the Girl by Polina Subbotina*, 2008; *Teachers*, 2014; *Village Teacher*, 2015, etc.);

- the result of the relationship of teachers with students is ambiguous ... (*School*, 2010; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011, *Geographer Burned the Globe*, 2013; *Teacher of Physical Education*, 2014, *Teacher*, 2015; *Student*, 2016; *Good Boy*, 2016, etc.).

As for the gender aspect of the school-university theme, but like the last decades of the USSR, in the Russian cinematography among the teachers / teachers the dominant are women, increasingly single and / or uncomfortable (*School*, 2010; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Teacher*, 2015; *Pupil*, 2016; *Good Boy*, 2016, etc.).

Case study: The series Physics or Chemistry: hermeneutic analysis of media text

Ideology of authors in the socio-cultural context

The main authors of any cinematic text are directors and screenwriters. However, in the case of the Russian series on the school topic *Physics or Chemistry* (2011), they were not independent creators of media texts, since this work was a remake of the same successful Spanish series *Physics or Chemistry* (*Física o química*, 2008-2011). The spirit of tolerance and political correctness of the media culture of the European Union of the 21st century, that is, a benevolent attitude toward uninhibited behavior and sexual relations (including homosexual) between schoolchildren of 16-17 years of age, condescension to use by minors, students and teachers of light drugs, etc. A special emphasis was placed on the friendly interpretation of sexual relations between a teacher and a high school student who had reached the age of sexual consent. Let us not forget that as of August 2017 the age of sexual consent in Germany and Italy came from 14 years, in France – from 15 years, in Spain – from 16 years. However, at the time of the release of the Spanish series *Physics or Chemistry / Física o química* (2008-2011), there was still the most liberal approach in Europe to the age of sexual consent – from the age of 13 (in July 2015 it was raised to 16 years) (Age ..., 2017). In Russia, "the age of sexual consent" comes from age 16 (Age ..., 2017), but apparently wanting to avoid attacks of retrogrades, the creators of the series *Physics or Chemistry* insured: all the roles of high school students were performed by actors who in 2011 were from 21 years to 25 years.

In connection with the armed conflict in Ukraine, which began in 2014, the official Russian ideology of 2014-2017 is in many respects in conflict with the ideological vector of the European Union. However, at the time of filming (2010-2011) and the release of the television version (August-September 2011) of the Russian version of the series *Physics or Chemistry* Russia, in spite of the South Ossetian conflict with Georgia in 2008, could to some extent be considered inertial (especially with regard to the western-oriented education system) within the framework of adherence to "European values".

Market conditions that contributed to the concept, the process of creating media text

Since the early 1990s, the Russian media culture has experienced significant influences from Western standards. For example, on TV, formats such as talk shows and sitcoms have become common. A dramatic increase in the number of tangible commercials in the 21st century has caused TV producers to understandably wish to produce remakes, that is, transplant successful Western series on Russian soil, including the Spanish *Physics or Chemistry / Física o química* (2008-2011).

Structure and methods of narration in the media text

Schematically structure, plot, representativeness, ethics, features of genre modification, iconography, character characters can be represented as follows:

Historical period, the scene: Moscow 2010 - 2011.

Conditions, household items: school classes, gymnasium, library, swimming pool, corridors, director's office, city streets, living rooms. The school (and its equipment), the characters' apartments look very modern. All teachers and schoolchildren have mobile phones.

Methods of depicting the reality: ambivalent attitude in relation to almost all the characters, without a rigid division into "positive" and "negative." In the series, almost every more or less significant character has his own storyline. The visual and sound series are constructed without any creative frills, which is typical for the vast majority of serials.

Characters, their values, ideas, clothing, physique, vocabulary, facial expressions, gestures: Characters dressed in 2010-2011 fashion – bright, bold: no school uniforms and strict suits. Teachers can afford deep neckline and free hairstyles. Students – tattoos, active facial expressions, gestures and abusive vocabulary (however, never turning to obscene expressions: the series on the channel STS was in prime time). The head teacher together with another teacher smokes in the toilet. One of the teachers (though outside the school) uses light drugs and is not going to give it up. 10th grade students are also indulging in drugs: “The relations of parents and pupils in the first series are boldly presented: the mother recommends that her son carefully check the pockets of his trousers before washing, so that he does not accidentally wash the dope-grass lying there” (Sputnitskaya, 2016, p. 64). In the classroom, teachers and schoolchildren willingly discuss topics of sex, same-sex love, pedophilia, drugs, and suicide. One of the characters-schoolchildren constantly allows himself in the classroom dirty jokes and racist remarks about the Chinese classmate. Almost all the characters (adults and schoolchildren) are active users of media technology: “space for mastering the lessons of *Physics or Chemistry* – the Internet, pages in ... social networks, virtual diaries that have become a continuation of the genre of school chronicles, songbooks, exercise books” (Sputnitskaya, 2011). We remember that in one of the relatively recent French films about the school the main conflict of the plot flared up around the erotic photo of the teacher sent to the director. In the Russian TV

series *Physics or Chemistry*, the tenth-graders who mastered the media equipment send photomontages to all their teachers, where they appear in the nude, but this only causes good understanding smiles and comments from the teaching staff and has no influence on the development of the subsequent plot of the series.

A significant change in the life of the characters: each of the characters has a key change in his life (among teachers: the difficulties of professional adaptation in school, the betrayal of his wife, the fight, sexual intercourse with a minor, accusation of pedophilia, etc., in the tenth grade: a sexual relationship with the teacher, death of parents, drug overdose, suicide, racist insult, open confession in their unconventional sexual orientation, etc.).

The problem that arose: the choice of a strategy for later life, love experiences.

The search for a solution to the problem: an attempt to defend your life choices, struggle for your love.

Solving the problem: due to the fact that the series was planned to be continued, the plot lines of the characters are not fully completed, although many conflicts are being resolved (in particular, conflicts based on racism, drug addiction, intimate communication between the teacher and the tenth grade student, etc.).

Historical Context. What media text tells us about the period of its creation?

When was the premiere of this media text? How did the events of that time affect the media text? The premiere of the series *Chemistry or Physics* was held on the channel STS in August-September 2011. The film was shot shortly before the Russian-Western sanctions conflict over Ukraine (which began in 2014), when certain pro-Western tendencies were still felt at the official level (including the organization of the educational process). The strongest influence on the series *Physics or Chemistry* was the original plot of the Spanish TV series *Física o química* (2008-2011) with the same name (Cappelletto, 2017; Guarinos, 2009).

How does the media text comment on the events of the day? Does knowledge of historical events help understand the media text? How does understanding these events enrich our understanding of media text? The series *Physics or Chemistry* (perhaps due to excessive adherence to the Spanish original) is far from commenting on Russia's political and economic problems of the 21st century. There are also many hotly debated school problems here (excessive bureaucratization of the management and reporting apparatus, overload of teachers, corruption, etc.). Focused primarily on the love story lines, the series in the course of the case touches on such acute for the society (including the school) topics like teenage suicide, drug addiction, racism, sexual relations, homosexuality and homophobia.

Cultural context. How the media text reflects, strengthens, inspires, or shapes cultural attitudes, values, behavior, concerns, myths. The series *Physics or Chemistry* clearly seeks to reflect, strengthen, form the Western cultural values that are peculiar to the media culture of the countries of the European Union: free,

sometimes very free (including sexual) relations between people (including teachers and high school students), tolerance towards people of other races and sexual orientation (Ramírez Alvarado & Cobo Durán, 2013), tolerance towards extravagant behavior.

World view. What kind of world is depicted in the media text? What is the culture of this world? What do we know about the people of this world? Are the characters represented in a stereotyped manner? What does this representation tell us about the cultural stereotype of this group? The series *Physics or Chemistry* depicts a world intentionally isolated by the authors from real political and economic life, but completely immersed in the world of love and other interpersonal relations (the themes of racism, suicide, homosexuality are also touched upon). People inhabiting this world are represented in a dualistic manner: in one or another proportion, positive and negative traits are mixed in them. No one character, even the most sneaky at first glance, is not built in a stereotypically negative way, “Nevertheless, the assortment of the stories of the youth series as such have been stabilized for the time being, and the generation of new units is possible within the existing material: each story is also quite original (Has a wide range of variability, gives space for repeated creativity), and is predictable” (Sputnitskaya, 2011).

What worldview represents this world - optimistic or pessimistic? Are the characters of this media text happy? Do the characters of this media text have a chance to be happy? Are the characters able to control their own destinies? Despite numerous acute interpersonal conflicts, the world of *Physics or Chemistry* is rather optimistic. Characters want to be (each in their own way) happy, although not all of them are able to control their own destiny.

What is the hierarchy of values according to this worldview? What values can be found in the media text? What values are embodied in the characters? The main values of the characters of the film: love, tolerance, friendship. However, each of the characters interprets these values in their own interests. For example, for the tenth grade Igor (partly copied from the main negative character *Dear Elena Sergeevna* by E. Ryazanov), love and friendship are a domination linked with the joint use of drugs, the organization of sexual orgies, etc. By the way, he is also a racist! And all this does not stop the authors from being tolerant to him and from time to time make him a little bit positive.

What does it mean to have success in this world? How does a person succeed in this world? What behavior is rewarded in this in the world? In *Physics or Chemistry* we are talking about the values of material (for example, Rita's tenth grade student after the death of her parents gets a rich inheritance), but the main understanding of the characters about success is their love and other (including professional) self-realization. In this world those characters are rewarded who are not afraid to tell others about their love affairs (even if they are the liaisons of a teacher and a seventeen-year-old student), about non-traditional orientation and commitment to light drugs.

At one time, the appearance of a very modest sex scene in V. Pichul's youth drama *Little Vera* (1988) caused a storm of indignation from the cinematography and the conservative part of the audience, the film was hotly debated by professional criticism and became a real event of the year. However, in *Physics or Chemistry* (2011) neither the authorities nor the spectators were particularly shocked, although there were more bold scenes (including the orgy of high school students and homosexuality). Professional film criticism on *Physics or Chemistry* reacted sluggishly. In fact, in addition to one review in the magazine *Cinema Art* (Sputnitskaya, 2011), there were no other serious professional debates.

Thus, the tolerant "European format" of the series *Physics or Chemistry* was planted in already prepared soil, and, unlike the harsh films of Valeria Gay Germanika *Everyone Dies and I Stay* and *School* (2010), it did not become the focus of protracted media discussions. At the same time, the TV series *Physics or Chemistry* clearly and unequivocally marked the pro-Western orientation of approaches to the school theme:

- a benevolent attitude towards the relaxed behavior and sexual relations (including homosexual) between schoolchildren aged 16-17 (and even between the teacher and the student);
- leniency towards consumption by under-age students and teachers of light drugs, etc .;
- the authors' ambivalent attitude to almost all the characters, even to those who, a few years ago, would be considered negative in all canons;
- the main perceptions of the characters about success are their love and other (including professional) self-realization, and characters are rewarded in this world who are not afraid to tell others about their love relationships (even if they are the affairs of the teacher and the seventeen-year-old student), non-traditional orientation and addiction to light drugs.

In general, the series *Physics or Chemistry* became a vivid evidence of significant changes in social and media ideas about the school, schoolchildren and teachers that occurred in Russia in the 21st century.

Conclusions

Most of the films about the school and university of the post-Soviet period were based on stereotypes that largely reflected the significant changes that occurred after the collapse of the USSR and the transition of Russia to the capitalist path of development. In general, the images of teachers and students have undergone a strong transformation. For example, many characters-students of Russian school-student films of the XXI century can be characterized by the old Russian word "mob": they (almost) lack intellect, they do not have positive life perspectives and interests, and "those who are not used to picking up every day and to fall asleep in an embrace with a bottle, in this not tragic, but hopeless world there is only one. First you need to trample in a disco ... then you need to kiss in the entranceway against indecent inscriptions, then you can ride around the area on

a motor scooter, and in the finale ... Well, you know yourself. Probably not small!" (Ivanov, 2015). Another (smaller) part of the characters is the so-called "majors", the children of wealthy parents whose interests are also mostly sexually entertaining, but there is a clear life hedonistic perspective. The third group (very few) consists of aggressive individuals striving for total domination: "The class, as a community, in a state of chaos, begins to spontaneously establish its own understanding of the order, almost always reproducing the signs of archaic societies that gravitate towards" shadow "(mafia) or criminal structures. Relations are built and governed by the right of the strong. In relations between pupils, blackmail and bribery are widely used, "scapegoat" is chosen, rigid differentiation is established for the dominant and subordinate, almost permanently in a state of liminality (humiliation and deprivation of rights, lack of personal significance). Most often, power is captured by an informal leader, endowed with psychotypical signs of a charismatic, skillfully manipulating his adepts. It is such a leader that begins to confront the authority of the teacher, and between them a duel unfolds, the outcome of which is always unpredictable" (Kruglova, 2016, p.103). And, finally, the fourth group (also small) of school-student characters is the heirs of the good old Soviet cinema: smart, honest, purposeful, friendly and principled.

As for the images of educators, in recent years there has been an increasing number of lonely, beggars, lost vital signs and, by and large, interest in the profession (which has a very low social status), teachers and teachers who are not respected by students; "The authority of the teacher is extremely low and is not supported even at the level of formal adherence to the rules. The resource for managing the process of mastering knowledge appears either as exhausted or as unreliable. Teachers are not actually representatives of the authorities, they are translators of officially accepted cultural and social norms, but this function united the classical school at all stages of its history - from the beginning of the New Time to the end of the industrial society" (Kruglova, 2016, p. 103). In such a context, such degrading images of a teacher and a pedagogical university sound like "uchilka", "sludge", "prepod" in the jargon of which such words as "unsuccessful", "beggar", "absurd", "boring", "loser", "hopelessly behind the modern life".

In contrast to them, there are images of authoritarian teacher-managers who occupy the administrative chairs of the director, the head teacher, the dean, etc. And only a small group of film characters are talented and creative teachers dedicated to their work.

In the 21st century, the priority of the series in school-student subjects was clearly indicated. Of course, first of all, this was due to the fact that it was practically impossible to make money on film distribution of films about the school and university, and the television series (even artistically insignificant ones) brought substantial profits from advertising revenues. But on the other hand, the ideological factor is also important, because "ideology explains, but the series explains. Ideology leads, but the series forces, only makes it more subtle. The

ideology is abstract, the series is concrete. But the most important thing in the other: ideology acts on the mind, the series - on the heart. Therefore, the process of influence of ideology is noticeable, the process of exposure of the series is hidden. ... If the news does it directly, then the series is in a soft form. It stands between the poles of the Order and the Request. The series justifies the world, explaining the logic of even wrong actions" (Pocheptsov, 2017). Hence the triumph of the author's tolerant (as it were neutral) attitude toward meanness, aggressive psychological dominance and lies (and even easy drugs) in such series as *School*, *Golden*, *Physics or Chemistry*, etc. Thus, serial versions of school-student reality, in our opinion, to some extent affect the reality of this.

So, the analysis of Russian films of 1992-2017 on the school-university theme shows that:

- the educational / educational process left in the past the Soviet framework of communist orientations and anti-religious orientation;
- the number of entertaining interpretations has sharply increased;
- the stories are not directly related to key international political events, although they are to some extent dependent on domestic political attitudes;
- the main conflicts are built on the confrontation of extraordinary teachers and students with stagnation, bureaucracy, the grayness of the bosses / colleagues / team; very often the focus is on problem areas (crisis, disappointment and fatigue, professional "burnout" of teachers, bureaucracy, corruption, pragmatic cynicism of students, teenage cruelty, etc.);
- among the characters distinctly manifested property differentiation;
- the pupil characters are basically divided into the following categories: optimistic and vital perspectives (often associated with material status and hedonism), or in a state of depression and hopelessness;
- activity of students is more directed towards entertainment, sex and material gain;
- the attitude of teachers and students has lost the barriers of subordination, largely because the prestige of the pedagogical profession in the eyes of students and the public continued to fall;
- in the pedagogical collectives, the images of female teachers, often lonely and unsettled, still come to the fore;
- the appearance of students and teachers has become even more "free", vividly denoting female sex appeal;
- film stories about students, in contrast to a number of Soviet counterparts, are virtually devoid of intellectual disputes, but are densely immersed in the genre element of melodrama and / or comedy; and in general, the theme of love in the cinema on the school-university theme is for the most part given accented comedic and / or melodramatic aspect.

List of Soviet and Russian film on school and university topics

(compiled by A. Fedorov)

Children and young people appeared as characters in hundreds of Soviet and Russian films. This list includes not films with the characters-children / schoolchildren / students, but those films where the prominent position is occupied by the school and university topic. Exceptions are made mainly for some films significant for the theme of education of the younger generation (for example, the action of which occurs in summer camps for schoolchildren).

Soviet films

1919-1930

1924

Ванька – юный пионер. СССР, 1924. Режиссер и сценарист Пётр Малахов. Актеры: Шура Константинов, Урсула Круг, Алексей Массеев и др. Драма.

Остров юных пионеров. СССР, 1924. Режиссер Алексей Ган. Сценарист и исполнитель главной роли Владимир Веревкин. Агитфильм.

1925

Федькина правда. СССР, 1925. Режиссер Ольга Преображенская. Сценаристы: Николай Асеев, Александр Перегуда. Актеры: Юрий Зимин, Марик Майя, Даниил Введенский, Елена Дейнеко и др. Драма.

1928

Золотой мед. СССР, 1928. Режиссеры: Николай Береснев, Владимир Петров. Сценарист Николай Береснев. Актеры: Федор Богданов, Пётр Кузнецов, Фатима Гилязова и др. Драма.

Маленькие и большие. СССР, 1928. Режиссер Дмитрий Бассальго. Сценаристы: Дмитрий Бассальго, Александр Филимонов. Актеры: Ольга Третьякова, Иван Капралов, Сергей Минин и др. Драма.

Оторванные рукава. СССР, 1928. Режиссер Б. Юрцев. Сценаристы: Иван Пырьев, Борис Юрцев. Актеры: Александр Жуков, Лебедев, Серпуховитин, Александр Сафронов и др. Драма.

1929

Танька-трактирщица. СССР, 1929. Режиссер Борис Светозаров. Сценаристы: Борис Светозаров, Константин Минаев. Актеры: Неонила Иванова-Толмачёва, Кузьма Ястребецкий, Любовь Ненашева и др. Драма.

Человек с портфелем. СССР, 1929. Режиссер Чеслав Сабинский. Сценарист А. Кириллов (автор пьесы – А. Файко). Актеры: Николай Монахов, Ирина Володко, Коля Симонович и др. Драма.

1930

Право на женщину / Студентка. СССР, 1930. Режиссер Алексей Каплер. Сценаристы: Алексей Каплер, Николай Бажан. Актеры: Татьяна Златогорова, Владимир Сокирко, Иван Скуратов, Таня Мухина и др. Драма.

Право отцов. СССР, 1930. Режиссер Вера Строева. Сценаристы: Вера Строева, Станислав Уэйтинг-Радзинский, Серафима Рошаль. Актеры: И. Трердохлеб, Г. Ростов и др. Драма.

1931-1955

1931

Одна. СССР, 1931. Режиссеры и сценаристы Григорий Козинцев и Леонид Трауберг. Актеры: Елена Кузьмина, Пётр Соболевский, Сергей Герасимов, Мария Бабанова, Янина Жеймо, Борис Чирков и др. Драма.

Путевка в жизнь. СССР, 1931. Режиссер Николай Экк. Сценаристы: Александр Столпер, Николай Экк, Регина Янушкевич. Актеры: Йыван Кырля, Михаил Джагофаров, Александр Новиков, Николай Баталов, Мария Антропова, Михаил Жаров и др. Драма.

Человек без футляра. СССР, 1931. Режиссер Вера Строева. Сценаристы: Серафима Рошаль, Вера Строева. Актеры: Борис Фердинандов, Михаил Викторов, Николай Надемский и др. Драма.

1932

Поздравляю с переходом. СССР, 1932. Режиссер и сценарист Евгения Григорович. Актеры: С. Пельтик, Т. Зайченко, Иван Твердохлеб и др. Драма.

Сенька с "Мимозы". СССР, 1932. Режиссер Алексей Маслоков. Сценаристы: Николай Сказбуш, Алексей Маслоков. Актеры: Витя Фридрих, Борис Безгин, Николай Надемский. Драма.

1933

Отчаянный батальон. СССР, 1933. Режиссеры и сценаристы: Абрам Народицкий, Наум Угрюмов. Актеры: Геннадий Мичурин, Роза Свердлова и др. Драма.

1934

Разбудите Леночку. СССР, 1934. Режиссер Антонина Кудрявцева. Сценаристы: Николай Олейников, Евгений Шварц. Актеры: Янина Жеймо, Сергей Герасимов и др. Комедия.

1935

Конduit. СССР, 1935. Режиссер Борис Шелонцев. Сценаристы: Лев Кассиль, Лазарь Юдин (автор повести "Конduit и Швамбрания" – Л. Кассиль). Актеры: А. Кобзев, Е. Борисевич, Владимир Гардин и др. Драма.

1936

Настоящий товарищ. СССР, 1936. Режиссеры: Лазарь Бодик, Абрам Окунчиков. Сценарист Агния Барто. Актеры: Михаил Тарханов, Степан Шагайда, Дмитрий Голубинский и др. Драма.

1937

Буйная ватага. СССР, 1937. Режиссеры: Александр Попов, Гамар Саламзаде. Сценарист Юрий Фидлер. Актеры: А. Варганова, Муртаза Ахмедов, А. Багирова и др. Комедия.

1938

Семиклассники. СССР, 1938. Режиссеры: Яков Протазанов, Григорий Левкоев. Сценаристы: Наум Кауфман, В. Любимова. Актеры: Юра Митаев, Александр Зражевский, Анна Запорожец, Николай Гладков и др. Драма.

1939

Личное дело. СССР, 1939. Режиссер Александр Разумный. Сценаристы: Аркадий Гайдар, В. Поташев. Актеры: Лора Минаев, Петя Гроховский, Борис Рунге, Лев Мирский и др. Драма.

Учитель. СССР, 1939. Режиссер и сценарист Сергей Герасимов. Актеры: Борис Чирков, Тамара Макарова, Павел Волков и др. Драма.

Человек в футляре. СССР, 1939. Режиссер и сценарист Исидор Анненский. Актеры: Николай Хмелев, Михаил Жаров, Ольга Андровская, Владимир Гардин, Фаина Раневская, Алексей Грибов и др. Драма.

1940

Брат героя. СССР, 1940. Режиссер Юрий Васильчиков. Сценарист Лев Кассиль (автор «Черемыш — брат героя» - Л. Кассиль). Актеры: Николай Крючков, Петр Леонтьев, Елизавета Найденова и др. Драма.

Весенний поток. СССР, 1940. Режиссёр Владимир Юренев. Актеры: Александр Зражевский, Михаил Астангов, Валентина Серова и др. Драма.

Закон жизни. СССР, 1940. Режиссеры: Александр Столпер, Борис Иванов. Сценарист Александр Авдеенко. Актеры: Даниил Сагал, Александр Лукьянов, Освальд Глазунов, Нина Зорская и др. Драма.

Друзья. СССР, 1940. Режиссер Михаил Гавронский. Сценарист Николай Таубе. Актеры: Михаил Кузнецов, Тамара Алёшина, Владимир Гардин, Василий Меркурьев, Константин Сорокин, и др. Драма.

Тимур и его команда. СССР, 1940. Режиссер Александр Разумный. Сценарист Аркадий Гайдар. Актеры: Ливий Щипачёв, Пётр Савин, Лев Потёмкин, Виктор Селезнёв, Петя Гроховский и др. Драма.

1941

Романтики. СССР, 1941. Режиссер Марк Донской. Сценаристы: Тихон Семушкин, Федор Кнорре. Актеры: Даниил Сагал, Дарига Тналина, Ирина Федотова, Владимир Владиславский, Лев Свердлин и др. Драма.

1947

Сельская учительница. СССР, 1947. Режиссер Марк Донской. Сценарист Мария Смирнова. Актеры: Вера Марецкая, Даниил Сагал, Павел Оленев, Владимир Марута, Владимир Белокуров и др. Драма.

1948

Красный галстук. СССР, 1948. Режиссеры: Владимир Сухобоков, Мария Сауц. Сценарист и автор одноименной пьесы Сергей Михалков. Актеры: Александр Соколов, Ирина Начинкина, Слава Котов, Анатолий Ганичев, Александр Хвыля и др. Драма.

Первоклассница. СССР, 1948. Режиссер Илья Фрэнз. Сценарист Евгений Шварц. Актеры: Наталья Защипина, Тамара Макарова, Кира Головки и др. Драма.

1952

Навстречу жизни. СССР, 1952. Режиссер Николай Лебедев. Сценарист Екатерина Виноградская (автор повести «Звездочка» - Иван Василенко). Актеры: Надежда Румянцева, Владимир Соколов, Георгий Семёнов, Василий Меркурьев, Сергей Гурзо, Виктор Хохряков, Анатолий Кузнецов и др. Драма.

1953

Алеша Птицын вырабатывает характер. СССР, 1953. Режиссер Анатолий Граник. Сценарист Агния Барто. Актеры: Виктор Каргопольцев, Ольга Пыжова, Валентина Сперантова, Наталья Селезнёва, Надежда Румянцева и др. Комедия.

Честь товарища. СССР, 1953. Режиссер Николай Лебедев. Сценаристы: Борис Изюмский, Леонид Жежеленко (автор повести «Алые погоны» - Б. Изюмский). Актеры: Константин Скоробогатов, Борис Коковкин, Геннадий Мичурин, Владимир Дружников, Юрий Толубеев и др. Драма.

1954

Аттестат зрелости. СССР, 1954. Режиссер Татьяна Лукашевич. Сценарист и автор одноименной повести Лия Гераскина. Актеры: Василий Лановой, Вадим Грачёв, Галина Ляпина, Тамара Кирсанова и др. Драма.

Два друга. СССР, 1954. Режиссер Виктор Эйсымонт. Сценарист Николай Носов (автор повести «Витя Малеев в школе и дома» - Н. Носов). Актеры: Леонид Крауклис, Владимир Гуськов, Миша Аронов, Витя Белов, Янина Жеймо и др. Драматическая комедия.

Сёстры Рахмановы. СССР, 1954. Режиссер Камил Ярматов. Сценарист Владимир Швейцер. Актеры: Сара Ишантураева, Яйра Абдулаева, Юлдуз Ризаева и др. Драма.

1955

Васек Трубачев и его товарищи. СССР, 1955. Режиссеры: Илья Фрэнз, Эдуард Бочаров.

Сценаристы: Валентина Осеева-Хмелева, Борис Старшев (автор повести - В. Осеева). Актеры: Олег Вишнев, Саша Чудаков, Вова Семенович, Слава Девкин, Жора Александров, Наталья Рычагова, Леонид Харитонов, Иван Пельтцер, Юрий Медведев, Пётр Алейников и др. Драма.

Два капитана. СССР, 1955. Режиссер Владимир Венгеров. Сценаристы: Вениамин Каверин, Евгений Габрилович (автор одноименного романа – В. Каверин). Актеры: Александр Михайлов, Ольга Заботкина, Анатолий Адоскин, Евгений Лебедев, Борис Беляев и др. Драма.

Педагогическая поэма. СССР, 1955. Режиссеры: Мечислава Маевская, Алексей Маслюков. Сценаристы: Иосиф Маневич, Алексей Маслюков (автор одноименного романа – Антон Макаренко). Актеры: Владимир Емельянов, Михаил Покотило, Елена Лицканович, Нина Крачковская, Константин Михайлов, Павел Кадочников, Георгий Юматов, Юрий Саранцев, Юлиан Панич и др. Драма.

Сын. СССР, 1955. Режиссер Юрий Озеров. Сценарист Татьяна Сытина. Актеры: Леонид Харитонов, Пётр Константинов, Варвара Каргашёва, Виктор Гераскин, Надежда Румянцева, Константин Сорокин, Алексей Грибов, Владимир Белокуров, Роза Макагонова и др. Драма.

1956-1968

1956

Весна на заречной улице. СССР, 1956. Режиссеры: Феликс Миронер, Марлен Хуциев. Сценарист Феликс Миронер. Актеры: Нина Иванова, Николай Рыбников, Владимир Гуляев, Валентина Пугачёва, Геннадий Юхтин и др. Мелодрама.

Разные судьбы. СССР, 1956. Режиссер Леонид Луков. Сценаристы: Леонид Луков, Яков Смоляк. Актеры: Татьяна Пилецкая, Юлиан Панич, Лев Свердлин, Ольга Жизнева, Татьяна Коннохова, Георгий Юматов, Ада Войчик, Владимир Дорофеев, Сергей Блинников, Валентина Ушакова, Константин Сорокин, Всеволод Санаев, Бруно Фрейндлих и др. Драма.

1957

Они встретились в пути. СССР, 1957. Режиссер Татьяна Лукашевич. Сценарист Леонид Пантелеев. Актеры: Виктор Авдюшко, Роза Макагонова, Николай Комиссаров, Миша Меркулов, Нина Дорошина, Пётр Щербаков, Вера Васильева и др. Мелодрама.

Повесть о первой любви. СССР, 1957. Режиссер Василий Левин. Сценарист Мария Смирнова (автор повести Н. Атаров). Актеры: Джемма Осмоловская, Кирилл Столяров, Владимир Земляникин, Сергей Столяров и др. Мелодрама.

1958

Город зажигает огни. СССР, 1958. Режиссер и сценарист Владимир Венгеров. Актеры: Николай Погодин, Елена Добронравова, Олег Борисов, Лилиана Алешникова, Юрий Любимов, Алиса Фрейндлих и др. Драма.

Сверстницы. СССР, 1958. Режиссер Василий Ордынский. Сценарист Алла Белякова. Актеры: Лидия Федосеева-Шукшина, Людмила Крылова, Маргарита Кошелева, Владимир Костин, Всеволод Сафонов, Кирилл Столяров и др. Драма.

Флаги на башнях. СССР, 1958. Режиссер Абрам Народицкий. Сценарист Иосиф Маневич. Актеры: Владимир Емельянов, Владимир Судьин, Константин Доронин, Илья Милютенко, Роза Макагонова, Ада Роговцева и др. Драма.

1959

Мальчики. СССР, 1959. Режиссер Суламифь Цыбульник. Сценаристы: Анна Лисянская, Дора Вольперт. Актеры: Лёня Бабич, Николай Чурсин, Саша Карпов, Лидия Сухаревская и др. Драма.

На пороге жизни. СССР, 1959. Режиссер Константин Пипинашвили. Сценарист Юрий Кротков. Актеры: Лейла Абашидзе, Отар Хатиашвили, Гоча Абашидзе и др. Драма.

Это было весной. СССР, 1959. Режиссеры: Артур Войтецкий, Карл Гаккель. Актеры: Людмила Бутенина, Лев Жуков и др. Драма.

До будущей весны. СССР, 1960. Режиссер Виктор Соколов. Сценарист Сергей Воронин. Актеры: Людмила Марченко, Иннокентий Смоктуновский, Валентин Архипенко и др. Мелодрама.

1960

Тучи над Борском. СССР, 1960. Режиссер Василий Ордынский. Сценаристы: Семён Лунгин, Илья Нусинов. Актеры: Инна Гулая, Роман Хомятов, Владимир Ивашов, Наталья Антонова, Виктор Рождественский, Инна Чурикова и др. Драма.

Чудотворная. СССР, 1960. Режиссер Владимир Скуйбин. Сценарист Владимир Тендряков. Актеры: Владимир Васильев, Нина Меньшикова, Антонина Павлычева, Клавдия Половикова, Владимир Покровский, Иван Рыжов, Станислав Чекан и др. Драма.

1961

А если это любовь? СССР, 1961. Режиссер Юлий Райзман. Сценаристы: Иосиф Ольшанский, Юлий Райзман, Нина Руднева. Актеры: Жанна Прохоренко, Игорь Пушкарёв, Александра Назарова, Нина Шорина и др. Драма.

Друг мой, Колька! СССР, 1961. Режиссеры: Александр Митта, Алексей Салтыков. Сценаристы: Сергей Ермолинский, Александр Хмелик (автор одноименной пьесы – А. Хмелик). Актеры: Александр Кобозев, Анна Родионова, Анатолий Кузнецов, Савелий Крамаров, Борис Новиков и др. Драма.

Мишка, Серега и я. СССР, 1961. Режиссер Георгий Победоносцев. Сценаристы: Ниссон Зелеранский, Борис Ларин. Актеры: Юрий Цветов, Виктор Семёнов, Валерий Рыжаков, Василий Шукшин, Владимир Гусев и др. Драма.

1962

Грешный ангел. СССР, 1962. Режиссер Геннадий Казанский. Сценарист Михаил Берестинский. Актеры: Ольга Красина, Николай Волков (ст.), Нина Веселовская, Геннадий Фролов, Юрий Медведев, Борис Чирков, Галина Волчек и др. Драма.

Бей, барабан! СССР, 1962. Режиссер Алексей Салтыков. Сценаристы: Сергей Ермолинский, Александр Хмелик. Актеры: Алексей Крыченков, Люся Слепнева, Александр Демьяненко, Савелий Крамаров, Татьяна Конюхова и др. Драма.

Дикая собака Динго. СССР, 1962. Режиссер Юлий Карасик. Сценарист Анатолий Гребнев (автор одноименной повести – Р. Фраерман). Актеры: Галина Польских, Владимир Особик, Талас Умуразаков, Анна Родионова и др. Драма.

Маленькие мечтатели. СССР, 1962. Режиссеры: Олег Гречихо, Виктор Туров, Арсений Ястребов. Сценаристы: Елена Каплинская, Валентин Морозов, Нелли Морозова, Лилия Неменова, Геннадий Шпаликов. Актеры: Борис Битюков, Георгий Жжёнов, Ира Кривошанова и др. Драма.

Мы вас любим. СССР, 1962. Режиссер Эдуард Бочаров. Сценарист Сергей Михалков. Актеры: Александр Барсов, Вова Фурманкевич, Алеша Абрамов и др. Драма.

Приходите завтра. СССР, 1962. Режиссер и сценарист Евгений Ташков. Актеры: Екатерина Савинова, Анатолий Папанов, Юрий Горобец, Антонина Максимова, Надежда Животова, Александр Ширвиндт, Юрий Белов, Борис Бибииков и др. Комедия.

1963

Большие и маленькие. СССР, 1963. Режиссер Мария Фёдорова. Сценарист Иосиф Маневич. Актеры: Олеся Иванова, Василий Горчаков, Нина Меньшикова, Николай Бармин, Лев Свердлин, Любовь Виротайнен, Василий Ливанов и др. Драма.

Маленькие рыцари. СССР, 1963. Режиссеры: Нинель Ненова-Цулая, Гено Цулая. Сценарист: Эдишер Кипиани. Актеры: Додо Чоговадзе, Дато Гиоргадзе, Нино Натадзе и др. Драма.

Меня зовут Кожа. СССР, 1963. Режиссер Абдулла Карсакбаев. Сценарист Ниссон Зелеранский. Актеры: Нурлан Сегизбаев, М. Кокенов, Гульнар Курабаева и др. Комедия.

Случай в Даш-Кале. СССР, 1963. Режиссер Меред Атаханов. Сценаристы: Морис Симашко, Николай Фигуровский. Актеры: Кулдук Ходжаев, Дурды Сапаров, Аннагуль Аннакулиева и др. Драма.

Трудные дети. СССР, 1963. Режиссер Всеволод Цветков. Сценарист Юрий Сотник. Актеры: Александр Кекиш, Гена Бирюков, Татьяна Пельтцер и др. Комедия.

Улица Ньютона, дом 1. СССР, 1963. Режиссер Теодор Вульфович. Сценаристы: Теодор Вульфович, Эдвард Радзинский. Актеры: Юрий Ильенко, Лариса Кадочникова, Евгений Фридман, Евгений Агафонов и др. Драма.

1964

Добро пожаловать, или Посторонним вход воспрещен! СССР, 1964. Режиссер Элем Климов. Сценаристы: Семён Лунгин, Илья Нусинов. Актеры: Евгений Евстигнеев, Арина Алейникова, Илья Рутберг, Лидия Смирнова, Алексей Смирнов, Виктор Косых и др. Комедия.

1965

Внимание граждан и организаций. СССР, 1965. Режиссер Артур Войтецкий. Сценарист Олег Прокопенко. Актеры: Виталий Беляков, Антоша Сочивко, Юрий Леонидов и др. Драма.

Звонят, откройте дверь. СССР, 1965. Режиссер Александр Митта. Сценарист Александр Володин. Актеры: Елена Проклова, Ролан Быков, Владимир Белокуров, Сергей Никоненко, Ольга Семёнова, Виктор Косых и др. Драма.

Мимо окон идут поезда. СССР, 1965. Режиссеры: Эдуард Гаврилов, Валерий Кремнев. Сценаристы: Любовь Кабо, Александр Хмелик. Актеры: Лев Круглый, Мария Стерникова, Элла Некрасова и др. Драма.

Наваждение. СССР, 1965 (новелла из фильма «Операция «Ы»). Режиссер Леонид Гайдай. Сценаристы: Яков Костюковский, Морис Слободской, Леонид Гайдай. Актеры: Александр Демьяненко, Наталья Селезнёва, Виктор Павлов и др. Комедия.

Первая Бастилия. СССР, 1965. Режиссер Михаил Ершов. Сценарист Юрий Яковлев. Актеры: Валерий Головненков, Елизавета Солодова, Евгений Матвеев и др. Драма.

1966

Первый учитель. СССР, 1966. Режиссер Андрей Кончаловский. Сценаристы: Чингиз Айтматов, Борис Добродеев, Андрей Кончаловский (автор одноименной повести – Ч. Айтматов). Актеры: Болот Бейшеналиев, Наталья Аринбасарова, Д. Куюкова, И. Ногайбаев и др. Драма.

Республика ШКИД. СССР, 1966. Режиссер Геннадий Полока. Сценарист Леонид Пантелеев. Актеры: Сергей Юрский, Юлия Бурыйгина, Павел Луспекаев, Александр Мельников, Анатолий Столбов и др. Драматическая комедия.

Тени старого замка. СССР, 1966. Режиссер Мария Муат. Актеры: Л. Губанов, В. Муравьев, М. Болдуман, Ю. Пузырев, Ю. Лученко и др. Детектив.

Три с половиной дня из жизни Ивана Семёнова, второклассника и второгодника. СССР, 1966. Режиссер Константин Березовский. Сценарист Лев Давыдычев. Актеры: Владимир Воробей, Елена Калашникова, Борис Ихлов и др. Комедия.

1967

Личная жизнь Кузьева Валентина. СССР, 1967. Режиссеры: Илья Авербах, Игорь Масленников. Сценарист Наталья Рязанцева. Актеры: Виктор Ильичёв, Тамара Коновалова, Инна Сергеева и др. Драма.

Я вас любил... СССР, 1967. Режиссер Илья Фрз. Сценарист Михаил Львовский. Актеры: Виктор Перевалов, Виолетта Хуснулова, Виталий Ованесов, Лора Умарова, Валерий Рыжаков, Евгений Весник, Наталья Селезнёва и др. Комедийная мелодрама.

1968

Гольфстрим. СССР, 1968. Режиссер Владимир Довгань. Сценарист Олег Прокопенко. Актеры: Николай Бурляев, Валентин Марченко, Елена Легурова, Георгий Вицин и др. Драма.

Доживем до понедельника. СССР, 1968. Режиссер Станислав Ростоцкий. Сценарист Георгий Полонский. Актеры: Вячеслав Тихонов, Ирина Печерникова, Нина Меншикова, Михаил Зимин, Ольга Жизнева, Ольга Остроумова, Игорь Старыгин, Юрий Чернов, Любовь Соколова и др. Драма.

Когда я был маленьким. СССР, 1968. Режиссер Альгирдас Араминас. Сценаристы Альгирдас Араминас, Ицхокас Мерас. Актеры: Линас Крищонас, Юлия Кавалюскайте, Элена Ремишаускаене и др. Мелодрама.

Мужской разговор. СССР, 1968. Режиссер Игорь Шатров. Сценаристы: Валентин Ежов, Вадим Фролов (автор повести «Что к чему» - В. Фролов). Актеры: Николай Яхонтов, Александр Кавалеров, Василий Шукшин, Нинель Мышкова, Леонид Куравлёв и др. Драма.

Переходный возраст. СССР, 1968. Режиссер Ричард Викторов. Сценарист Александр Хмелик. Актеры: Елена Проклова, Сережа Makeев, Виталий Сегеда, Александр Барский, Лена Беспалова, Игорь Ледогоров и др. Драма.

Урок литературы. СССР, 1968. Режиссер Алексей Коренев. Сценарист Виктория Токарева (автор рассказа «День без вранья» - В. Токарева). Актеры: Евгений Стеблов, Леонид Куравлёв, Инна Макарова, Валентина Малявина, Евгений Леонов, Лариса Пашкова, Любовь Добржанская, Готтлиб Ронинсон, Виктория Фёдорова, Николай Парфёнов и др. Комедия.

1969-1985

1969

Завтра, третьего апреля... СССР, 1969. Режиссер Игорь Масленников. Сценарист Владимир Валуцкий. Актеры: Слава Горошенков, Наталья Данилова, Женя Малянцев, Лариса Малеванная, Александр Демьяненко, Виктор Ильичёв, Павел Луспекаев, Константин Райкин и др. Комедия.

Мальчишки. СССР, 1969. Режиссеры: Леонид Макарычев, Аян Шахмалиева. Актеры: Андрей Констатинов, Виктор Жуков, Майя Булгакова и др. Драма.

Я помню тебя, учитель. СССР, 1969. Режиссер Гасан Сеидбейли. Сценарист Максуд Ибрагимбеков. Актеры: Сулейман Алескеров, Насиба Зейналова, Шафига Мамедова и др. Драма.

1970

Внимание, черепаха! СССР, 1970. Режиссер Ролан Быков. Сценаристы: Семён Лунгин, Илья Нусинов. Актеры: Галина Буданова, Алексей Ершов, Андрей Самотолкин, Михаил Мартиросян, Алексей Баталов, Ирина Азер и др. Драма.

Волшебная сила. СССР, 1970. Режиссер Наум Бирман. Сценарист Виктор Драгунский. Актеры: Людмила Сенчина, Николай Трофимов, Костя Цепкаев, Людмила Васютинская, Игорь Богданов, Нина Ургант, Татьяна Доронина, Аркадий Райкин и др. Комедия.

Золотые часы. СССР, 1970. Режиссер Марк Толмачёв. Сценарист Леонид Пантелеев. Актеры: Андрей Никонов, Олег Шорин, Виктор Глазырин, Алексей Смирнов, Савелий Крамаров и др. Драма.

Переступи порог. СССР, 1970. Режиссер Ричард Викторов. Сценарист Анатолий Гребнев. Актеры: Евгений Карельских, Ирина Короткова, Константин Кошкин, Наталья Рычагова, Михаил Любезнов и др. Драма.

Тайна железной двери. СССР, 1970. Режиссер Михаил Юзовский. Сценарист Александр Рейжевский (автор повести «Шел по городу волшебник» Ю.Томин). Актеры: Эвальдас Микалюнас, Андрей Харыбин, Алиса Фрейдлих, Олег Табаков, Савелий Крамаров и др. Фантастическая комедия.

1971

Маленькая исповедь. СССР, 1971. Режиссер Альгирдас Араминас. Сценаристы: Альгирдас Араминас, Ицхокас Мерас (автор повести «Арберон» В. Бубнис). Актеры: Андриус Карка, Рута Сталилюнайте, Гедиминас Карка и др. Драма.

Ох, уж эта Настя. СССР, 1971. Режиссер Юрий Победоносцев. Сценарист Валентина Спирина. Актеры: Ира Волкова, Таня Невская, Сергей Кусков, Наталья Гвоздикова, Нина Архипова и др. Комедия.

«Тигры» на льду. СССР, 1971. Режиссеры: Валентин Козачков, Альберт Осипов. Сценаристы: Виктор Мережко, Николай Горбунов. Актеры: Юлия Корнева, Витя Снорков, Дима Сосновский, Саша Кривенко, Наталья Фатева, Владимир Грамматиков и др. Драма.

1972

Береги друга. СССР, 1972. Режиссеры: Мухтар Ага-Мирзаев, Исан Каримов. Сценаристы: Владимир Барабаш, Ярослав Филиппов. Драма.

Большая перемена. СССР, 1972. Режиссер Алексей Коренев. Сценаристы: Алексей Коренев, Георгий Садовников. Актеры: Михаил Кононов, Евгений Леонов, Ролан Быков, Александр Збруев, Светлана Крючкова, Юрий Кузьменков, Савелий Крамаров, Наталия Богунова, Наталья Гвоздиков, Виктор Проскурин, Валерий Носик, Нина Маслова, Ирина Азер, Людмила Касаткина, Валентина Талызина, Михаил Яншин, Лев Дуров, Люсьена Овчинникова и др. Комедия.

Очкарик. СССР, 1972. Режиссёр Альгимантас Видугирис. В ролях: Кубанычбек Алыбаев, Бермета Маликова, Олег Каркавцев и др. Драма.

Перевод с английского. СССР, 1972. Режиссер Инесса Селезнёва. Сценаристы: Георгий Полонский, Наталья Долинина. Актеры: Майя Булгакова, Георгий Тараторкин, Андрей Тенета, Армен Джигарханян, Валентина Талызина и др. Драма.

Точка, точка, запятая... СССР, 1972. Режиссер Александр Митта. Сценаристы: Михаил Львовский, Александр Митта. Актеры: Сергей Данченко, Миша Козловский, Юрий Никулин, Евгений Герасимов, Владимир Заманский, Жанна Прохоренко и др. Комедия.

Учитель пения. СССР, 1972. Режиссер Наум Бирман. Сценарист Эмиль Брагинский. Актеры: Андрей Попов, Людмила Иванова, Ирина Алфёрова, Константин Кошкин, Евгений Евстигнеев, Людмила Аринина, Александр Демьяненко, Георгий Штиль и др. Комедия.

Чудак из пятого "Б". СССР, 1972. Режиссер Илья Фрэнк. Сценарист Владимир Железников. Актеры: Андрей Войновский, Роза Агишева, Татьяна Пельтцер, Нина Корниенко, Николай Мерзликин, Евгений Весник и др. Комедия.

Юлька. СССР, 1972. Режиссер Константин Жук. Сценарист Евгения Рудых. Актеры: Ирина Варлей, Виктор Царьков, Сергей Проханов и др. Драма.

1973

Весёлые истории. СССР, 1973. Режиссеры: Альгимантас Кундялис, Гитис Лукшас, Стасис Мотеюнас. Сценарист и автор рассказов Николай Носов. Актеры: Дайва Дауэтите, Алёша Денисов, Артурас Правилонис и др. Комедия.

Каждый вечер после работы. СССР, 1973. Режиссер Константин Ершов. Сценаристы: Константин Ершов, Олег Прокопенко (автор повести «Елена Николаевна» М. Глушко). Актеры: Зинаида Славина, Александр Граве, Ирина Бунина, Николай Гринько и др. Драма.

Капля в море. СССР, 1973. Режиссер и сценарист Яков Сегель. Актеры: Саша Масленников, Валентина Телегина, Лилиана Алешникова, Арина Алейникова, Зоя Фёдорова и др. Комедия.

Пожар во флигеле, или подвиг во льдах. СССР, 1973. Режиссер Евгений Татарский. Сценарист Валерий Попов (автор рассказов – В. Драгунский). Актеры: Саша Михайлов, Саша Хмельницкий, Олег Даль и др. Комедия.

Разные люди. СССР, 1973. Режиссер: Геннадий Павлов. Сценарист Наталья Долинина. Актеры: Владимир Иванов, Виталий Ованесов, Алла Богина, Александр Бордуков, Геннадий Сайфулин, Ирина Муравьёва, Борис Чирков, Наталья Сайко и др. Драма.

1974

Валькины паруса. СССР, 1974. Режиссер Николай Жуков. Сценарист Валентина Спирина. Актеры: Андрей Цепкало, Феликс Смирнов, Гера Котовский и др. Драма.

Весенние перевертыши. СССР, 1974. Режиссер Григорий Аронов. Сценарист и автор одноименной повести Владимир Тендряков. Актеры: Роман Мадянов, Лариса Малеванная, Николай Пеньков, Лев Дуров, Николай Гринько и др. Драма.

Земные и небесные приключения. СССР, 1974. Режиссер Игорь Ветров. Сценарист Юрий Пархоменко. Актеры: Анатолий Матешко, Елена Плюйко, Валерий Провоторов, Елизавета Дедова, Михаил Глузский, Лаймонас Норейка, Глеб Стриженов и др. Драма.

Кыш и два портфеля. СССР, 1974. Режиссер Эдуард Гаврилов. Сценарист Юз (Иосиф) Алешковский. Актеры: Андрей Кондратьев, Катя Кузнецова, Леонид Куравлёв, Лариса Лузина, Владимир Заманский, Людмила Гладунко и др. Комедия.

Лжинка, или Маленькая ложь и большие неприятности. СССР, 1974. Режиссер: Алла Сурикова. Актеры: Володя Пустовит, Зорий Коваль, Маргарита Кошелева и др. Мюзикл.

Не болит голова у дятла. СССР, 1974. Режиссер Динара Асанова. Сценарист Юрий Клепиков. Актеры: Александр Жезляев, Елена Цыплакова, Александр Богданов, Ира Обольская, Екатерина Васильева, Николай Гринько и др. Драма.

Такие высокие горы. СССР, 1974. Режиссер Юлия Солнцева. Сценарист Валентина Никиткина. Актеры: Сергей Бондарчук, Константин Смирнов, Ирина Скобцева и др. Драма.

1975

Дневник директора школы. СССР, 1975. Режиссер Борис Фрумин. Сценарист Анатолий Гребнев. Актеры: Олег Борисов, Ия Саввина, Алла Покровская, Людмила Гурченко, Елена Соловей, Георгий Тейх, Николай Лавров, Юрий Визбор, Виктор Павлов и др. Драма.

Любовь с первого взгляда. СССР, 1975. Режиссер Резо Эсадзе. Сценарист Эдуард Тополь. Актеры: Вахтанг Панчулидзе, Наталья Юризицкая, Рамаз Чхиквадзе и др. Комедия.

Меняю собаку на паровоз. СССР, 1975. Режиссер Никита Хубов. Сценаристы: Сергей Михалков, Никита Хубов. Актеры: Дмитрий Шевелев, Татьяна Лаврова, Виктор Сергачёв, Дмитрий Ажнин, Павел Панков, Олег Табаков и др. Комедия.

Порясающий Берендеев. СССР, 1975. Режиссер Игорь Вознесенский. Сценарист Владимир Потоцкий. Актеры: Сергей Образов, Андрей Харыбин, Евгений Евстигнеев, Лилия Журкина, Борис Иванов, Леонид Каневский, Лев Дуров, Алексей Смирнов и др. Комедия.

Сто дней после детства. СССР, 1975. Режиссер Сергей Соловьев. Сценаристы: Александр Александров, Сергей Соловьев. Актеры: Борис Токарев, Татьяна Друбич, Ирина Малышева, Юрий Агилин, Нина Миньшикова, Сергей Шакуров, Арина Алейникова и др. Драма.

Школа господина Мариуса. СССР, 1975. Режиссер Микк Микивер. Сценаристы: Арво Круусемент, Лембит Реммельгас. Актеры: Харри Кырвитс, Антс Эскола, Мария Кленская, Кальё Кийск, Юри Ярвет и др. Драма.

Что с тобой происходит? СССР, 1975. Режиссер Владимир Саруханов. Сценарист Юз Алешковский. Актеры: Вячеслав Баранов, Оля Пономарева, Борис Зайденберг, Данута Столярская, Лилиана Алешникова и др. Драма.

Чужие письма. СССР, 1975. Режиссер Илья Авербах. Сценарист Наталья Рязанцева. Актеры: Ирина Купченко, Светлана Смирнова, Сергей Коваленков, Зинаида Шарко, Олег Янковский, Иван Бортник и др. Драма.

Это мы не проходили. СССР, 1975. Режиссер Илья Фрээ. Сценаристы: Илья Фрээ, Михаил Львовский. Актеры: Наталья Рычагова, Борис Токарев, Андрей Ростоцкий, Татьяна Канаева, Ирина Калиновская, Антонина Максимова, Татьяна Пельтцер, Нина Зоткина, Вера Васильева и др. Драма.

Эта тревожная зима. СССР, 1975. Режиссер Игорь Николаев. Сценарист Валентина Спирина. Актеры: Александр Копов, Эдуард Марцевич, Елена Костерова и др. Драма.

1976

Все дело в брате. СССР, 1976. Режиссер Валентин Горлов. Сценаристы: Павел Лунгин, Валентин Горлов. Актеры: Роман Мадянов, Юрий Дуванов, Наташа Сеземан, Марина Горлова, Элеонора Шашкова и др. Драма.

Два капитана. СССР, 1976. Режиссер Евгений Карелов. Сценаристы: Евгений Карелов, Вениамин Каверин (автор одноименного романа – В. Каверин). Актеры: Борис Токарев, Серёжа Кудрявцев, Елена Прудникова, Лена Лобкина, Юрий Богатырёв, Николай Гриценко, Ирина Печерникова и др. Драма.

Дневник Карлоса Эспинолы. СССР, 1976. Режиссер и сценарист Валентин Селиванов. Актеры: Хосе Бельместр, Марина Мухина, Карлос Сохо, Элеонора Шашкова, Вячеслав Шалевич, Людмила Чурсина и др. Драма.

Додумался, поздравляю! СССР, 1976. Режиссер Эдуард Гаврилов. Сценарист Анатолий Усов. Актеры: Алексей Ершов, Наталья Тенищева, Юра Юрьев, Люся Мухина, Роман Мадянов, Галина Польских, Олег Анофриев и др. Драма.

Ключ без права передачи. СССР, 1976. Режиссер Динара Асанова. Сценарист Георгий Полонский. Актеры: Елена Проклова, Алексей Петренко, Лидия Федосеева-Шукшина, Любовь Малиновская, Зиновий Гердт, Екатерина Васильева, Олег Хроменков, Анвар Асанов, Марина Левтова, Елена Цыплакова и др. Драма.

Несовершеннолетние. СССР, 1976. Режиссер Владимир Роговой. Сценарист Эдуард Тополь. Актеры: Владимир Летенков, Станислав Жданько, Николай Муравьев, Леонид Каюров, Павел Николаи, Вера Васильева, Юрий Кузьменков, Юрий Медведев и др. Драма.

Опровержение. СССР, 1976. Режиссер Юрий Кавтарадзе. Сценаристы: Василий Ардаматский, Юрий Кавтарадзе. Актеры: Лилиана Алешникова, Борис Гусаков, Николай Скоробогатов, Пётр Щербаков и др. Драма.

Остров юности. СССР, 1976. Режиссеры: Юлий Слупский, Борис Шиленко. Сценарист Александр Власов. Актеры: Владимир Андреев, Оля Демшевская, Виталий Лобзин и др. Драма.

Подранки. СССР, 1976. Режиссер и сценарист Николай Губенко. Актеры: Юозас Будрайтис, Алексей Черстов, Георгий Бурков, Александр Калягин, Жанна Болотова, Ролан Быков, Николай Губенко, Наталья Гундарева, Евгений Евстигнеев и др. Драма.

Предательница. СССР, 1976. Режиссер Никита Хубов. Сценаристы: Валерий Демин, Людмила Демина, Никита Хубов. Актеры: Лариса Блинова, Георгий Киянцев, Игорь Кучин и др. Драма.

Розыгрыш. СССР, 1976. Режиссер Владимир Меньшов. Сценарист Семён Лунгин. Актеры: Дмитрий Харатьян, Евгения Ханаева, Наталья Вавилова, Андрей Гусев, Евдокия Германова, Олег Табаков, Наталья Фатеева, Зиновий Гердт, Владимир Меньшов, Гарри Бардин и др. Музыкальная драма.

Тимур и его команда. СССР, 1976. Режиссеры: Александр Бланк, Сергей Линков. Сценаристы: Александр Бланк, Сергей Линков, Нина Давыдова (автор повести – А. Гайдар). Актеры: Антон Табаков, Инга Третьякова, Вячеслав Баранов, Лев Идашкин, Леонид Куравлёв, Бруно Фрейндлих, Любовь Соколова, Николай Гринько и др. Драма.

Цветы для Оли. СССР, 1976. Режиссер Радомир Василевский. Сценарист Радий Погодин. Актеры: Анна Надточий, Александр Лихачев, Вадим Шевченко и др. Мелодрама.

1977

Доброта. СССР, 1977. Режиссер Эдуард Гаврилов. Сценаристы: Семен Ласкин, Василий Соловьёв (автор повести «Абсолютный слух» - С.Ласкин). Актеры: Тамара Сёмина, Леонид Неведомский, Николай Константинов, Владимир Звягин, Андрей Гусев, Алина Покровская и др. Драма.

Жили-были в первом классе... СССР, 1977. Режиссер Маргарита Касьмова. Сценаристы: Владимир Железников, Алексей Леонтьев (автор повести «Поющий тростник» Г. Галахова). Актеры: Сино Ахмедов, Улугбек Садыков, Женя Бабаев и др. Драма.

Последняя двойка. СССР, 1977. Режиссер Борис Нащекин. Сценарист И. Витин. Актеры: Александр Ивахин, Евгений Герасимов, Людмила Иванова и др. Драма.

Школьный вальс. СССР, 1977. Режиссер Павел Любимов. Сценарист Анна Родионова.

Актеры: Елена Цыплакова, Сергей Насибов, Евгения Симонова, Наталья Вилькина, Юрий Соломин, Нина Меньшикова и др. Мелодрама.

1978

Баламут. СССР, 1978. Режиссер Владимир Роговой. Сценарист Сергей Бодров (ст.). Актеры: Вадим Андреев, Наталья Казначеева, Николай Денисов, Владимир Шихов, Валентина Клягина и др. Комедия.

Когда я стану великаном. СССР, 1978. Режиссер Инна Туманян. Сценаристы: Инна Туманян, Александр Кузнецов. Актеры: Михаил Ефремов, Наташа Сеземан, Лия Ахеджакова, Инна Ульянова, Марина Шиманская, Олег Ефремов, Владимир Качан и др. Драма.

Последний шанс. СССР, 1978. Режиссер Эдуард Гаврилов. Сценаристы: Ирина Рабкина, Борис Рабкин. Актеры: Андрей Мартынов, Леонид Каюров, Олег Ефремов, Марина Левтова, Андрей Харыбин, Анатолий Кузнецов, Любовь Соколова, Людмила Шагалова, Валентина Ананьина, Наталья Гвоздиков, Александр Кавалеров и др. Драма.

Расписание на послезавтра. СССР, 1978. Режиссер Игорь Добролюбов. Сценарист Нина Фомина. Актеры: Олег Даль, Маргарита Терехова, Тамара Дегтярёва, Александр Леньков, Александр Денисов, Валентин Никулин, Вячеслав Баранов, Юрий Воротницкий, Владимир Солодовников, Ирина Метлицкая, Полина Медведева, Евгений Стеблов, Валентина Титова, Борис Новиков и др. Драма.

Сдается квартира с ребенком. СССР, 1978. Режиссер Виктор Крючков. Сценарист Эдуард Акопов. Актеры: Елена Фетисенко, Александр Копов, Миша Кожекин, Людмила Дьяконова, Павел Винник, Алла Мещерякова, Виталий Соломин, Николай Парфёнов и др. Комедия.

Смилуйся над нами. СССР, 1978. Режиссер Альгирдас Араминас. Актеры: Альгирдас Латенас, Дмитрий Миргородский, Татьяна Майорова и др. Драма.

Уроки французского. СССР, 1978. Режиссер и сценарист Евгений Ташков. Автор одноименного рассказа – Валентин Распутин. Актеры: Михаил Егоров, Татьяна Ташкова, Галина Яцкина, Валентина Талызина, Борис Новиков и др. Драма.

1979

В моей смерти прошу винить Клаву К. СССР, 1979. Режиссеры: Николай Лебедев, Эрнест Ясан. Сценарист Михаил Львовский. Актеры: Надежда Боргесани-Горшкова, Владимир Шевельков, Лена Хопшносова и др. Мелодрама.

Камертон. СССР, 1979. Режиссер Виллен Новак. Сценарист Леонид Браславский. Актеры: Елена Шанина, Борис Сабуков, Андрей Ташков и др. Драма.

Кузнечик. СССР, 1979. Режиссер Борис Григорьев. Сценарист Феликс Миронер. Актеры: Людмила Нильская, Николай Иванов, Людмила Аринина, Анатолий Ромашин, Марина Левтова, Вячеслав Баранов и др. Драма.

Мой первый друг. СССР, 1979. Режиссер Яков Базелян. Сценаристы: Ганна Слуцки, Александр Хмелик. Актеры: Егор Грамматиков, Валерий Владинов, Анна Голубева, Ольга Волкова и др. Драма.

Полоска нескошенных диких цветов. СССР, 1979. Режиссер Юрий Ильенко. Сценаристы: Юрий Ильенко, Олесь Гончар. Актеры: Юра Маджула, Алексей Черствов, Регимантас Адомайтис, Людмила Ефименко, Зинаида Славина и др. Драма.

Приключения маленького папы. СССР, 1979. Режиссер Дмитрий Крупко. Сценарист Дмитрий Крупко (автор повести «Когда папа был маленьким» А. Раскин). Актеры: Валентин Юцкевич, Александр Демьяненко, Татьяна Томышева и др. Комедия.

Приключения Электроника. СССР, 1979. Режиссер Константин Бромберг. Сценарист Евгений Велтистов. Актеры: Юрий Торсуев, Владимир Торсуев, Василий Скромный, Оксана Алексеева, Николай Гринько, Елизавета Никищихина, Владимир Басов, Николай Караченцов, Евгений Весник, Майя Булгакова и др. Фантастика.

Та сторона, где ветер. СССР, 1979. Режиссер Ваграм Кеворков. Сценарист Владислав Крапивин. Актеры: Алексей Мелехов, Виктор Березин, Денис Скударь, Илья Тихонов и др. Драма.

Ты только не плачь. СССР, 1979. Режиссер Алексей Мороз. Сценаристы: Сергей Иванов, Михаил Герман. Актеры: Лена Середя, Володя Чубарев, Павел Кадочников, Валерия Чайковская и др. Драма.

Я буду ждать. СССР, 1979. Режиссер Виктор Живолуб. Сценарист Анатолий Степанов. Актеры: Николай Ерёмченко (мл.), Анна Твеленёва, Ирина Шевчук, Константин Степанков, Рита Gladунко, Юрий Каморный и др. Мелодрама.

1980

Алёша. СССР, 1980. Режиссер Виктор Обухов. Сценарист Анатолий Шайкевич. Актеры: Виталий Юшков, Наталия Флоренская, Эрнст Романов, Геннадий Корольков и др. Драма.

Вам и не снилось... СССР, 1980. Режиссер Илья Фрэнз. Сценаристы: Галина Щербакова, Илья Фрэнз. Актеры: Татьяна Аксюта, Никита Михайловский, Елена Соловей, Ирина Мирошниченко, Лидия Федосеева-Шукшина, Альберт Филозов, Татьяна Пельтцер, Руфина Нифонтова, Евгений Герасимов, Леонид Филатов и др. Мелодрама.

Неоконченный урок. СССР, 1980. Режиссер Анатолий Тютюнник. Сценарист Виктор Гераскин (автор повести «Когда мы взрослеем» - Н. Зелеранский). Актеры: Валерий Никифоров, Альбина Матвеева, Галина Польских и др. Драма.

Подготовка к экзамену. СССР, 1980. Режиссер Борис Конунов. Сценаристы: Евгений Багиров, Александр Юровский (автор одноименной повести Н. Деметьев). Актеры: Елена Финогеева, Геннадий Скоморохов, Наталья Стриженова, Ион Унгуряну и др. Мелодрама.

Последний побег. СССР, 1980. Режиссер Леонид Менакер. Сценарист Александр Галин. Актеры: Михаил Ульянов, Алексей Серебряков, Ирина Купченко, Леонид Дьячков, Валерий Гатаев, Евгения Ханаева, Виктор Павлов и др. Драма.

Спасатель. СССР, 1980. Режиссер и сценарист Сергей Соловьев. Актеры: Татьяна Друбич, Василий Мищенко, Сергей Шакуров, Ольга Белявская, Вячеслав Кононенко, Александр Кайдановский и др. Драма.

Тихие троечники. СССР, 1980. Режиссер Вячеслав Никифоров. Сценарист Владимир Потоцкий. Актеры: Дмитрий Андриевский, Сережа Скрибо, Елена Антонюк, Марина Левтова, Евгения Ханаева, Елена Драпеко, Ольга Остроумова, Альберт Филозов и др. Драма.

1981

Все наоборот. СССР, 1981. Режиссеры: Виталий Фетисов, Владимир Грамматиков. Сценарист Павел Лунгин. Актеры: Михаил Ефремов, Ольга Машная, Олег Табаков, Светлана Немоляева, Александр Пашутин и др. Комедия.

Наше призвание. СССР, 1981. Режиссер Геннадий Полока. Сценаристы: Геннадий Полока, Евгений Митько (автор книги Н. Огнев). Актеры: Валерий Золотухин, Павел Кадочников, Василий Мищенко, Георгий Тейх, Игорь Наумов, Ия Саввина, Фёдор Никитин, Валентина Теличкина и др. Драматическая комедия.

Придут страсти-мордасти. СССР, 1981. Режиссер и сценарист Эрнест Ясан. Актеры: Дмитрий Кузьмин, Антон Гранат, Людмила Шевель и др. Драма.

Прощание за чертой. СССР, 1981. Режиссер Карен Геворкян. Сценаристы: Карен Геворкян, Александр Диванян. Актеры: Л. Манукян, А. Миракян, В. Плужян и др. Драма.

Снег на зеленом поле. СССР, 1981. Режиссер Валентин Морозов. Сценарист Эдуард Шим. Актеры: Дима Веселков, Саша Гладкобородов, Оля Дуренкова и др. Драма.

Трудное начало. СССР, 1981. Режиссер Тенгиз Магалашвили. Сценаристы: Эрлом Ахвледиани, Тенгиз Магалашвили. Актеры: Ираклий Хизанишвили, Нани Чиквинидзе, Эдишер Магалашвили и др. Драма.

Что бы ты выбрал? СССР, 1981. Режиссер Динара Асанова. Сценарист Александр Кургатников. Актеры: Анвар Асанов, Марина Кривицкая, Настя Никольская, Ярослав Яковлев, Лидия Федосеева-Шукшина, Екатерина Васильева, Елена Соловей и др. Драма.

Кафедра. СССР, 1982. Режиссер Иван Киясашвили. Сценаристы: Ирина Грекова, Семён Лунгин, Марк Розовский (автор одноименной повести – И. Грекова). Актеры: Андрей Попов, Светлана Кузьмина, Ростислав Янковский, Галина Макарова, Елена Степанова, Игорь Ясулович, Елена Антоненко, Александр Кайдановский, Виктор Сергачёв и др. Драма.

1982

Колыбельная для брата. СССР, 1982. Режиссер Виктор Волков. Актеры: Егор Грамматиков, Лена Москаленко, Володя Зотов и др. Драма.

Мы жили по соседству. СССР, 1982. Режиссер и сценарист Николай Лырчиков. Актеры: Жанна Прохоренко, Андрей Мартынов, Антон Гольшев и др. Мелодрама.

С тех пор, как мы вместе. СССР, 1982. Режиссер Владимир Григорьев. Сценарист Святослав Тараховский. Актеры: Светлана Смирнова, Андрис Лиелайс, Антонина Шуранова и др. Мелодрама.

4:0 в пользу Танечки. СССР, 1982. Режиссер Радомир Василевский. Сценарист Михаил Дымов. Актеры: Наталия Флоренская, Андрей Мягков, Светлана Немоляева, Евгения Ханаева, Юрий Васильев, Елена Санько, Вацлав Дворжецкий и др. Комедия.

Чужая пятёрка. СССР, 1982. режиссер Г. Бзаров. Сценарист В. Малиновская. Актеры: У. Хамраев, В. Ибрагимова, Ф. Реджаметова и др. Драма.

1983

Если верить Лопотухину. СССР, 1983. Режиссер Михаил Козаков. Сценарист Александр Хмелик. Актеры: Григорий Евсеев, Леонид Бронева, Светлана Крючкова, Борислав Брондуков и др. Комедия.

Магия черная и белая. СССР, 1983. Режиссер Наум Бирман. Сценарист Валерий Приёмыхов. Актеры: Павел Плисов, Антон Гранат, Рита Иванова, Александр Ленков и др. Комедия.

Обман. СССР, 1983. Режиссер Николай Раужин. Сценарист Альберт Иванов (автор рассказа «Любовь октябрьнка Овечкина» Н. Соломко). Актеры: Ольга Дольникова, Вячеслав Невинный, Любовь Германова и др. Мелодрама.

Опасные пустышки. СССР, 1983. Режиссер: Виктор Волков. Актеры: Инна Гомес, Наталья Гусева, Коля Макаров и др. Агитфильм.

Пацаны. СССР, 1983. Режиссер Динара Асанова. Сценарист Юрий Клепиков. Актеры: Валерий Приёмыхов, Андрей Зыков, Сергей Наумов, Евгений Никитин, Олег Хорев, Александр Совков, Ольга Машная и др. Драма.

Плыви, кораблик. СССР, 1983. Режиссер Григорий Аронов. Сценаристы: Сергей Александрович, Григорий Аронов. Актеры: Стефания Станюта, Павлик Шагин, Татьяна Иванова и др. Драма.

Признать виновным. СССР, 1983. Режиссер Игорь Вознесенский. Сценаристы: Владимир Карасев, Юрий Иванов. Актеры: Александр Михайлов, Владимир Шевельков, Игорь Рогачёв, Александр Силин, Марина Яковлева, Вера Сотникова, Ирина Мирошниченко и др. Драма.

Приключения Петрова и Васечкина. СССР, 1983. Режиссер Владимир Алеников. Сценаристы: Владимир Алеников, Валентин Горлов. Актеры: Дмитрий Барков, Егор Дружинин, Инга Ильм и др. Музыкальная комедия.

Талисман. СССР, 1983. Режиссеры: Араик Габриэлян, Вениамин Дорман. Сценарист Виктория Токарева. Актеры: Денис Чурмантеев, Наталья Варлей, Лидия Федосеева-Шукшина, Spartak Мишулин, Лия Ахеджакова, Борислав Брондуков, Элеонора Шашкова и др. Комедия.

Уроки на завтра. СССР, 1983. Режиссер А. Акбарходжаев. Сценарист М. Мухаммад Дост. Актеры: М. Мухаммад Дост, Б. Ихтияров, М. Абзалов и др. Драма.

Утро без отметок. СССР, 1983. Режиссер Владимир Мартынов. Сценарист Оскар Ремез. Актеры: Кирилл Головкин-Серский, Маша Вартикова, Павел Гайдученко и др. Комедия.

Чучело. СССР, 1983. Режиссер Ролан Быков. Сценаристы: Ролан Быков, Владимир Железников. Актеры: Кристина Орбакайте, Юрий Никулин, Елена Санаева, Дмитрий Егоров, Ксения Филиппова и др. Драма.

1984

Благие намерения. СССР, 1984. Режиссер Андрей Бенкендорф. Сценарист и автор одноименной повести Альберт Лиханов. Актеры: Марина Яковлева, Юрий Платонов, Маша Баленко и др. Драма.

Дневник, письмо и первоклассница. СССР, 1984. Режиссер Хабиб Файзиев. Сценарист Валентина Малиновская. Актеры: Равшан Хамраев, Улугбек Хамраев, Гулнора Пайзиева и др. Драма.

Единица с обманом. СССР, 1984. Режиссер Андрей Праченко. Сценарист Александр Гусельников (автор одноименной повести В. Нестайко). Актеры: Елена Борзунова, Елена Зайцева, Олег Кропот и др. Комедия.

Идущий следом. СССР, 1984. Режиссер Родион Нахапетов. Сценаристы: Родион Нахапетов, Юлий Николин. Актеры: Ивар Калныньш, Николай Гринько, Елена Прудникова, Пётр Глебов, Андрей Смирнов, Вера Глаголева, Владислав Стржельчик, Римма Маркова и др. Драма.

Лидер. СССР, 1984. Режиссер Борис Дуров. Сценарист Даль Орлов. Актеры: Алексей Волков, Александр Стриженов, Екатерина Стриженова, Валентина Карева, Анатолий Опритов, Любовь Стриженова и др. Драма.

Моя маленькая жена. СССР, 1984. Режиссер Раймундас Банионис. Сценарист Римантас Шавялис. Актеры: Элеонора Коризнайте, Саулос Баландис, Ингеборга Дапкунайте и др. Мелодрама.

Подслушанный разговор. СССР, 1984. Режиссер и сценарист Сергей Потепалов. Актеры: Гия Думбадзе, Алексей Полуян, Ольга Агапова и др. Мелодрама.

Пока не выпал снег. СССР, 1984. Режиссер Игорь Апасян. Сценаристы: Елена Щербиновская, Людмила Абрамова, Игорь Апасян. Актеры: Наталья Сайко, Александр Пороховщиков, Елена Соловей, Евгения Добровольская, Ольга Машная и др. Драма.

Почти ровесники. СССР, 1984. Режиссер Татьяна Пименова. Сценарист Денис Драгунский. Актеры: Михаил Морозов, Елена Новосельская, Юра Жуков и др. Драма.

Сильная личность из 2 «А». СССР, 1984. Режиссер Анатолий Ниточкин. Сценарист Геннадий Мамлин. Актеры: Женя Пивоваров, Екатерина Лычева, Любовь Соколова, Андрей Мартынов, Валентина Теличкина и др. Комедия.

Сладкий сок внутри травы. СССР, 1984. Режиссеры: Аманбек Альпиев, Сергей Бодров (ст.). Сценаристы: Зауреш Ергалиева, Сергей Бодров (ст.). Актеры: Гульшад Омарова, Айгерим Беккулова, Элико Минашвили и др. Мелодрама.

Солнце в кармане. СССР, 1984. Режиссер Эдуард Гаврилов. Сценаристы: Эдуард Гаврилов, Ольга Сидельникова. Актеры: Даша Вишнякова, Вера Ивлева, Мария Скворцова и др. Драма.

Третий в пятом ряду. СССР, 1984. Режиссер Сергей Олейник. Сценарист Екатерина Маркова (автор одноименной повести А. Алексин). Актеры: Алла Покровская, Александр Продан, Юлия Космачёва и др. Драма.

1985

Валентин и Валентина. СССР, 1985. Режиссер Георгий Натансон. Сценаристы: Георгий Натансон, Михаил Рошин (автор одноименной пьесы – В. Рошин). Актеры: Марина Зудина, Николай Стоцкий, Татьяна Доронина, Нина Русланова, Зинаида Дехтярёва, Борис Щербаков, Лариса Удовиченко, Люсьена Овчинникова и др. Мелодрама.

Зловредное воскресенье. СССР, 1985. Режиссер Владимир Мартынов. Сценарист Оскар Ремез. Актеры: Павел Гайдученко, Михаил Пуговкин, Вера Васильева, Валентина Талызина, Марина Дюжева, Раиса Рязанова, Георгий Штиль, Борислав Брондуков, Евгений Герасимов, Марина Яковлева и др. Комедия.

Игры для детей школьного возраста. СССР, 1985. Режиссеры: Арво Ихо, Лейда Лайус. Сценарист Марина Шептунова (автор повести «Приемная мать» - С. Раннамаа). Актеры: Моника Ярв, Хендрик Тоомпере и др. Драма.

Как молоды мы были. СССР, 1985. Режиссер и сценарист М. Беликов. Актеры: Т. Денисенко, Е. Шкурпело, А. Пашутин и др. Мелодрама.

Мужчины есть мужчины. СССР, 1985. Режиссер и сценарист Алексей Мороз. Актеры: Петя Митрюхин, Виталий Шевцов, Сергей Хусаинов и др. Комедия.

Непохожая. СССР, 1985. Режиссеры: Владимир Алеников, Мария Муат. Сценарист Екатерина Маркова (автор повести «Родео Лиды Карякиной» - Людмила Сабинина). Актеры: Ольга Толстецкая, Клара Лучко, Евгения Ханаева, Александра Турган, Всеволод Абдулов, Александра Захарова, Юрий Чернов, Александр Пашутин и др. Драма.

Осторожно - Василёк! СССР, 1985. Режиссер Эдуард Гаврилов. Сценарист Ольга Сидельникова. Актеры: Илья Тюрин, Георгий Бурков, Олег Ефремов и др. Комедия.

С нами не соскучишься. СССР, 1985. Режиссер Антонина Зиновьева. Сценарист Сергей Иванов. Актеры: Павел Суворов, Анастасия Фатеева, Ксения Кутепова, Полина Кутепова, Геннадий Сайфулин и др. Драма.

1986-1991

1986

Белая лошадь - горе не моё. СССР, 1986. Режиссер: Виктор Спиридонов. Актеры: Сергей Балабанов, Леонид Марков, Александр Пороховщиков и др. Драма.

Была не была. СССР, 1986. Режиссер Валерий Федосов. Сценаристы: Александр Чумак, Юрий Перов. Актеры: Григорий Катаев, Тина Лаптева, Алексей Жарков, Валентина Теличкина, Лариса Белогурова и др. Драма.

За явным преимуществом. СССР, 1986. Режиссер Владимир Саруханов. Сценарист Анатолий Мадорский. Актеры: Олег Старосацкий, Нина Саруханова, Владимир Борисов, Игорь Буланцев, Паул Буткевич, Армен Джигарханян и др. Драма.

Здравствуйте, Гульнора Рахимовна! СССР, 1986. Режиссер Абдурахим Кудусов. Сценаристы: Валентина Малиновская, В. Федоров. Актеры: Тамара Яндиева, Бахтиер Фидоев, Ирбек Алиев и др. Драма.

Листопад в пору лета. СССР, 1986. Режиссер Тофик Исмаилов. Сценарист Асим Джалилов. Актеры: Сиявуш Аслан, Наджиба Гусейнова, Фирангиз Шарифова и др. Драма.

Малышкин и компания. СССР, 1986. Режиссер Юрий Кузьменко. Сценарист Юрий Яковлев. Актеры: Сергей Савостьянов, Максим Гапонов, Ася Власенко и др. Комедия.

Очень страшная история. СССР, 1986. Режиссер Никита Хубов. В ролях: Андрюша Козлов, Толя Юртаев, Вера Панасенкова, Людмила Артемьева, Станислав Садальский и др. Детектив.

Плюмбум, или Опасная игра. СССР, 1986. Режиссер Вадим Абдрашитов. Сценарист Александр Миндадзе. Актеры: Антон Андросов, Елена Дмитриева, Елена Яковлева, Зоя Лирова, Александр Феклистов, Владимир Стеклов, Александр Пашутин и др. Драма.

Экзамен на директора. СССР, 1986. Режиссер Александр Ефремов. Сценаристы: Владимир Бутромеев, Евгений Митько. Актеры: Сергей Шкалик, Михаил Глузский, Юрий Казючиц и др. Драма.

Я — вожатый форпоста. СССР, 1986. Режиссер Геннадий Полока. Сценаристы: Евгений Митько, Геннадий Полока (автор книги Н. Огнев). Актеры: Павел Кадочников, Василий Мищенко, Валерий Золотухин, Ия Саввина и др. Драма.

1987

Дом с привидениями. СССР, 1987. Режиссер Ефим Гальперин. Сценарист Семён Лунгин. Актеры: Катя Пуканова, Виктория Гаврилова, Ярослав Лисоволик, Сергей Домнин и др. Драма.

Забавы молодых. СССР, 1987. Режиссер Евгений Герасимов. Сценарист Виктор Мережко. Актеры: Станислав Любшин, Марина Зудина, Нина Русланова, Валентина Теличкина, Николай Парфёнов, Виктор Павлов, Вячеслав Невинный, Алексей Серебряков, Владимир Качан, Ирина Климова и др. Драма.

Завтра была война. СССР, 1987. Режиссер Юрий Кара. Сценарист и автор одноименной повести Борис Васильев. Актеры: Сергей Никоненко, Нина Русланова, Вера Алентова, Ирина Чериченко, Наталья Негода, Юлия Тархова, Владимир Заманский и др. Драма.

Мы - ваши дети. СССР, 1987. Режиссер Ольгерд Воронцов. Сценаристы: Геннадий Никитин, Ольга Пыжова (авторы пьесы «Иван» Г. Никитин и О. Пыжова). Актеры: Галина Польских, Леонид Куравлёв, Валерий Малинин, Валерий Барин, Сергей Сазонтьев и др. Драма.

Пощечина, которой не было. СССР, 1987. Режиссер Игорь Шатров. Сценаристы: Рустам Ибрагимбеков, Виктор Багдасаров. Актеры: Андрей Болтнев, Людмила Соловьёва, Владимир Стеклов, Ольга Рачинская, Вадим Любшин, Игорь Кашинцев, Ксения Стриж, Александр Стриженов и др. Драма.

Соблазн. СССР, 1987. Режиссер Вячеслав Сорокин. Сценаристы: Юрий Клепиков, Валерий Стародубцев. Актеры: Алиса Зыкина, Наталия Сорокина, Сергей Лучников, Елена Руфанова и др. Драма.

Тихоня. СССР, 1987. Режиссер Ю. Азимов. Сценаристы: П. Луцик, А. Саморядов. Актеры: Г. Аминова, А. Каримова, А. Мухитдинов и др. Драма.

Шантажист. СССР, 1987. Режиссер Валерий Курыкин. Сценарист Эдуард Володарский. Актеры: Михаил Ефремов, Андрей Тихомирнов, Александр Ширвиндт, Марина Старых, Нина Гомиашвили, Леонид Куравлёв, Валентина Титова, Сергей Гармаш и др. Драма.

1988

Воля Вселенной. СССР, 1988. Режиссёр Дмитрий Михлеев. Актеры: Вячеслав Илющенко, Наталья Гусева, Андрей Бабошкин, Виктор Ильичёв и др. Мелодрама.

Дорогая Елена Сергеевна. СССР, 1988. Режиссер Эльдар Рязанов. Сценаристы: Людмила Разумовская, Эльдар Рязанов (автор одноименной пьесы – Л. Разумовская). Актеры: Марина Неёлова, Наталья Щукина, Фёдор Дунаевский, Дмитрий Марьянов, Андрей Тихомирнов. Драма.

Куколка. СССР, 1988. Режиссер Исаак Фридберг. Сценарист Игорь Агеев. Актеры: Светлана Засыпкина, Ирина Метлицкая, Владимир Меньшов, Наталья Назарова и др. Драма.

На окраине, где-то в городе... СССР, 1988. Режиссер Валерий Пендраковский. Сценарист Владислав Романов. Актеры: Александр Ларионов, Андрей Мананников, Антон Шереметьев и др. Драма.

Публикация. СССР, 1988. Режиссер Виктор Волков. Сценарист Юрий Коротков. Актеры: Людмила Аринина, Лариса Шахворостова, Владислав Дашевский, Никита Гурьев и др. Драма.

Пусть я умру, господи... СССР, 1988. Режиссер Борис Григорьев. Сценарист Галина Щербакова. Актеры: Галина Польских, Иван Лапиков, Елена Морозова, Игорь Ледогоров, Лидия Федосеева-Шукшина, Леонид Куравлёв и др. Драма.

Работа над ошибками. СССР, 1988. Режиссер Андрей Бенкендорф. Сценарист Владимир Холодов (автор одноименной повести – Ю. Поляков). Актеры: Евгений Князев, Оксана Дроздова, Елена Чухалёнок и др. Драма.

Стукач. СССР, 1988. Режиссер и сценарист Николай Лырчиков. Актеры: Артем Тынкасов, Александр Феклистов, Аркадий Левин, Виктор Павлюченков, Владимир Стеклов, Игорь Дмитриев и др. Драма.

Черный коридор. СССР, 1988. Режиссер Вадим Дербенёв. Сценаристы: Анатолий Горло, Наталия Асмолова, Вадим Дербенёв (автор повести «60 свечей» В. Тендряков). Актеры: Иннокентий Смоктуновский, Владимир Ильин, Ион Унгуряну, Ольга Кабо, Сергей Гармаш и др. Драма.

Шут. СССР, 1988. Режиссер Андрей Эшпай. Сценарист и автор одноименной повести Юрий Вяземский. Актеры: Дмитрий Весенский, Мария Маевская, Игорь Костолевский и др. Драма.

Щенок. СССР, 1988. Режиссер Александр Гришин. Сценарист Юрий Щекочихин. Актеры: Сергей Роженцев, Федор Гаврилов, Владимир Шевельков, Вениамин Смехов, Всеволод Сафонов и др. Драма.

1989

Авария – дочь мента. СССР, 1989. Режиссёр Михаил Туманишвили. Сценарист Юрий Коротков. Актеры: Оксана Арбузова, Владимир Ильин, Анастасия Вознесенская, Николай Пастухов, Борис Романов, Игорь Нефёдов и др. Драма.

Астенический синдром. СССР, 1989. Режиссер Кира Муратова. Сценаристы: Кира Муратова, Сергей Попов, Александр Черных. Актеры: Ольга Антонова, Сергей Попов, Галина Захурдаева, Наталья Бузько, Александра Свенская, Павел Полищук (II), Наталья Раллева, Галина Касперович, Виктор Аристов и др. Драма.

Казенный дом. СССР, 1989. Режиссёр Альберт Мкртчян. Автор сценария Михаил Кончакивский. Актеры: Галина Польских, Нина Русланова, Алёша Сергиевский, Алёша Колесов, Павел Гайдученко и др. Драма.

Князь Удача Андреевич. СССР, 1989. Режиссер Геннадий Байсак. Сценарист Валерий Приемных. Актеры: Евгений Пивоваров, Дмитрий Головин, Светлана Крючкова, Виктор Павлов, Армен Джигарханян, Станислав Садальский и др. Детектив.

Мир в другом измерении. СССР, 1989. Режиссеры: Михаил Кончакивский, Альберт Мкртчян. Сценаристы: Михаил Кончакивский, Елена Ласкарева. Актеры: Алеша Колесов, Иван Бортник, Владимир Кукушкин, Александра Колкунова, Ирина Мирошниченко, Нина Русланова, Галина Польских, Владимир Ильин, Владимир Самойлов и др. Драма.

Поджигатели. СССР, 1989. Режиссер Александр Сурин. Сценарист Алла Криницына. Актеры: Наталья Федотова, Елена Сидорук, Лариса Осипова, Елена Крючкова, Виктория Князева и др. Драма.

1990

Сообщница. СССР, 1990. Режиссер Владимир Опенышев. Сценарист Нина Филиппова. Актеры: Юлия Тархова, Александр Баширов, Сергей Быстрицкий и др. Драма.

СЭР. СССР, 1989. Режиссер и сценарист Сергей Бодров (ст.). Актеры: Володя Козырев, Светлана Гайтан, Александр Буреув и др. Драма.

Это было у моря. СССР, 1989. Режиссер Аян Шахмалиева. Сценарист Елена Лобачевская. Актеры: Нина Русланова, Светлана Крючкова, Ника Турбина, Катя Политова и др. Драма.

Сделано в СССР. СССР, 1990. Режиссеры: Владимир Шамшурин, Святослав Тараховский. Сценарист Святослав Тараховский. Актеры: Армен Джигарханян, Оксана Арбузова, Кирилл Белевич, Александра Фомичёва, Алла Клюка, Вера Панасенкова, Леонид Куравлёв, Эдуард Марцевич, Валентина Теличкина и др. Драма.

Хомо новус. СССР, 1990. Режиссер Пал Эрдэш. Сценарист Зоя Кудря. Актеры: Ирина Купченко, Георгий Тараторкин, Анна Баженова, Римма Маркова и др. Драма.

1991

Милый Эп. СССР, 1991. Режиссер Олег Фомин. Сценарист и автор одноименной повести Геннадий Михасенко. Актеры: Михаил Палатник, Инна Хрулёва, Игорь Юраш, Александр Стриженов, Ирина Рябцева и др. Драма.

Окно. СССР, 1991. Режиссеры Гасан Аблуч, Энвер Аблуч. Сценарист Иси Мелик-заде. Актеры: Ильхам Бабаев, Валех Керимов, Яшар Нури и др. Драма.

Russian films

1992-2017

1993

Равноправие. Россия, 1993. Режиссер Сергей Багиров. Сценарист Александр Детков. Актеры: Наталья

Карпунина и др. **Комедия.**

Рыпкина любовь. Россия, 1993. Режиссёр: Сергей Багиров. В ролях: Костя Курас, Олег Абрамов, Павел Евсеев, Оксана Шевченко и др. Комедия.

1994

АБВГД Ltd. Россия, 1992-1994. Сценаристы: Михаил Васильев, Константин Наумочкин, Олег Осипов, Алексей Овчинников. Актеры: Антон Табаков, Роман Рябов, Авангард Леонтьев, Мария Порошина, Ярослав Бойко, Гоша Куценко и др. Комедия.

1995

Какая чудная игра. Россия, 1995. Режиссер и сценарист Пётр Тодоровский. Актеры: Андрей Ильин, Геннадий Назаров, Денис Константинов, Геннадий Митник, Елена Яковлева, Лариса Удовиченко, Николай Бурляев, Юрий Кузнецов, Алексей Золотницкий, Дмитрий Марьянов, Мария Шукшина и др. Драма.

1996

Экзамены. Россия, 1996. Режиссер и сценарист Дмитрий Панченко. Актеры: Георгий Предвечнов, Георгий Бутусов, Виталий Бурятинский и др. Драма.

1997

Американка. Россия, 1997. Режиссер Дмитрий Месхиев. Сценарист Юрий Коротков. Актеры: Сергей Васильев, Наталья Данилова, Нина Усатова, Виктор Бычков, Юрий Кузнецов, Алиса Гребенщикова и др. Мелодрама.

Змеиный источник. Россия, 1997. Режиссер и сценарист Николай Лебедев. Актеры: Екатерина Гусева, Ольга Остроумова, Евгений Миронов и др. Триллер.

2000

Нежный возраст. Россия, 2000. Режиссер Сергей Соловьев. Сценаристы: Дмитрий Соловьев, Сергей Соловьев. Актеры: Дмитрий Соловьев, Елена Камаева, Ольга Сидорова, Людмила Савельева, Кирилл Лавров, Сергей Гармаш, Андрей Панин, Валентин Гафт и др. Драма.

2001

Московские окна. Россия, 2001. Режиссер Александр Аравин. Сценаристы: Константин Наумочкин, Алексей Каранович, Игорь Осипов, Алексей Овчинников, Сергей Кобцев, Алексей Поярков, Владимир Неклюдов, Дмитрий Руковишников, Владимир Смирных. Актеры: Анна Арланова, Марина Могилевская, Игорь Бочкин, Елена Аминова, Ксения Алфёрова, Илья Древнов, Николай Чиндяйкин, Елена Финогеева, Игорь Петренко и др. Мелодрама.

Общага. Россия, 2001. Режиссер Борис Берзнер. Актеры: Владимир Гусев (II), Наталья Карпунина, Юрий Круглов, Максим Лагашкин и др. Комедия.

2002

Займемся любовью. Россия, 2002. Режиссер Денис Евстигнеев. Сценарист Ариф Алиев. Актеры: Кирилл Малов, Евгений Цыганов, Ульяна Лукина, Андрей Новиков, Иван Кокорин и др. Драма.

Королева красоты, или Очень трудное детство. Россия, 2002. Режиссеры: Игорь Ахмедов, Борис Чертков. Сценарист Игорь Ахмедов. Актеры: Женя Горбунов, Дарья Сазонова, Александр Королёв, Александр Белявский, Елена Кондулайнен и др. Комедия.

Пер-р-вокурсница. Россия, 2002. Режиссер и сценарист Юрий Рогозин. Актеры: Мария Шалаева, Дмитрий Шевченко, Юрий Данильченко и др. Комедия.

Театральная академия. Россия, 2002. Режиссеры: Александр Замятин, Вадим Шмелев. Сценаристы: Александр Бачило, Родион Белецкий, Дмитрий Курилов, Юрий Солодов, Вадим Шмелев. Актеры: Денис Никифоров, Ольга Битюцкая, Михаил Богдасаров, Игорь Верник, Эммануил Виторган и др. Комедия.

2003

Весёлая компания. Россия, 2003. Режиссер Владимир Тихий. Сценаристы: Олег Зима, Георгий Конн, Александра Смилянская, Армен Ватян. Актеры: Олег Мосалев, Евгений Сиротин, Артём Мазунов, Екатерина Лыкова, Эммануил Виторган, Александр Лыков и др. Комедия.

Простые истины. Россия, 1999-2003. Режиссеры: Вадим Шмелев, Евгений Старков, Александр Замятин, Юрий Беленький. Сценаристы: Юрий Беленький, Марк Левин, Вадим Шмелев и др. Актеры: Борис Невзоров, Елена Фатюшина, Наталья Чернявская, Антонина Венедиктова, Анна Исайкина, Ольга Будина и др. Драма.

2004

Кадеты. Россия, 2004. Режиссер Сергей Артимович. Сценарист Игорь Евсюков. Актеры: Александр Головин, Аристарх Венес, Алексей Мерзлов и др. Драма.

Курсанты. Россия, 2004. Режиссер Андрей Кавун. Сценарист Зоя Кудря. Актеры: Андрей Чадов, Иван Стебунов, Александр Голубев, Алексей Горбунов, Елена Ксенофонтова, Владимир Вдовиченков, Игорь Петренко, Андрей Мерзликин и др. Драма.

Ночь света. Россия - Украина, 2004. Режиссер Роман Балаян. Сценаристы: Рустам Ибрагимбеков, Роман Балаян. Актеры: Андрей Кузичёв, Алексей Панин, Ольга Сутулова, Ирина Купченко, Владимир Гостюхин и др. Мелодрама.

Вовочка. Россия, 2000-2004. Режиссер и сценарист Андрей Максимков. Актеры: Игорь Качанов, Виктория Корхина, Вадим Гуцин, Татьяна Иванова и др. Комедия.

2005

ОБЖ. Россия, 2000-2005. Режиссеры: Антон Азаров, Максим Демченко, Максим Кубринский, Алексей Волинский, Антон Духовской, Полина Бахаревская, Павел Симонов, Дмитрий Петрушков. Сценаристы: Антон Зинченко, Вячеслав Лейкин, Антон Духовской, Татьяна Григорченкова, Иван Милов, Сергей Дмитриев. Актеры: Антон Азаров, Анна Виноградова, Леандра Кудряшова и др. Комедия.

Студенты-1. Россия, 2005. Режиссер Ольга Перуновская. Сценаристы: Вячеслав Дусмухаметов, Виталий Коломиец и др. Актеры: Евгений Кулаков, Сергей Рудзевич, Алексей Янин, Дарья Лузина, Юрий Кузнецов, Владимир Стержаков, Дмитрий Марьянов и др. Комедия.

Тронутые. Россия, 2005. Режиссер Анатолий Газиев. Сценаристы: Анатолий Газиев, Дмитрий Заболотских. Актеры: Дмитрий Паламарчук, Валентин Захаров, Виталий Исаков, Сергей Барковский и др. Комедия.

2006

Большие девочки. Россия, 2006. Режиссеры: Александр Назаров (II), Роман Самгин, Эдуард Ливнев. Сценаристы: Ольга Данилова, Сергей Борзунов, Вадим Голованов, Константин Наумочкин, Иван Филиппов, Алексей Гордовский, Роман Романов (III), Михаил Васильев (II), Наталья Заякина. Актеры: Ольга Остроумова, Валентина Теличкина, Галина Петрова и др. Комедия.

Студенты-2. Россия, 2006. Режиссер Ольга Перуновская. Сценаристы: Роман Романов, Алекс Легат, Василий Иванов и др. Актеры: Ивар Калныньш, Владимир Стержаков, Михаил Мамаев и др. Комедия.

Студенты International. Россия, 2006. Режиссер Ольга Перуновская. Сценаристы: Виталий Шляппо, Вячеслав Дусмухаметов, Алексей Троцюк и др. Актеры: Евгений Кулаков, Евгения Волкова, Алексей Лонгин, Юлия Зиминая, Александр Пальчиков, Валерий Золотухин, Александр Панкратов-Чёрный, Владимир Стержаков, Эвелина Блэданс и др. Комедия.

2007

Исчезнувшая империя (Любовь в СССР). Россия, 2007. Режиссер Карен Шахназаров. Сценаристы: Сергей Рокотов, Евгений Никишов. Актеры: Александр Ляпин, Лидия Милюзина, Егор Барановский, Иван Купреенко, Армен Джигарханян, Ольга Тумайкина, Владимир Ильин и др. Драма.

Кадетство. Россия, 2006-2007. Режиссеры: Сергей Арланов, Валентин Козловский, Павел Игнатов и др. Сценаристы: Леонид Купридо, Александр Булышко, Сергей Олехник и др. Актеры: Александр Головин, Борис Корчевников, Иван Добронравов и др. Комедия.

Потанов, к доске! Россия, 2007. Режиссер Александр Орлов. Сценаристы: Тамара Крюкова, Александр Орлов, Сергей Тарасов. Актеры: Александр Олейников, Виталий Кулаков, Мария Фомина, Валерия Хардина, Лия Ахеджакова и др. Комедия.

Своя команда. Россия, 2007. Режиссеры: Дмитрий Панченко, Виктория Орлова, Эдуард Ливнев. Сценаристы: Кирилл Керзок, Дмитрий Щербаков, Елена Имамова, Дмитрий Курилов, Татьяна Малахова, Елена Романенко, Михаил Щедринский, Михаил Беленький, Татьяна Глушенко, Мария Крашенинникова. Актеры: Вячеслав Кулаков, Анастасия Шеховцова, Ирина Цывина и др. Драма.

Учитель в законе. Россия, 2007. Режиссер Александр Мохов. Сценаристы: Алексей Подосенов, Александр Мохов. Актеры: Юрий Беляев, Наталия Вдовина, Кристина Бабушкина и др. Драма.

Школа № 1. Россия, 2007. Режиссеры: Кирилл Белевич, Гюзель Султанова. Сценарист Елена Воробей. Актеры: Артём Крестников, Сергей Назаров, Мария Костикова, Янина Студилина, Лана Щербакова и др. Драматическая комедия.

2008

Взрослая жизнь девчонки Полины Субботиной. Россия, 2008. Режиссер Александр Сурин. Сценарист Алла Криницына. Актеры: Любовь Тихомирова, Елизавета Арзамасова, Алексей Кравченко и др. Драма.

Взрослые игры. Россия, 2008. Режиссеры: Юрий Ильин, Юлия Морева, Юрий Дружинин. Сценаристы: Елена Ласкарева, Алена Головащ, Анастасия Волкова, Инна Вознюк, Юлия Миланович, Елена Медведева. Актеры: Мария Климова, Степан Старчиков, Екатерина Кабак, Олег Морозов и др. Мелодрама.

Все умрут, а я останусь. Россия, 2008. Режиссер Валерия Гай Германика. Сценаристы: Александр Родионов, Юрий Клавдиев. Актеры: Полина Филоненко, Агния Кузнецова, Ольга Шувалова, Юлия Александрова, Донатас Грудович и др. Драма.

Приколы на переменке. Россия, 2007-2008. Режиссеры: Виктор Рудниченко, Игорь Широков. Сценаристы: Яна Тюльпанова, Игорь Брусенцев. Актеры: Глеб Шевчук, Василий Ракша, Владислав Демидов, Джеймс Бэглоу и др. Комедия.

Розыгрыш. Россия, 2008. Режиссер Андрей Кудиненко. Сценаристы: Александр Качан, Андрей Житков. Актеры: Юрий Кузнецов, Ирина Купченко, Дмитрий Дюжев, Дмитрий Харатьян, Евдокия Германова и др. Комедия.

Стиляги. Россия, 2008. Режиссер Валерий Тодоровский. Сценарист Юрий Коротков. Актеры: Антон Шагин, Оксана Акиньшина, Евгения Брик, Максим Матвеев, Екатерина Вилкова, Сергей Гармаш, Олег Янковский, Ирина Розанова, Леонид Ярмольник, Алексей Горбунов и др. Музыкальная драма.

Юленька. Россия, 2008. Режиссер Александр Стриженов. Сценаристы: Андрей Курейчик, Григорий Подземельный, Валентин Спиридонов. Актеры: Дарья Балабанова, Марат Башаров, Оксана Лаврентьева, Александра Дыхне, Ирина Купченко и др. Мистический триллер.

2009

Барвиха. Россия, 2009. Режиссер Евгений Лаврентьев. Сценаристы: Шура Никитин, Александр Чалدرانян, Илья Артибилов и др. Актеры: Лянка Грыу, Марина Орлова, Анна Михайловская, Анна Хилькевич, Елена Меркулова и др. Драма.

Крыша. Россия, 2009. Режиссер Борис Грачевский. Сценаристы: Ирина Бурденкова, Борис Грачевский. Актеры: Софья Ардова, Мария Белова, Анфиса Черных, Мария Шукшина, Валерий Гаркалин и др. Драма.

Чучело-2. Россия, 2009. Режиссер Сергей Кузнецов. Сценарист Галина Арбузова (автор повести «Чучело 2, или Игра мотыльков» - В. Железников). Актеры: Елизавета Бирюкова, Василий Ракша, Полина Дядюх, Алёна Бабенко, Алексей Булдаков, Владислав Ветров и др. Драма.

2010

Детям до 16... Россия, 2010. Режиссер Андрей Кавун. Актеры: Лянка Грыу, Анна Старшенбаум, Павел Прилучный, Дмитрий Кубасов, Родион Долгирев, Алексей Горбунов, Ирина Мерцалова, Алексей Шевченко, Ольга Хохлова, Валерий Тодоровский и др. Мелодрама.

Кремлёвские курсанты. Россия, 2009-2010. Режиссеры: Валентин Козловский, Дмитрий Чирков. Сценаристы: Леонид Купридо, Андрей Чивурин, Александр Кушнаренко, Валентин Иванов и др. Актеры: Денис Береснев, Павел Бессонов, Аристарх Венес и др. Драма.

Старшеклассники. Россия, 2006-2010. Режиссеры: Ядвига Закржевская, Петр Смирнов, Павел Симонов, Татьяна Симонова, Галина Муртазина, Каролина Кубринская, Полина Бахаревская, Валентина Мозолькова, Денис Шибаев, Михаил Смирнов, Олег Тищенко. Сценаристы: Петр Смирнов, Мария Ошмянская, Антон Зинченко, Петр Внуков, Анна Кумачева, Иван Милов, Александра Лусникова, Светлана Сивак, Дамир Салимзянов, Михаил Годин. Актеры: Артём Анчуков, Полина Бахаревская, Александр Бахаревский, Наталья Бахматова и др. Драма.

Ранетки. Россия, 2008-2010. Режиссеры: Сергей Арланов, Валентин Козловский, Карен Захаров, Олег Смольников, Андрей Головкин. Сценаристы: Татяна Донская, Ольга Шевченко, Наталья Назарова и др. Актеры: Анна Руднева, Наталья Мильниченко, Евгения Огурцова, Валерия Козлова и др. Музыкальная комедия.

Школа. Россия, 2010. Режиссеры: Валерия Гай Германика, Руслан Маликов, Наталия Мещанинова. Сценаристы: Наталья Ворожбит, Нелли Высоцкая, Вячеслав Дурненков, Юрий Клавдиев, Иван Угаров, Ольга Ларионова. Актеры: Алексей Литвиненко, Валентина Лукашук, Анна Шепелева, Наталья Терешкова, Игорь Огурцов, Анатолий Семёнов, Елена Папанова, Александра Ребенок, Наталья Сапецкая и др. Драма.

2011

Белая ворона. Россия, 2011. Режиссер Сергей Быстрицкий. Сценарист Альжбета Горицвет. Актеры: Глафира Тарханова, Иван Жидков, Александр Лойе и др. Мелодрама.

Золотые. (Барвиха-2). Россия, 2011. Режиссеры: Михаил Соловьёв, Владислав Каптур. Сценаристы: Елена Любарская, Григорий Зельцер. Актеры: Лянка Грыу, Наталья Бардо, Марина Орлова, Анна Михайловская, Андрей Дементьев, Артём Волков, Равшана Куркова, Анна Хилькевич, Елена Меркулова и др. Драма.

Папины дочери. Россия, 2007-2011. Режиссеры: Сергей Алдонин, Ирина Васильева (II), Александр Жигалкин, Валентин Козловский, Эдуард Радзюкевич, Иван Агапов, Олег Смольников, Карен Захаров. Сценаристы: Вячеслав Дусмухаметов, Алексей Троцюк, Виталий Шляппо, Илья Полежайкин, Андрей

Дерьков, Александр Гаврильчик, Аскар Бисембин, Денис Хорошун. Актеры: Андрей Леонов, Ольга Волкова, Мирослава Карпович, Анастасия Сиваева, Елизавета Арзамасова и др. Комедия.

Универ. Россия, 2008-2011. Режиссеры: Пётр Точилин, Иван Китаев, Роман Самгин, Жанна Кадникова. Сценаристы: Вячеслав Дусмухаметов, Семён Слепаков, Илья Полежайкин, Максим Пешков и др. Актеры: Андрей Гайдулян, Валентина Рубцова, Виталий Гогунский, Мария Кожевникова и др. Комедия.

Институт благородных девиц. Россия, 2010-2011. Режиссеры: Леонид Белозорович, Сергей Данелян, Юрий Попович, Ольга Грекова, Сахат Дурсунов, Валерий Рожко, Александр Зеленков. Сценаристы: Юрий Беленький, Елена Ласкарева, Анастасия Волкова, Сергей Кушнир и др. Актеры: Алиса Сапегина, Александр Арсентьев, Иван Колесников, Ксения Хаирова и др. Драма.

Физика или химия. Россия, 2011. Режиссер Рамиль Сабитов. Сценарист Василий Павлов. Актеры: Любовь Германова, Александр Смирнов, Виктория Полторацкая, Мария Викторова, Анна Невская и др. Мелодрама.

2012

День учителя. Россия, 2012. Режиссер и сценарист Сергей Мокрицкий. Актеры: Анатолий Кот, Светлана Немоляева, Ирина Рахманова, Людмила Титова и др. Комедия.

Закрытая школа. Россия, 2011-2012. Режиссеры: Олег Асадулин, Константин Статский, Антон Новосельцев, Константин Максимов, Марк Горобец, Андрей Записов, Александр Зеленков, Сергей Пищиков. Сценаристы: Алла Максименко, Лусинэ Мартиросян, Оксана Васина и др. Актеры: Антон Хабаров, Татьяна Васильева, Павел Прилучный, Алексей Коряков и др. Мистический триллер.

После школы. Россия-Эстония, 2012. Режиссеры: Андрей Болтенко, Владимир Пресняков, Олег Пресняков. Сценаристы: Владимир Пресняков, Олег Пресняков. Актеры:

Сергей Шакуров, Михаил Пореченков, Михаил Трухин, Ксения Раппопорт, Александр Гордон, Анна Михалкова и др. Музыкальная комедия.

Частное пионерское. Россия, 2012. Режиссер Александр Карпиловский. Сценаристы: Алексей Бородачёв, Александр Карпиловский, Татьяна Мирошник. Актеры: Семён Трескунов, Егор Клинаев, Анфиса Вистингаузен, Юлия Рутберг, Светлана Иванова, Владимир Зайцев, Ирина Линдт, Раиса Рязанова, Роман Мадянов и др. Драматическая комедия.

2013

Географ глобус пропил. Россия, 2013. Режиссер Александр Велединский. Сценаристы: Александр Велединский, Валерий Тодоровский, Рауф Кубаев (автор одноименного романа – Алексей Иванов). Актеры: Константин Хабенский, Елена Лядова, Александр Робаков, Евгения Брик, Анна Уколова, Агриппина Стеклова и др. Драма.

И шарик вернётся. Россия, 2013. Режиссер Валерий Деятелилов. Сценаристы: Анна Аносова, Лариса Леоненко. Актеры: Татьяна Космачёва, Екатерина Травова, Полина Филоненко и др. Мелодрама.

Тайны института благородных девиц. Россия, 2013. Режиссеры: Сергей Данелян, Сахат Дурсунов, Александр И. Строев, Бата Недич. Сценаристы: Михаил Беленький, Юрий Беленький, Виталий Полосухин, Сергей Кушнир и др. Актеры: Алиса Сапегина, Алёна Созинова, Полина Беленькая и др. Драма.

Универ: день открытых дверей. Россия, 2013. Режиссер Роман Новиков. Актеры: Анна Кузина, Роман Петренко, Александр Дулерайн, Арарат Кещян, Илья Полежайкин, Юлия Галиченко и др. Комедия.

Учитель в законе. Возвращение. Россия, 2013. Режиссеры: Сергей Виноградов, Рустам Уразаев. Сценаристы: Василий Игерин, Андрей Тартаков. Актеры: Юрий Беляев, Сергей Векслер, Наталия Антонова, Олеся Судзиловская, Владимир Стеклов и др. Драма.

Цена любви. Россия, 2013. Режиссер Александр Хван. Сценарист Мария Никитина. Актеры: Анна Невская, Юрий Батурин, Анастасия Матвеева и др. Мелодрама.

2014

Ангелика. Россия, 2014. Режиссеры: Радда Новикова, Антон Федотов, Валерия Ивановская, Антон Маслов. Сценаристы: Ирина Журавлёва, Денис Остапчук, Денис Ворочай и др. Актеры: Ангелика Каширина, Ксения Теплова, Мария Баева, Любовь Толкалина и др. Комедия.

Выпускной. Россия, 2014. Режиссер Всеволод Бродский. Сценаристы: Александр Незлобин, Сергей Светлаков, Илья Бурец, Дмитрий Нелидов, Тимофей Зайцев. Актеры: Виктор Грудев, Кристина Исайкина, Ольга Хохлова, Сергей Бурунов и др. Комедия.

Дневник мамы первоклассника. Россия, 2014. Режиссер Андрей Силкин. Сценарист Мария Зверева (автор повести – М. Трауб). Актеры: Светлана Ходченкова, Дима Полунин, Дмитрий Ендальцев и др. Мелодрама.

Класс коррекции. Россия, 2014. Режиссер Иван Твердовский. Сценаристы: Иван Твердовский, Мария Борожанская, Дмитрий Ланчихин (по одноименной книге Е. Мурашовой). Актеры: Мария Поезжаева, Филипп Авдеев, Никита Кукушкин, Артём Маркарьян, Ирина Вилкова и др. Драма.

Мальчики + девочки. Россия, 2014. Режиссер Евгений Соколов. Сценарист Евгений Фролов. Актеры: Артём Минин, Влада Лукина, Наталья Меньшова, Андрей Максимов и др. Драма.

Овечка Долли была злая и рано умерла. Россия, 2014. Режиссер Алексей Пиманов. Сценаристы: Галина Сальгарелли, Елена Серова, Алексей Пиманов. Актеры: Данила Шевченко, Юлия Савичева, Виктор Сухоруков и др. Фантастика.

Семицветик. Россия, 2014. Режиссер Елизавета Трусевич. Сценаристы: Дмитрий Полищук, Елизавета Трусевич. Актеры: Светлана Немоляева, Иван Оранский, Анна Потебня и др. Мелодрама.

Учителя. Россия, 2014. Режиссер Вардан Акопян. Сценаристы: Ольга Ларионова, Яна Райская, Юлия Разумовская. Актеры: Марк Богатырёв, Ольга Красько, Ирина Розанова и др. Мелодрама.

Я не вернусь. Россия – Эстония – Финляндия, 2014. Режиссер Ильмар Рааг. Сценаристы: Ярослава Пулинович, Олег Газе. Актеры: Полина Пушкарук, Виктория Лобачева, Андрей Астраханцев и др. Драма.

2015

Клинок. Россия, 2015. Режиссер Сергей Пускепалис. Сценаристы: Алексей Слаповский, Сергей Пускепалис. Актеры: Алексей Серебряков, Ася Домская, Агриппина Стеклова и др. Драма.

Призрак. Россия, 2015. Режиссер Александр Войтинский. Сценаристы: Олег Маловичко, Андрей Золотарев. Актеры: Фёдор Бондарчук, Семён Трескунов, Ян Цапник, Игорь Угольников и др. Мистическая комедия.

Работа над ошибками. Россия, 2015. Режиссер Сергей Гиргель. Сценарист Екатерина Андерсон. Актеры: Ольга Бурлакова, Александр Никитин, Вера Полякова, Александр Душечкин и др. Мелодрама.

Сельский учитель. Россия, 2015. Режиссер Дмитрий Сорокин. Сценаристы: Анастасия Экарева, Кира Худолеев. Актеры: Артём Семакин, Ирина Таранник, Юлия Кокрятская и др. Драма.

Училка. Россия, 2015. Режиссер Алексей Петрухин. Сценаристы: Екатерина Асмус, Алексей Петрухин. Актеры: Ирина Купченко, Анна Чурина, Андрей Мерзликин, Роза Хайруллина, Алиса Гребенщикова, Ольга Егорова, Алексей Огурцов и др. Драма.

Частное пионерское. Ура, каникулы!!! (Частное пионерское -2). Россия, 2015. Режиссер Александр Карпиловский. Сценаристы: Олег Сироткин, Алла Гусева, Марина Шихалеева, Александр Карпиловский, Татьяна Мирошник. Актеры: Семён Трескунов, Егор Клинаев, Анфиса Вистингаузен, Василий Мищенко и др. Комедия.

14+ Россия, 2015. Режиссер и сценарист Андрей Зайцев. Актеры: Глеб Калюжный, Ульяна Васькович, Ольга Озоллапина, Дмитрий Блохин, Ирина Фролова, Шандор Беркеш, Дмитрий Баринов и др. Мелодрама.

Я – учитель. Россия, 2015. Режиссер Сергей Мокрицкий. Сценарист Алексей Бородачёв.

Актеры: Александр Ковтунец, Юлия Пересильд, Андрей Смоляков и др. Драма.

2016

Два отца и два сына. Россия, 2013-2016. Режиссер: Радда Новикова. Сценаристы: Александр Трофимов, Сергей Сазонов, Василий Смолин, Сергей Лебедев, Алексей Акимов, Станислав Гунько, Александр Завгородний, Александр Касьянов, Сергей Баронов. Актеры: Дмитрий Нагиев, Максим Студеновский, Илья Костюков, Виктория Лукина, Анна Якунина, Галина Петрова, Алика Смехова и др. Комедия.

Любимая учительница. Россия – Украина, 2016. Режиссер Леонид Белозорович. Сценаристы: Мария Бек, Елена Бойко. Актеры: Алина Сергеева, Олег Гаас, Ольга Радчук, Алена Узлюк и др. Мелодрама.

Первокурсница. Россия, 2016. Режиссер Валерия Ивановская. Сценаристы: Евгений Куратов, Вадим Фоминых. Актеры: Анна Тараторкина, Екатерина Симаходская, Алексей Анищенко, Аристарх Венес и др. Мелодрама.

Универ: новая общага. Россия, 2011-2016. Режиссеры: Рустам Мосафир, Константин Смирнов, Максим Зыков, Тимофей Шоталов. Сценаристы: Евгений Соболев, Антон Колбасов, Максим Вахитов, Юлия Галиченко, Илья Полежайкин и др. Актеры: Виталий Гогунский, Арарат Кещян, Станислав Ярушин, Анна Кузина, Настасья Самбурская, Анна Хилькевич и др. Комедия.

Ученик. Россия, 2016. Режиссер Кирилл Серебренников. Сценаристы: Кирилл Серебренников, Мариус фон Майенбург. Актеры: Виктория Исакова, Пётр Скворцов, Александр Горчилин, Юлия Ауг и др. Драма.

Учитель в законе. Схватка. Россия, 2016. Режиссеры: Борис Казаков, Александр Калугин. Сценаристы: Камиль Закиров, Виктор Михеев. Актеры: Юрий Беляев, Игорь Миркурбанов, Александра Флоринская, Юрий Цурило и др. Драма.

Физрук. Россия, 2014-2016. Режиссеры: Сергей Сенцов, Фёдор Стуков, Дмитрий Губарев. Сценаристы: Константин Майер, Александр Вялых, Ксения Воронина, Михаил Чистов, Алексей Ляпичев и др. Актеры: Дмитрий Нагиев, Александр Гордон, Полина Гренц, Анастасия Панина и др. Комедия.

Хороший мальчик. Россия, 2016. Режиссер Оксана Карас. Сценаристы: Михаил Местецкий, Оксана Карас, Роман Кантор. Актеры: Семён Трескунов, Анастасия Богатырева, Василий Буткевич, Михаил Ефремов, Иева Андреевайтэ, Константин Хабенский, Ирина Денисова, Татьяна Догилева, Ирина Пегова и др. Комедия.

2017

Реальные пацаны. Россия, 2010-2017. Режиссер Жанна Кадникова. Сценаристы: Антон Зайцев, Жанна Кадникова, Максим Филипьев, Юрий Овчинников, Денис Шенин. Актеры: Николай Наумов, Зоя Бербер, Антон Богданов, Владимир Селиванов, Станислав Тляшев, Мария Скорницкая, Валентина Мазунина и др. Комедия.

Притяжение. Россия, 2017. Режиссер Фёдор Бондарчук. Сценаристы: Олег Маловичко, Андрей Золотарев. Актеры: Ирина Старшенбаум, Олег Меньшиков, Александр Петров, Никита Кукушкин и др. Фантастика.

Филфак. Россия, 2017. Режиссер Фёдор Стуков. Актеры: Денис Парамонов, Алексей Золотовицкий, Василий Поспелов, Ефим Шифрин, Александра Бортич, Алексей Литвиненко и др. Комедия.

Спасти Пушкина. Россия, 2017. Режиссер Филипп Коршунов. Сценарист Елена Исаева.

Актеры: Константин Крюков, Ирина Крутик, Алексей Лукин и др. Комедия.

Частное пионерское – 3. Россия, 2017. Режиссер Александр Карпиловский. Сценаристы:

Олег Сироткин, Алла Максименко, Александр Карпиловский. Актеры: Семён Трескунов, Егор Клинаев, Анфиса Вистингаузен, Олег Блинов и др. Комедия.

References

- Age of sexual consent in Europe*. 08/23/2017. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%92%D0%BE%D0%B7%D1%80%D0%B0%D1%81%D1%82_%D1%81%D0%B5%D0%BA%D1%81%D1%83%D0%B0%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%BE_%D1%81%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%BB%D0%B0%D1%81%D0%B8%D1%8F_%D0%B2_%D0%95%D0%B2%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%BF%D0%B5
- Alenushkina, V. (2013). Mom, I want to be a pioneer! *Ovideo.ru*. September, 15. <http://www.ovideo.ru/review/42769#ixzz4nyWXaXFX>
- Anninsky, L. (1991). *The sixties and we*. Moscow: Cinema Center, 255 p.
- Anninsky, L.A. (2006). *Late tears*. Moscow: Eisenstein-Center, VGIK, 432 p.
- Arcus, L. (2010). Adventures of a white crow: evolution of a "school film" in Soviet cinema. *Seance*. June, 2. <http://seance.ru/blog/whitecrow/>
- Arkhangelsky, A. (2015). We are an uplifting nightmare. *Ogonek*. 2015. August, 17. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2785973>
- Arkhangelsky, A. (2017). The poet did not die. *Ogonek*. May, 1. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/3281128>
- Aronson, O.V. (2003). *Metacinema*. Moscow: Ad Marginem.
- Artamonova, A. (2013). School for Fools. *New Kaliningrad*. 2013. <https://www.newkaliningrad.ru/afisha/cinema/reviews/2814963-shkola-dlya-durakov.html>
- Artemieva, E.A. (2015). *Typology of images of adolescents in the Soviet film drama 1960s-1980s*. PhD Dis. Moscow, 2015.
- Atamanova, N. (1979). Grasshopper. *Sputnik of the viewer*, № 5.
- Ayers, W. (1994). A Teacher Ain't Nothin' But a Hero: Teachers and Teaching in Film. In Joseph, P., & Burnaford, G. (Eds.). *Images of Schoolteachers in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 147-156.
- Baranov, O. (1979). *The screen becomes a friend*. Moscow: Education, 96 p.
- Bauer, D. (1998). Indecent Proposals: Teachers in the Movies. *College English*. 60 (3), 301-317.
- Bazalgette, C. (1995). *Key Aspects of Media Education*. Moscow: Association for Film Education.
- Bednov, S. (2012). Sleepless after school. *Trud*. No. 173. November 27.
- Bell, A. (1996). *Approaches to media discourse*. London: Blackwell.
- Belokurov, B. (2009). The novel about the girls. *Tomorrow*. № 16 (804). April, 15.
- Belyaeva, G.A., Mikhaylin, V.Y. (2015). Soviet school cinema: the birth of the genre. *Islands of Utopia: the pedagogical and social design of the post-war school (1940s-1990s)*. Moscow: New Literature Review, 549-596.
- Bogomolov, Y. Love them with black ones. *Cinema Art*. 2010. № 1. <http://kinoart.ru/archive/2010/01/n1-article25>
- Burbach, H.J. and Figgins, M.A. (1993). A Thematic Profile of the Images of Teachers in Film. *Teacher Education Quarterly*. Vol. 20, No. 2, 65-75.
- Bykov, D. (2007). Eastern syndrome. *Seance*. № 37-38. <http://seance.ru/n/37-38/movies-37-38/lostempire/vostochniy-sindrom/>
- Cappelletto, G. (2017). *Análisis del doblaje de la serie de televisión "Física o Química"*. Tesi di Laurea. Padova: Università degli Studi di Padova, 146 p. http://tesi.cab.unipd.it/54793/1/GIULIO_CAPPELLETTO_2017.pdf
- Changes and amendments to the Federal Law of May 5, 2014 to Federal Law No. 53 On the State Language of the Russian Federation* (dated June 1, 2005). <http://base.garant.ru/12140387/#friends#ixzz4p3qU4Uo0>
- Chashchukhin, A.V. (2006). The construction of the teacher's image in the Stalinist propaganda of 1945-1953. *Human. Society. Control*, № 3, 132-135.
- Considine, D. (1985). *The Cinema of Adolescence*. Jefferson and London, UK: McFarland & Company.
- Crume, M. (1988). *Images of Teachers in Novels and Films for the Adolescent, 1980-1987*. PhD Dis., University of Florida.
- Dalton, M. (1999). *The Hollywood Curriculum: Teachers and Teaching in the Movies*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Demin, V.P. (1980) My Anfisa. *Sputnik of the viewer*, № 7.
- Derenkovskaya, E. (2008). *People with disabilities*. <http://kg-portal.ru/movies/rozygrysh/reviews/3887/>
- Dolin, A. (2013). *The Geographer Burned the Globe* - everyday cinema about real people. *Vesti FM*. November, 7. <http://radiovesti.ru/brand/61178/episode/1410641/>
- Dolin, A. (2014). Debut was a success: why it is worth looking at *Class correction* by Ivan Tverdovsky. *Vesti FM*. September, 25. <http://radiovesti.ru/brand/61178/episode/1418754/>
- Dolin, A. (2014). Graduation: our American Pie. *Afisha*. October, 14. <https://daily.afisha.ru/archive/vozduh/cinema/vypusknoy-nash-amerikanskiy-pirog/>
- Dolin, A. (2016). *A good boy*. *Vesti FM*. November, 11. <http://radiovesti.ru/brand/61178/episode/1432282/>
- Dolin, A. (2016). *Student of Serebrennikov and Listening to Beethoven* of Harry Bardin: the Russians in Cannes. *Afisha*. May, 13. <https://daily.afisha.ru/cinema/1507-uchenik-serebrennikova-i-slushaya-bethovena-garri-bardina-russkie-v-kannah/>
- Dondurei, D.B. (2010). PR-content, content-PR. *School* as an example of producer's work. *Cinema Art*. № 1. <http://kinoart.ru/archive/2010/01/n1-article2>
- Dubois, R. (2007). *Une histoire politique du cinema*. Paris: Sulliver, 216 p.
- Eco U. (1998). *Lack of Structure. Introduction to Semiology*. St. Petersburg: Petropolis, 432 p.

- Eco U. (2005). *The Role of the Reader. Studies on the Semiotics of the Text*. St. Petersburg: Symposium, 502 p.
- Edelman, R. (1990). Teachers in the Movies. *American Educator*. N 7(3), 26-31.
- Fanaylova, E. (2009). None of us will get out of here alive. *Seance*. № 37-38. <http://seance.ru/n/37-38/movies-37-38/vseumrut/nikto-iz-nas-ne-vyyidet-otsyuda-zhivym/>
- Farber, P., & Holm, G. (1994a). Adolescent Freedom and the Cinematic High School. In P. Farber, E. Provenzo, Jr., & G. Holm, (Eds.) *Schooling in the Light of Popular Culture*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Farber, P., & Holm, G. (1994b). A Brotherhood of Heroes: The Charismatic Educator in Recent American Movies. In P. Farber, E. Provenzo, Jr., & G. Holm, (Eds.) *Schooling in the Light of Popular Culture*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Fedorov, A.V., Levitskaya, A.A., Gorbatkova, O.I. (2017). School and university in the mirror of audiovisual media texts: basic approaches to the research problem. *Media Education*. № 2, 187-206.
- Fedorova, M. (2012). Welcome, or No Trespassing (1964). *Noah's Ark of Russian Cinema*. Moscow: Globus-Press, . 218-222.
- Gerber, A.E. (1989). "Boy, who are you?". *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, 124-129.
- Gerber, A.E. (1989). "We lost track of what to do to us!". *Soviet Screen*. № 15, 6-7, 10.
- Gladilchikov, Y. (2013). Dreams about Russia. Dream 1-st: *Geographer*. *Moscow News*. October, 31.
- Golubev, D. (2017). *Philological Faculty: Quiet humanitarian horror*. *New view*. <http://www.newlookmedia.ru/?p=53076>
- Gordeev, V. (2010). *School*. *Screen.ru*. October, 12. <http://www.ekrank.ru/film/2385/>
- Govorushko, U. (2013). *The Geographer Burned the Globe. 25th frame*. 2013. <http://25-k.com/page.php?id=3337>
- Grigorieva, O. (2007). The image of the teacher in the Soviet cinema: from the "Spring thaw" to "Big Break". *Visual anthropology: new views on social reality*. Saratov: Scientific book, 223-239.
- Gromov, E. (1981). School film waltz. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, 31-38.
- Gromov, E.S. (1982). *Becoming a hero (screen and youth). A teachers' guide*. Moscow: Education, 192 p.
- Guarinos, V. (2009). Fenómenos televisivos «teenagers»: prototipias adolescentes en series vistas en España. *Comunicar*, n° 33, v. XVII, 2009, pp. 203-211.
- Gusyatskiy, E. (2009). Pure specifically. *Seance*. № 37-38. <http://seance.ru/n/37-38/movies-37-38/vseumrut/nikto-iz-nas-ne-vyyidet-otsyuda-zhivym/>
- Hoffman, A. (2013). *The Geographer Burned the Globe. 25th frame*. <http://25-k.com/page.php?id=3337>
- Ivanov, B. (2014). School years are horrible. *Film.ru*. <https://www.film.ru/articles/shkolnye-gody-uzhasnye>
- Ivanov, B. (2015). A friend from the future. *Film.ru*. 2015. February, 18. <https://www.film.ru/articles/drug-iz-budushego>
- Ivanov, B. (2015). Little Vika. *Film.ru*. October, 2. <https://www.film.ru/articles/malenkaya-vika>
- Ivanov, B. (2016). Stupid of the Heavenly King. *Film.ru*. October, 25. <https://www.film.ru/articles/oluh-carya-nebesnogo>
- Ivanova, V.S. (1990). Madonna from the gateway (*Temptation*). *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp.149-152.
- Joseph, P., & Burnaford, G. (1994). Contemplating Images of Schoolteachers in American Culture. In: P. Joseph & G. Burnaford (Eds.) *Images of Schoolteachers in Twentieth Century America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kabo, L.R. (1974). *Cinema and children*. Moscow: Knowledge, 96 p.
- Kabo, L.R. (1978). *Cinema in the Aesthetic and Moral Education of Children*. Moscow: Education.
- Karakhan, L. *School. Snob*. 2010. January, 15. https://snob.ru/selected/entry/11457#comment_47410
- Kenez, P. (1992). *Cinema and Soviet Society, 1917-1953*. Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 281 p.
- Keroes, J. (1999). *Tales Out of School: Gender, Longing, and the Teacher in Fiction and Films*. Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Khlebnikova, V. (2016). On the fence painted boy. *Cinema Art*. № 6. <http://www.kinoart.ru/archive/2016/06/nazabore-narisovan-malchik-khoroshij-malchik-rezhisser-oksana-karas>
- Khlopyankina, T.M. (1988). Jester. *Satellite of the viewer*. № 10, p. 14.
- Khokhlov, B. (2014). Exercises in the beautiful. *Film.ru*. 2014. May, 15. <https://www.film.ru/articles/uprazhneniya-v-prekrasnom>
- Khokhlov, B. (2014). The main thing is not to get lost. *Afisha*. <https://www.film.ru/articles/glavnoe-ne-zapalitsya>
- Khokhlov, B. (2017). Real botanists. *Film.ru*. <https://www.film.ru/articles/realnye-botany>
- Khrenov, N.A. (2006). *Cinema - rehabilitation of archetypal reality*. Moscow: Agraf, 704 p.
- Khrenov, N.A. (2008). *Images of the "Great Gap". Cinema in the context of changing cultural cycles*. Moscow: Progress-tradition, 536 p.
- Khrustalev, V. (2009). *Grachevsky filmed his film, but without blackjack and whores: The Roof*. <http://www.obzorkino.tv/2009/11/04/krysha/>
- Kichin, V. (1977). Confrontation. *Cinema Art*. № 1, 41-52.
- Kichin, V. (2013). I give a private pioneer. Cinema as a way to reconcile the era. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. No. 6187 (211). <https://rg.ru/2013/09/18/kino-site.html>
- Kichin, V. (2013). The place of punishment is the school. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. No. 6212 (236). October, 21.

- Kichin, V. (2014). The Tunnel at the End of the World. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. No. 6486 (214). September, 12.
- Koretsky, V. (2009). *Yulenska*. *Timeout.ru*. <http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/142480/review>
- Korsakov, D. (2014). Jubilant Students. *Vedomosti*. No. 3699, October, 20. <https://www.vedomosti.ru/lifestyle/articles/2014/10/20/likuyuschaya-shkolota>
- Korsakov, D. (2014). The orphan was on the highway. *Vedomosti*. No. 3612. June, 19. <https://www.vedomosti.ru/newspaper/articles/2014/06/19/shla-sirootka-po-shosse>
- Korsakov, D. (2015). Romeo will live long time. *Vedomosti*. No. 3933. October, 6. <https://www.vedomosti.ru/lifestyle/articles/2015/10/07/611719-film-14-odin-luchshih-otechestvennih-filmov-goda>
- Korsakov, D. (2016). New *Eralash*. *Vedomosti*. No. 4201. November, 10. <https://www.vedomosti.ru/lifestyle/articles/2016/11/11/664443-horoshii-malchik-aneidotov>
- Kotov, D. (2015). Take care of the honor from the youth. *Post Criticism*. October, 9. <http://postcriticism.ru/chastnoe-pionerskoe/>
- Kovalov, O.A. (2016). *Studies of the strange*. St.-Petersburg: Séance, 328 p.
- Kruglova, T.A. (2016). Stockholm syndrome in the Russian school: film *Uchilka*. *Philological class*. No. 1 (43), 102-107.
- Kudryavtsev, S.V. (2006). *Review of the film Tomorrow was a war.* <http://kinanet.livejournal.com/227703.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S.V. (2007). *A tender age*. <http://kinanet.livejournal.com/573761.html>
- Kukarkina, T. (1978). Logic of Success. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, 118-121.
- Kulikov, I. (2008). About life. *Film.ru*. October, 24. <https://www.film.ru/articles/pro-zhyn>
- Kuvshinova, M. (2013). The shadow of the teacher. *Seance*. November, 7. Http://seance.ru/blog/reviews/geograph_kuvshinova/
- Kuzmina, O. (2012). TV series *After school*: incredible TV set. *Evening Moscow*. No. 215, p. 5.
- Kuznetsova, M. (1989). "Boy, who are you?". *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 129-131.
- Lawton, A. (2004). *Imaging Russia 2000. Films and Facts*. Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing, 348 p.
- Levshina, I.S. (1978). *Do you like cinema?* Moscow: Art, 1978, 254 p.
- Levshina, I.S. (1989). *A teenager and a screen*. Moscow: Education, 176 p.
- Lisitsyna, A. (2012). School of Skolkovo coffee makers. *Gazeta.ru*. November, 16. https://www.gazeta.ru/culture/2012/11/16/a_4856413.shtml
- Litovchenko, A. (2015). The cruel beauty is far away. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. October, 7. <https://rg.ru/2015/10/07/odinchetyre-site.html>
- Loshakova, D. (2014). *Graduation*: when we leave the schoolyard ... *Weburg*. <http://weburg.net/news/51079>
- Lyashchenko, V. (2008). *Joke*. *Afisha*. May, 28. <https://www.afisha.ru/movie/186559/review/224041/>
- Lyubarskaya, I. (2012). And once again study. *Results*. № 47
- Lyubarskaya, I. (2014). *Class of correction*. *The Hollywood Reporter*. September, 23. <http://thr.ru/cinema/recenzia-klass-korrekcii/>
- Lyubarskaya, I. (2015). *Clinch*. *The Hollywood Reporter*. October, 23. <http://thr.ru/cinema/recenzia-klinc-sergea-puskepalisa/>
- Machenin, A.A. (2016). The collective image of a school teacher in the reflection of the TV / Cinema / Internet media space. *Media Education*. 2016. № 3, 23-48.
- Malyukova, L. (2015). "Beat the muzzles ... better with your feet". *Novaya Gazeta*. October, 5. <https://www.novayagazeta.ru/articles/2015/10/05/65877-171-bit-mordy-8230-luchshe-nogami-187>
- Mamaladze, T. (1977). Composition on an unexpected topic. *Cinema art*. № 4, 75-84.
- Maslova, L. (2009). Psychology of Invertebrates. *Kommersant*. February, 20.
- Maslova, L. (2014). The Tale of the Hitchhiking. *Kommersant*. June, 18. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2492979>
- Matizen, V. (2013). What the geographer did not drink. *New Izvestia*. November, 13. <https://newizv.ru/news/culture/13-11-2013/192321-chego-ne-propil-geograf>
- Mikhailin, V., Belyaeva, G. (2012). The historian in hysterics. Teacher of History in the Soviet cinema of the 1960s-1970s. *Involuntary stock*. No. 5 (85).
- Mitina, T.S. (2015). The image of a teacher in the Soviet cinema of the first half of the twentieth century. *Siberian Scientific Bulletin*. № 2.
- Narinskaya, A. (2012). *After school* - without form. *Kommersant*. November, 20.
- Nefedov, E. (2009). *Yulenska*. *World-art*. February, 21. <http://www.world-art.ru/cinema/cinema.php?id=21667>
- Nefedov, E. (2010). Children under 16... *World Art*. September, 29. <http://www.world-art.ru/cinema/cinema.php?id=26443>
- Nikolaev, I. (2015). *Uchilka* will teach the life of both junior and senior. *Evening Moscow*. November, 27. <Http://vm.ru/news/2015/11/27/uchilka-nauchit-zhizni-i-mladshih-i-starshih-304403.html>
- Nusinova, N.I. (2003). "Now you are ours." A child in Soviet cinema 1920s - 1930s. *Cinema Art*. № 12, pp. 81-87.
- Oliker, M.A. (1993). On the Images of Education in Popular Film. *Educational Horizons*. Vol. 71, No. 2.
- Paisova, E., Dementieva, A. (2010). Hamsters protest, and this is good. *Cinema Art*. № 1. <Http://kinoart.ru/archive/2010/01/n1-article4>

- Paramonova K.K. (1976). *Film and children*. Moscow.
- Paramonova, K.K. (1975). *Films for children, its specifics, and educational functions*. Moscow: Publishing House of the Institute of Cinematography, 51 p.
- Penzin, S.N. (1973). *Cinema as a means of education*. Voronezh, 152 p.
- Penzin, S.N. (1986). *Lessons of cinema*. Moscow, 66 p.
- Petition: ban for the film *14+*. (2015). <https://www.change.org/p/%D1%87%D0%B5%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B5%D0%BA%D1%83-%D0%B7%D0%B0%D0%BF%D1%80%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%B8%D1%82%D1%8C-%D1%84%D0%B8%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BC-14>
- Plakhov, A. (2015). Jinn from a bottle of liquor. *Kommersant*. October, 12. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2831039>
- Pocheptsov, G.G. (2017). Democracy and serials: they are constructed in the same way for single purposes. *Khvilya*. August, 6. <http://hvylya.net/analytics/society/demokratiya-i-serialyi-oni-postroenyi-odinakovo-i-dlya-edinyih-tseley.html>
- Potapova, G. (2017). Poet in Russia is not sold until he was killed. *Movie poster*. April, 27. <https://www.kinoafisha.info/reviews/8326845/>
- Potter, W.J. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Thousand Oaks – London: Sage Publication, 423 p.
- Potter, W.J. (2016). *Media Literacy*. Los Angeles: Sage Publication.
- Pritulenko, V. (1995). Addressed to children. *Cinema, politics and people. 1930s*. Moscow: Mainland, 229 p.
- Pukhachev, S.B. (2008). Evolution of the teacher's image in the Russian cinema (the experience of analyzing the cultural memory of the generation). *Soviet culture in the modern social space of Russia: transformations and perspectives*. Ekaterinburg.
- Rabinovich, Y.M. (1969). *The role of cinema in the education of students*. Kurgan, 26 p.
- Rabinovich, Y.M. (1991). *Cinema, literature, and my whole life*. Kurgan: Periodicals, 120 p.
- Raikhlina, E.L., Yurchik, N.N. (2016). The image of a teacher in Russian cinema. *Young scientist*. № 13.2, pp. 60-62.
- Ramírez Alvarado, M.M., Cobo Durán, S. (2013). La ficción gay-friendly en las series de televisión españolas. *Nueva época*, № 19, pp. 213-235.
- Razlogov, K. (2010). School. *Snob*. January, 15. https://snob.ru/selected/entry/11457#comment_47410
- Razzakov, F.I. (2013). The industry of betrayal, or Cinema, which blew up the USSR. Moscow: Algorithm, 416 p.
- Report of the cultural department of the CPSU Central Committee on Y. Reizman's film *What if it's love?*, 1961.
- Resolution of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR "On measures to combat juvenile delinquency". 1935.
- Statement of the State Duma of the Russian Federation "In memory of the victims of the famine of the 1930s on the territory of the USSR." 2.04.2008.
- Resolution of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR No. 789 of May 31, 1943 "On the Introduction of Separate Teaching of Boys and Girls in the 1943-44 academic year in incomplete secondary and secondary schools of regional and regional cities, capital centers of Union and autonomous republics and large industrial cities."
- Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee (1969). *On increasing the responsibility of the leaders of the press, radio and television, cinematography, cultural and art institutions for the ideological and political level of published materials and repertoire*. January 7, 1969. Moscow.
- Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee (1972). *On Literary and Art Criticism*. January 21, 1972. *The Soviet Communist Party in resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums*. Moscow: Politizdat, 1986. Vol. 12, 170-173.
- Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee (1972). *On measures for the further development of Soviet cinema*. August 2, 1972. *The Soviet Communist Party in resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums*. Moscow: Politizdat, Vol. 12, 263-268.
- Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (1984). *On the main directions of the reform of the schools*. April 12, 1984, n 13-XI.
- Roginsky, A. (2010). Stalinism: figures and myths. Aug. 14 [Http://echo.msk.ru/programs/staliname/696621-echo/#element-text](http://echo.msk.ru/programs/staliname/696621-echo/#element-text)
- Romanenko, A.R. (1989). They and we. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 43-48.
- Romanova, O. (2012). And if this is love? *Noah's Ark of Russian Cinema*. Moscow: Globe-Press, pp. 190-194.
- Ruzaev, D. (2013). *The Geographer Burned the Globe*. *Time Out*. <http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/291256/review>
- Ruzaev, D. (2014). *I will not return*. *Time Out*. <http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/42854#review>
- Ruzaev, D. (2015). Love on the Mikrazh. *Time Out*. October, 8. [Http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/356139](http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/356139)
- Rybak, L.A. (1980). *Tet-a-tet with a film. On the art of being a moviegoer*. Moscow: BPSK, 57 p.
- Sazonov, A. (2010). *Children under 16...* *Time Out*. <http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/180909/review>
- Schwartz, J. (1963). *The Portrayal of Education in American Motion Pictures, 1931-1961*. PhD. Dis., University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana.
- Shakina, O. (2014). All conditionally, as in folklore crying. *Colta.ru*. September, 25. [Http://www.colta.ru/articles/cinema/4778](http://www.colta.ru/articles/cinema/4778)

- Shaw, T. and Youngblood, D.J. (2010). *Cinematic Cold War: The American and Soviet Struggle for Heart and Minds*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 301 p.
- Shipulina, N.B. (2010). The image of a teacher in Soviet and modern Russian cinema. *Izvestiya of Volgograd State Pedagogical University*, № 8 (52), pp. 4-16.
- Shlapentokh, D. and V. (1993). *Soviet Cinematography 1918-1991: Ideological Conflict and Social Reality*. N.Y.: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Shumakov, S.L. (1989). "For never was a story of more woe...". *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 131-134.
- Silverblatt, A. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut – London: Praeger, 449 p.
- Sobolev, O. (2014). And laughter, and sin: the series *Physical education teacher*. May, 6. <http://www.interviewrussia.ru/movie/i-smeh-i-greh-serial-fizruk>
- Soloveitchik, S.L. (1975). Teacher - a profession and fate. *Soviet screen*. N 20.
- Sosnovsky, D. (2015). History of the story was stolen. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. November, 26. <https://rg.ru/2015/11/26/uchilka-site.html>
- Sosnovsky, D. (2016). I do not want to study, I want to pray. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. October, 15. <https://rg.ru/2016/10/15/uchenik-chackij-v-iubke-protiv-mraka-i-bezyshodnosti-etoj-strany.html>
- Sputnitskaya, N.Y. (2011). Universchool. TV series *Physics or Chemistry*. *Cinema Art*. № 11.
- Sputnitskaya, N.Y. (2016). *The problem of gender in contemporary Russian cinema and serials: a critical introduction*. Moscow: Academy of Media Industry, 126 p.
- Stishova, E.M. (1992). Review of the film *Darling Ap*. *Cinema Art*. № 3, p. 135.
- Strada, M. (1989). A Half Century of American Cinematic Imagery: Hollywood's Portrayal of Russian Characters, 1933-1988. *Coexistence*. N 26, pp. 333-350.
- Strada, M.J. and Troper, H.R. (1997). *Friend or Foe? Russian in American Film and Foreign Policy*. Lanham, Md., & London: The Scarecrow Press, 255 p.
- Stroeva, A.S. (1962). *Children, Film and TV*. Moscow: Knowledge, 47 p.
- Sumenov, N.M. (1989). *They and we*. Moscow: Knowledge, 56 p.
- Suspitzina, T. (2002). On the teacher, husband and rank: (Re) construction of masculinities men - workers of high school. *About husband(N)bility*. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2002, pp. 303-324.
- The series *School* angered Moscow officials (2010). <https://lenta.ru/news/2010/01/12/schule/>
- Tolstysh, A.V. (1988). *Below 16 and older...* Moscow: Cinema Center, 64 p.
- Trier, J.D. (2001). The Cinematic Representation of the Personal and Professional Lives of Teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 127-142.
- Trofimenkov, M. (2016). The eternal youth of adults. *Kommersant*. November, 12. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/3138067>
- Trofimenkov, M. (2016). Vaudeville on the downed pants. *Kommersant*. October 15. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/3117697>
- Ukhov, E. (2013). Vitya Sluzhkin at school and at home. *Film.ru*. October, 27. <https://www.film.ru/articles/vitya-sluzhkin-v-shkole-i-doma>
- Ukhov, E. (2014). Stand up and go. *Film.ru*. September, 11. <https://www.film.ru/articles/vstan-i-idi>
- Ukhov, E. (2015). Class 2015. *Film.ru*. November, 29. <https://www.film.ru/articles/klass-2015>
- Ukhov, E. (2015). The Hostage. *Film.ru*. October, 18. <https://www.film.ru/articles/zalozhnica>
- Ukhov, E. (2017). A wonderful moment of the past future. *Film.ru*. April, 29. <https://www.film.ru/articles/chudnoe-mgnovenie-minuvshego-buduschego>
- Usov, Y.N. (1980). *The technique of using film art in the ideological and aesthetic education of pupils of 8-10 classes*. Tallinn, 125 p.
- Vilenkin, D. (2014). Redemption by brooms. *Postcriticism.ru*. 2014. May, 8. <http://postcriticism.ru/iskuplenie-venikami/>
- Volobuev, R. (2008). Cannes laureate, an authentic film about high school students. *Afisha*. 2008. October, 8. <https://www.afisha.ru/movie/188389/review/247240/>
- Volobuev, R. (2010). Lovely Bones. *Afisha*. January, 19. <https://www.afisha.ru/blogcomments/6037/>
- Youngblood, D. (2012). *Spring in the Riverside Street. Noah's Ark of Russian Cinema*. Moscow: Globus-Press, pp. 175-179.
- Yushchenko, A. (2010). *Rules of sex*. *Filmz.ru*. September, 20. http://www.filmz.ru/pub/7/20584_1.htm
- Zaretskaya, J. (2013). Love the Khabensky whitish. *Fontanka.ru*. November, 7. <http://calendar.fontanka.ru/articles/1127/>
- Zharikova, V.V. (2015). Chronotope school in the domestic film. *Historical, philosophical, political and juridical sciences, cultural studies and art history. Theory and practice*. № 5 (55): Part II, 59-62.
- Zhavoronkov, G.I. (1977). You, we... *Cinema art*. № 9, 41-52.
- Zorkaya, N.M. (1989). Freedom - yes. Joy – no. *Soviet screen*. № 8, pp. 14-15.

Fedorov, A.V., Levitskaya, A.A., Gorbatkova, O.I. *School and university in the mirror of Soviet and Russian cinema*. Moscow: ICO Information for All, 2017. 152 p.

* This research was funded by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation (RSF, project No. 17-18-01001) at the Rostov State University of Economics. Project theme: "School and university in the mirror of Soviet, Russian and Western audiovisual media texts". Head of the project is professor Alexander Fedorov.

School and university in the mirror of Soviet and Russian cinema

Electronic Edition

COPYRIGHT © 2017 BY ALEXANDER FEDOROV

1954alex@mail.ru

Publisher:

ICO "Information for All"

Mailing address: Russia, 121096, Moscow, box 44

E-mail contact@ifap.ru
<http://www.ifap.ru>