

Alexander Fedorov

**Soviet science fiction movies
in the mirror of film criticism
and viewers' opinions**

Moscow, 2021

Fedorov A.V. Soviet science fiction movies in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: Information for all, 2021. 162 p.

The monograph provides a wide panorama of the opinions of film critics and viewers about Soviet movies of the fantastic genre of different years.

For university students, graduate students, teachers, teachers, a wide audience interested in science fiction.

Reviewer: Professor M.P. Tselysh.

© Alexander Fedorov, 2021.

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
1. Soviet science fiction in the mirror of the opinions of film critics and viewers	4
2. "The Mystery of Two Oceans": a novel and its adaptation	117
3. "Amphibian Man": a novel and its adaptation	122
3. "Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin": a novel and its adaptation	126
4. Soviet science fiction at the turn of the 1950s — 1960s and its American screen transformations.....	130
Conclusion	136
Filmography (Soviet fiction Sc-Fi films: 1919—1991)	138
About the author	151
References.....	156

Introduction

This monograph attempts to provide a broad panorama of Soviet science fiction films (including television ones) in the mirror of the opinions of film critics and viewers. Certain parts of the text of the book were pre-tested on Yandex platforms, the portals Kino-pressa.ru, Kino-teatr.ru, on Facebook (where the author often received good corrections and comments; in particular, I Thank you for the constructive comments of Sergey Kudryavtsev and Igor Arkadiev).

Unfortunately, the distribution data for not all Soviet feature films (and there were more than seven thousand) are available (there are, for example, serious gaps in the distribution data of the 1920s — 1930s), therefore, the number of viewers for the first year of screening is indicated not in all cases. The number of millions of viewers in the first year of film distribution (on average for one episode, if there were several) is given, according to a number of sources (Belenky, 2019; For Success!, 1967; 1968; Furikov, 1990; Kudryavtsev, 1998; What viewers are watching, 1987; 1988; 1989, Zemlyanukhin, Segida, 1996, etc.).

It was not possible to collect data on some science fiction short—length films (in particular, not on all of the course and diploma films shot at VGIK).

The selection of feature films was not always easy. So, as a rule, films in the genres of fairy tales and mysticism were not taken into account ("Old Man Hottabych", "The Tale of Lost Time", "Snow Tale", "Kingdom of Crooked Mirrors", "Magic Robe", "Above the Rainbow", "Viy" , "The Mystery of the Iron Door", "Flight to the Land of Monsters", "Mister Designer", "Hotel "Eden", "Overnight. Friday", "Dina", "Family of Ghouls", "Revolt the City, Count!", "Lumi", etc.).

The book did not include adventure films (for example, "Sannikov's Land", "Island of Lost Ships"), dramas, parables, detective stories and comedies (for example, "Return from Orbit", "Ladder", "Dogs", "The Cure Against Fear", "Entrance to the Labyrinth", "Gray Disease", "Thirty—Three"), where the fantastic line was manifested very conditionally. Not included in the book and Soviet films of the 1920s — 1930s, which represent on the screen a hypothetical response of the USSR to the military aggression of Western opponents ("If There is War Tomorrow", etc.). The book does not include science fiction cartoons.

The book uses fragments of viewers' reviews on the portals Kino-teatr.ru, Kinopoisk, etc. as illustrations of the views of the audience about Soviet science fiction films.

In the filmography of Soviet science fiction films, as a rule, the year when the film or series was released on cinema / television is indicated.

I hope that the material of this book may be of interest to higher education teachers, students, graduate students, researchers, film critics, journalists, as well as a wide range of readers interested in the history of cinematography, problems of cinema, film criticism and film sociology.

1. Soviet science fiction in the mirror of the opinions of film critics and viewers

Abduction of the Sorcerer. USSR, 1981. Director and screenwriter Gleb Selyanin (based on the novel of the same name by Kir Bulychev). Actors: Natalia Danilova, Yuri Demich, Vitaly Yushkov, Anatoly Abramov, Anatoly Slyassky, Ivan Krasko and others. **TV premiere on August 5, 1983.**

Gleb Selyanin (1926—1984) has directed three dozen TV films, including the fantasy genre.

In the sci-fi film “Abduction of the Sorcerer”, graduate student Anna, who lives in the 80s of the XX century, encounters strangers who assure her that they came here from the XVIII century...

Reviews of the 21st century viewers about this film are generally positive:

"This movie — that rare case when one's own fantasy turned out to be very close to the body, an outstanding, exemplary thing, I liked it very much! And somehow everything is timely and in its place" (June).

"It's interesting to watch and there is something to fantasize about at the end: what happened next with the heroes from the future and the “sorcerer”. ... The only thing that disappointed me a little— modern speech of heroes after moving in time” (Owl).

Abduction of the Sorcerer. USSR, 1989. Directed by Victor Kobzev. Screenwriters Victor Kobzev, Kir Bulychev (based on the novel of the same name by Kir Bulychev). Actors: Julia Aug, Sergey Varchuk, Romualdas Ramanauskas, Victor Solovyov, Vladimir Gostyukhin, Andrey Boltnev, Lev Borisov and others.

Victor Kobzev directed five full-length feature films and TV series. "Abduction of the Sorcerer"— his only one work in the fantasy genre.

In the sci-fi film “Abduction of the Sorcerer”, graduate student Anna, who lives in the 80s of the XX century, encounters strangers who assure her that they came here from the XVIII century...

Viewers' opinions about the cinnabar version of "Abduction of the Sorcerer" are rather contradictory:

"The film is based on a very good, albeit not a masterpiece, fantastic story by Kir Bulychev, written during the heyday of his talent. ... One comment I have on this great film — the aliens look too mundane” (Alexander).

"Awesome hack. He stopped watching from the scene when in the 13th century a girl in modern slippers kissing one of the besiegers. As for the idea — a strange approach: save on the basis of genius, and let the not so ingenious perish. And if so, why not start with Archimedes?" (Fred).

Abdullajan, or Dedicated to Steven Spielberg. USSR, 1991. Directed by Zulfikar Musakov. Screenwriters Zulfikar Musakov, Rikhsiva Mukhamedzhanov. Actors: Tuti Yusupova, Rajab Adashev, Shukhrat Kayumov, Sergey Dreiden, Vladimir Menshov, Vladimir Tsvetov and others.

Zulfikar Musakov directed fifteen full-length films of different genres, including the simple fantastic comedy "Abdullajan, or Dedicated to Steven Spielberg", which tells how an alien ship crashes and an alien boy finds himself in the Uzbek collective farm "Communism"...

The opinions of XXI viewers about this film differ significantly:

"The film is very cool, you just laugh at every frame. ... This is one of my favorite films” (S. Zhuravleva).

“An incomparable film. Given the grim release timing, the comedy came out on time. The whole movie laughed. A very unusual genre — humorous fantasy” (D. Erokhin).

“Rare bullshit. I tried to watch it through to the end, but by the end of the film the roof almost left the stupidity of what was happening on the screen” (Larek).

Accident in Utinoozersk. USSR, 1989. Directed by Semyon Morozov. Screenwriter Leonid Treer. Actors: Evdokia Germanova, Lyubov Polishchuk, Vladimir Steklov, Alexander Pankratov-Cherny, Victor Ilyichev, Alexander Pashutin, Alexander Belyavsky, Valentin Smirnitsky, Boris Novikov, Natalia Krachkovskaya, Yuri Prokopovich, Svetlana Starikova, etc.

Semyon Morozov directed two full-length feature films, one of them is the fantastic comedy "Accident in Utinoozersk", where a prehistoric lizard suddenly appears in an ordinary Soviet lake...

Semyon Morozov managed to put together a good acting ensemble, but, in my opinion, he did not have enough comedic gift for a full-length film, although, probably, a funny short film could have been made from the proposed material...

Adventure of Electronic. USSR, 1979. Directed by Konstantin Bromberg. Screenwriter Evgeny Veltistov (based on his own book). Actors: Yuri Torsuev, Vladimir Torsuev, Vasily Modest, Oksana Alekseeva, Maxim Kalinin, Dmitry Maksimov, Evgeny Livshits, Valeria Soluyan, Nikolay Grinko, Elizaveta Nikishchikhina, Vladimir Basov, Nikolai Karachentsov, Evgeny Vesnik, Maya Bulgakova, Nikolai Makoyarsky, Roza Yuri Chernov, Lev Perfilov and others. **TV premiere: May 2, 1980.**

Konstantin Bromberg (1939—2020) directed only four full-length feature films, two of which — "Adventures of Electronic" and "The Wizards" — immediately fell in love with the multimillion TV audience.

In the year of its appearance on TV screens, "Adventures of Electronic" seemed purely childish fantasy with a funny plot and pleasant music.

But after several decades, this film not only became a cult, but also served as the basis for several dissertations and cultural studies.

And already in the 21st century, culturologist Ilya Kuklin noted that the "social" message "of the film about Electronic ... can be interpreted as follows: no, the ideas and practices of the "sixties" are not discredited, they can still be reanimated, despite a temporary defeat — but if two conditions: if the "sixties" do not "format" the next generation in their own image and likeness, and if this next generation reveals the ability for self-organization and self-development" (Kuklin, 2008).

Many of today's viewers still recall with nostalgia "Adventures of Electronic" as a favorite film of their childhood:

"This is my favorite childhood movie! All songs from this movie are the best! And the film itself is the best Soviet film!" (Vika).

"It's my favorite movie! The only film from which nothing could distract me. When the film ended, I was sad for a long time" (Spectator).

"A lovely film from childhood, magic music. The best of children's science fiction" (Andros).

Aelita. USSR, 1924. Directed by Yakov Protazanov. Screenwriters: Fedor Otsep, Alexey Tolstoy, Alexey Faiko (based on the story of the same name by A. Tolstoy). Actors: Julia Solntseva, Nikolai Batalov, Igor Ilyinsky, Nikolai Tseretelli, Vera Orlova, Valentina Kuindzhi, Konstantin Eggert, Yuri Zavadsky and others.

Since 1909, **Yakov Protazanov (1881—1945)** directed 114 (!!!) feature films, of which, as a result, only "Dowry" was included in the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films.

Returning from a short emigration, Alexei Tolstoy and Yakov Protazanov decided to demonstrate their loyalty to the authorities in the first Soviet science fiction film "Aelita", which was based on the story of space and other adventures of the Red Army soldier Gusev and the victory of the revolutionary Martian proletariat, equal to the advanced workers of the sixth part of the planet Earth ...

The cheerful soldier Gusev performed by Nikolai Batalov was not devoid of charm. The Martian ruler Aelita, played by the future companion of Alexander Dovzhenko, Yulia Solntseva, amazed with her harsh beauty. And Igor Ilyinsky successfully amused the audience in the role of an unlucky amateur detective ... Much in this film today looks naive and "cardboard". But at one time the authors achieved their goal — the movie had considerable audience success, and a wide and clear road was opened for Protazanov to the cinema of the Land of the Soviets ...

This quote from the monograph by Nikolai Lebedev (1897–1987) gives an idea of the opinion of the official Soviet cinematography about the film "Aelita": “An attempt to please the spectator of the capitalist countries was the first major production of the newly united “Mezhrabpom—Rus”...“Aelita” the company leaders relied on an export“ action movie”, technically and staging not inferior to the best Western European films, interesting both for the first—screen public inside the country, and for the foreign bourgeois audience. The film was supposed to be "large-scale" and "sensational" — with an unusual plot, a large number of characters, with popular names of the author, director and performers of the main roles. ... The release of "Aelita" on the screens of Moscow and Berlin was preceded by a large and inventive advertisement. ... The audience of the first—screen cinemas watched the film, but it left them indifferent. On the second and third screens, the film flopped. Even less success awaited "Aelita" abroad. The film was not received by any critics,

*Already in the XXI century, film critic Mikhail Trofimenkov, in general, expressed solidarity with the opinion of N. Lebedev, noting that in "Aelita" “*The mountain gave birth to a mouse. In the final episode, three mysterious words that earthlings took for signals from Mars turned out to be an advertisement for American tires, and the galactic expedition itself was a dream of an engineer Elk (Nikolai Tsereteli): too cheap way to get out of the plot maze is to declare everything that happens on the screen as a dream. The fact is that Protazanov, who had just returned from emigration, a "Smenovekhovets", "really wanted to do something modern." Before the revolution, the master made about 70 films, the titles of which read like a poem: "How the child's soul sobbed", "War and Peace", "How good, how fresh the roses were", "The Seagull", "One enjoyed, the other paid off", "Father Sergius". "Something modern" turned out to be a combination of the proven moves of tabloid melodrama and delightfully false revolutionary pathos. ... But Protazanov wanted to be a little more avant—garde... The masters of life wore archaic helmets that heralded Star Wars. The Martian proletarians were sporting some kind of cardboard boxes on their heads. And next to Aelita, her slave Ighoshka was voluptuously bending, suggesting that the Martian queen is an evil lesbian with a sadomasochistic bias. In short, "Aelita", if filmed, say, in Italy in the 1960s, would have every chance of becoming a cult film among thrash fans. However, Protazanov was ahead of his time, and "Aelita"

The opinions of today's viewers about "Aelita", as a rule, are sharply divided into "for" and "against":

“Wonderful avant—garde sets and superb performance by silent film actors made this film famous. Very interesting interruption of frames of fantastic Mars and post—revolutionary Russia. Shots of the film are still often cited, citing as an excellent example of the beginning of fantastic cinema” (V. Samodurov).

“I watched this wonderful film several times. ... I really love science fiction, then I was just carried away by the acting. Such an expressive game is nowhere to be seen. This is a real masterpiece of Soviet cinema” (A. Rozhkova).

“I watched this film many years ago, when I was in school, and I remember that then I really didn't like it because of the big changes in the plot. ... And then, silent cinema is archaic, and I don't really like it” (B. Nezhdanov).

Aero NT—54. USSR, 1925. Directed by Nikolai Petrov. Screenwriter Nikolai Surovtsev. Actors: Ekaterina Korchagina—Alexandrovskaya, Vladimir Voronov, Alexander Orlov and others. **The film has not survived.**

Air Seller. USSR, 1968. Directed by Vladimir Ryabtsev. Screenwriter Alexander Petrovsky (based on the story of the same name by Alexander Belyaev). Actors: Gennady Nilov, Gleb Strizhenov, Valentina Titova, Pavel Kadochnikov, Artyom Karapetyan, Evgeny Zharikov and others. **TV premiere on March 23, 1968.**

Vladimir Ryabtsev (1940—2014) directed only three full-length feature films. The screen version of Alexander Belyaev's fantastic story "Air Seller" is his most famous film.

Some bourgeois want to conserve all the air of the Earth, so that later they can sell it to a choking world...

I believe that if the film "Air Seller" was shot in color and with a more charismatic and well-known actor in the lead role (after all, Gennady Nilov looks like a scientist who got into the lair of a secret base for total air injection, it would be rather unattractive) would have had every chance of becoming a hit in the Soviet film distribution in 1968. Moreover, Gleb Strizhenov and Pavel Kadochnikov create extraordinary and ambiguous images on the screen, and the plot is indeed intriguing. But in the end, the picture was shot on black and white film and for television...

Film critic Alexander Rudenko believes that today "Air Seller" looks like "noiristic paranoid thriller with a ridiculous plot" (Rudenko, 2007).

Viewers' opinions about the "Air Seller" differ significantly today:

"Just the other day we were repeating on one of the retro channels. Accidentally hit and could not switch. And what a game! What are the actors! The idea again... Not some kind of oil, gas, yachts, gold and diamonds, but the life of all mankind. Without the idea of serving all humanity, our current series are worthless. The happiness of one particular individual is not interesting to me. And then, how well all these tunnels and rooms are filmed. Simply mesmerizing. Well, they don't know how to shoot like that now, they don't know how" (Ruinmud).

"I love the works of Belyaev. Today I reviewed the "Air Seller". The film, of course, is not in line with the text, in places it is delayed. Probably not everything that Belyaev wrote was technically feasible in cinema at that time. But the drama of the film is undeniable. ... The fewer the special effects, the more requirements for the actors' play, and here they are at their best" (Svetlana).

"I looked right after reading the novel. Vivid adventure fantasy and wonderful images turned into gray, sluggish, poor in invention and cheap cinema. And most importantly: the meaning and ideas of the novel are distorted. Even eminent actors do not save the situation" (A. Seleverov).

"The film is about how it is not clear where, it is not clear with whom, it is not clear what is happening. The stars of our cinema play in the film, but even they do not understand what they are doing in this film. The actions and speeches of the heroes are completely unmotivated. ... It's amazing that this could happen to one of the best novels of our wonderful science fiction writer Alexander Belyaev. The film did not work out" (Tygdym).

Alien Girl. USSR, 1984. Directed by Yakov Segel. Screenwriters Iosif Olshansky, Yakov Segel. Actors: Liliana Aleshnikova, Vladimir Nosik, Lyudmila Shagalova, Victor Shulgin, Andrey Yurenev and others. **5.9 million viewers in the first year of the show.**

Yakov Segel (1923—1995) directed 14 films, two of which ("The House I Live In", "Farewell Doves!") were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

In this fantastic comedy, an alien woman falls in love with an earthly man ...

Yakov Segel began with quite realistic films, but in the second half of the 1960s, unexpectedly for fans of "The House I Live In" and "Farewell Doves", he first shot the tragicomic parable "The Gray Disease" (1966), and then the fantastic comedy "Wake Mukhin!" (1968). Both of these films received a small circulation and went on screens without much success, and Yakov Segel returned to the fantastic genre only 15 years later in "Alien". Leading Soviet film publishers ("Soviet Screen",

"Cinema Art") preferred not to notice this movie. And this picture did not arouse interest among the mass audience. Perhaps because it seemed to adults too "childish", and to children — too "adult".

Viewers of the XXI century "Alien Girl" evokes polar opinions:

"I watched the movie "Alien Girl". A good film and subtly psychological in terms of the love of people from two different planets and in terms of knowing each other people from two different planets" (A. Markov).

"Extremely uninteresting. Into the furnace!" (Sazdinets).

Alien Ship. USSR, 1986. Directed by Sergei Nikonenko. Scriptwriter Vladimir Gubarev. Actors: Oleg Tabakov, Ekaterina Voronina, Sergey Nikonenko, Raivo Trass, Valery Gataev, Vladimir Steklov, Natalia Arinbasarova and others. **6.6 million viewers in the first year of the show.**

Alternative. USSR, 1987. Directed by Anna Victorova. Screenwriter Kir Bulychev (based on his own story "Choice"). Cast: V. Baranov, A. Zolotnitsky, E. Borzova, Yu. Sarantsev and others. **Short film.**

As a **film director Anna Victorova** (daughter of the famous director Richard Victorov) is known only for the short film "Alternative".

In the fantastic film "Alternative" the main character one day finds out that he is ... an alien.

The story of Kir Bulychev, based on which the film by Anna Victorova was staged, was already filmed in the 1970s by director Nikolai Lukyanov (1949—2008). His 1976 film was called, like the story, "The Choice."

It is curious that both "Choice" and "Alternative" are now thoroughly forgotten — both by film critics and by the audience...

Amphibian Man. USSR, 1962. Directed by Vladimir Chebotarev, Gennady Kazansky. Screenwriters: A. Golburt, A. Kapler, A. Ksenofontov (based on the novel by A. Belyaev). Actors: Vladimir Korenev, Anastasia Vertinskaya, Mikhail Kozakov, Nikolay Simonov and others. Composer Andrey Petrov. **65.5 million viewers in the first year of the show.**

Gennady Kazansky (1910—1983) has directed 16 films and is best known as a co-director of the fantastic film "Amphibian Man", but he also has such popular movie fairy tales as "The Snow Queen" and "Old Man—Hottabych". In total, four films were included in the thousand of the highest—grossing Soviet films ("Amphibian Man", "Old Man Hottabych", "Warm Heart", "The Snow Queen").

Vladimir Chebotarev (1921—2010) during his creative career, he also directed 16 films, seven of which ("Amphibian Man", "What should I call you now?", "Collapse", "Secretary of the Regional Committee", "Diamonds for Maria", "Shot in the Back", "Wild Honey ") were included in one thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

The screen version of the science fiction novel by Alexander Belyaev, made by directors Gennady Kazansky and Vladimir Chebotarev, was a huge success with the audience. Denis Gorelov is right: "the meeting between the seasoned storyteller, ... Kazansky and ... Chebotarev, inclined to adventurous adventures, was truly historic. Only this tandem was able to merge sparkling underwater ballets and acrobatic somersaults from roof to roof, duels of bathyspheres with pearling schooners and cunning shoots with a twin truck—set—up, Wells-style filmed cathedrals and hot Mediterranean dances a la; the Assyrian profile of Vertinskaya, the Neapolitan cheekbones of Korenev, the Castilian beard of Kozakov and the Scandinavian oval of Vladlen Davydov; neorealism, water park and operetta "Free Wind" (Gorelov, 2018).

However, despite the success of the film with 65 million viewers, Soviet film critics greeted the "Amphibian Man" with hostility.

For example, film critic Andrei Zorky (1935–2006) wrote: “Instead of the living element of the ocean, whose master and captive was Ichthyander, there is such an unthinkable beauty of the sea, where Ichthyander and Gutiere swim, dressed in spectacular costumes resembling silver wrappers from chocolate sweets. Well, the acting of the actors is in harmony with this motley spectacle. It is impossible without irony to look at M. Kozakov (Pedro Zurita), gloomily playing something extremely negative and highly non-existent on earth, at Vl. Davydov (Olsen), who has to embody the mysterious image of a persecuted journalist. One cannot look without regret at A. Vertinskaya, who failed to become either Green's Assol (“Scarlet Sails”), or Belyaev's Gutiere” (Zorky, 1962).

Another well-known film & literacy critic of those years, Stanislaw Rassadin (1935–2012), fully agreed with Andrei Zorky, assuring that about the “Amphibian Man” is “one could even write a feuilleton — there are too many rather elementary overlays and the most uncomplicated platitudes ... Underwater filming is really flawless, ... but the falsity of the entire imaginative structure of the film, its frivolous beauty tune in to a frivolous perception of everything that is done on the screen — even what is worth watching, what is worth admiring. Still, even the most remarkable technical innovations are not enough to create a work of art” (Rassadin, 1962: 7).

Another well-known Soviet literary and film critic Boris Galanov (1914–2000) was convinced that “the success of the quite artisan film “Amphibian Man”, a film in which there is neither real beauty nor good taste, but there is a lot of beauty and bad taste, causes not only chagrin and annoyance. This success makes one think about the fate of the genre” (Galanov, 1962: 8).

The verdict of V. Revich (1929–1997) was no less harsh: “What is A. Belyaev's novel about? About the tragedy of Ichthyander, about the collapse of the illusions of a lone scientist in the society of businessmen and traders. What are the ideas for the film? The political ones are reduced to depressing straightforwardness, the artistic ones — to a melodramatic love triangle and Ichthyander's tasteless Tarzan walks on the roofs” (Revich, 1968: 83).

Here it is — a typical in all its glory non-generic approach of ideologized socialist film criticism, when class-political conclusions are demanded from an exotic folk-fairy story, mixed with a bright melodramatic story!

As D. Gorelov correctly noted, the adaptation of “Amphibian Man” became “the first superblockbuster of the post-Stalin era. The cinema chain has never seen such a collapse ... Should a competent producer see the ocean of gold brought by a film about an amphibian ... But Chebotarev and Kazansky lived in a wild, ugly, ruthless world of freedom, equality and brotherhood, where profit is nothing, and piece art is not to the court. The duo of science fiction poets took their lungs away, laughed at the gills and threw them out with their baby fish into the world ocean. Critics scolded them for their lightness and attractiveness in the holy theme of the struggle with capital ... “Soviet Screen” for the first time blatantly falsified the results of its annual readership competition, giving primacy to a gray and long-ago dead drama ... “Amphibia” was pushed as much as third place,

At the end of the 20th century, the film critic Andrei Shemyakin, in my opinion, quite rightly wrote that “evaluating the “Amphibian Man”, criticism unwittingly played the role of the devil's advocate. She blasted the movie for the low taste and primitiveness of the production, but in fact fell upon one of the first attempts to create a full-fledged spectator cinema after the 1930s, free from the dictates of ideology, but almost indistinguishable from its similarity. Criticism then supported a completely new phenomenon — the emerging auteur cinema, having seen the ghost of this dictate in the cinema as a mass and accidentally confusing the cause with the effect. But is it not because the subsequent path of world cinema was so difficult (recall the ordeals of V. Motyl and G. Poloka), that its renewal would mean a real liberation of myths from the content prescribed by the State, while the evolution of auteur cinema, with all the conventionality of such a distinction, has shown not only the possibilities, but also the boundaries of debunking the myth by individual means? Perhaps that is why it is so difficult to revive genre cinema in our country ... that real mass illusions are not guessed and formed” (Shemyakin, 1992).

In 1997, one of the brightest film critics of the 1980s — 1990s, Sergei Dobrotvorsky (1959–1997), wrote about the phenomenon of “Amphibian Man”, emphasizing the connection between the film “Amphibian Man” and the motives of books and film adaptations by Alexander Green: “No less exotic the environment than clouds or the water column was abroad for Soviet cinema. When

constructing it, Soviet cinema always fell into a puddle. Paris, filmed in Lvov, or Tallinn, made up like Berlin, invariably betrayed needlework and handicraft. "Amphibian Man" was one of the few films where foreign countries turned out to be without giveaway and stylish. The southern port city, dark blue skies, bright sun and dust, street braziers and small benches almost smelling from the screen of vanilla, ginger and tobacco, were not attempts at a copy of the asphalt jungle or a vain attempt to peep through the crack of the iron curtain. Marseille, Algeria, Lisbon? Maybe Maracaibo or Georgetown? Or Casablanca? Most likely, Zurbagan is the capital of dreams, a ghost town invented and mapped in the 1960s by Alexander Green.

In the screen version of "Amphibian Man," Green seemed to really rewrite Belyaev. And not only because Anastasia Vertinskaya, who played Guttierre, had starred in the role of Assol from "Scarlet Sails" a year earlier... Belyaev composed social utopias, Green invented sensitive utopias. That is, he allowed feelings to become what they could have been, finally breaking with reality. In the early 1960s, two myths came together. The romantic story of a beautiful stranger, hermit and outcast has become an equally romantic love story, a deafening melodrama with a fantastic tolerance. Long before the soap operas, it had a bizarre tropical environment, the sea, the sun, pearl divers, night taverns, Andrey Petrov's cool ballad about "it's better to lie on the bottom" and the famous boogie—woogie "Hey sailor, you've been swimming too long!" (Dobrotvorsky, 1997).

Film critic and director Oleg Kovalov believes that "the cross-cutting internal theme of the art of the Soviet "thaw"... was the study of the dramatic and even tragic fate of the idealist — a morally perfect person who managed to appear in an imperfect and immoral world. The film "Amphibian Man", filmed in the genre of a fantastic extravaganza, in its own way and in the most unexpected way, expressed this leading motive of Soviet art of the late 1950s — early 1960s" (Kovalov, 2014: 7-8).

One way or another, but "Amphibian Man" with its humanistic concept and time—consonant reflections about the country of the free (internally free, about which the directors could not directly say), about responsibility for human life and his fate, has become one of the symbols of the just begun short-term the "thaw" era. And, of course, the film "Amphibian Man" (1961) became one of the first swallows of the genre of "environmental fiction" on the national screen. The theme of the scientist's responsibility for his discoveries was stated in a very spectacular form.

And one more thing: how to intertwine mythological and fairy-tale structures, the film "Amphibian Man" successfully corresponds to the Propp's (Propp, 1976; 1998) analytical approaches of media texts (Fedorov, 2008: 79–87).

The responses of modern viewers of the film "Amphibian Man" confirm that its authors have happily guessed the secrets of audience preferences:

"I really love this film with its magical atmosphere. How many years have passed, technically, camera work has undergone revolutionary changes, but it looks in one go. Yes, unusually colorful color rendition. Actors, the sea and amazing music — everything came together in a unique picture. Not to mention how nice it is to look at such young and so beautiful Vertinskaya and Korenev. Against the background of all this, the modern version of the series is simply vulgar" (Lika).

"Fantastic movie. How many years have passed, and there was nothing better than this film in this genre. Stunningly beautiful heroes — Korenev and Vertinskaya. Stunningly beautiful footage — nature and the underwater world. A film for the ages, a true masterpiece of cinematography" (Anna).

"Miracle! A fairy tale for adults! Sea, sun, rocks... The main character with a pure, unspoiled, deep soul. A proud beauty heroine. The villain in love with the heroine... The classic love triangle. And even if a little naive, exaggerated, but — great!" (Anastasia).

"As a child, the wonderful film "Amphibian Man" made a very strong impression on me — "sea devil", pearl divers, a unique underwater world, costumes, Latin American dances, music. I liked it so much that I went to watch it in the cinema several times. And when the filmstrip "Amphibian Man" appeared, he played it for a long time on a filmscope. It is with great pleasure that I watch the film now. The song "Hey sailor, you sailed too long" instantly became popular. It sounded from all windows. It was copied from each other to movie recorders. The hobby for swimming with fins also began. And narrow white trousers, like Ichthyander's, began to come into fashion" (Andrey).

"I knew this film literally by heart! The first time I saw him was in the third grade... I kept track of how many times I was able to watch this film — after twenty I dropped it... I came to the cinema with a camera and shot the most interesting shots. ... In 1971 I was lucky to buy a record with the music from this film — I just washed it down. But it is still kept! The film, of course, I now have on disk, is on the shelf in a place of honor. ... In short, I was quietly obsessed with this film... And here is my official opinion: this film is the highest achievement of cinematography in the genre of romantic cinema! This is not and will not be! This is the secret of his success" (Anti).

And It Will Echo. USSR, 1987. Director and screenwriter Gennady Tishchenko (based on his own story "Heritage"). Actors: Fakhraddin Manafov, Nadezhda Georgieva, Z. Khaidarova and others.

This is the only feature film by the artist, animator and writer **Gennady Tishchenko**.

"And It Will Echo" — sci-fi film, which combines game sequences with animation and documentary footage, tells the story of a hypothetical man-made disaster and deadly pandemic.

And then I looked back ... / Wedding photo. USSR, 1981. Directed by Raul Tammet. Screenwriter Svyatoslav Gervassiev. Actors: Rein Aren, Lembit Ulfsak, Raul Tammet and others. **Short film.**

Actor and director Raul Tammet staged only three feature films, two of which ("Solo", "And Then He Looked Back...") — in a fantasy genre.

In the fantastic parable "And then he looked back..." an alien from the future from another galaxy returns old man Ants in 1939, on the day when his wedding was upset...

The picture turned out to be stylish, mysterious, philosophically ambiguous... It is a pity that Raul Tammet did not return to filmmaking after 1983.

Andromeda's Nebula. USSR, 1968. Directed by Evgeny Sherstobitov. Screenwriters: V. Dmitrievsky, Evgeny Sherstobitov (based on the novel of the same name by Ivan Efremov). Actors: Viya Artmane, Sergei Stolyarov, Nikolai Kryukov, Tatiana Voloshina, Alexander Gai, Yuri Gavriilyuk, Lyudmila Chursina, Gennady Yukhtin, Alexander Goloborodko and others. **15 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Evgeny Sherstobitov (1928—2008) staged 19 full-length feature films, mostly "ideologically consistent" and designed for a children's audience, but only some of them ("Taking it all on ourselves", "Andromeda Nebula") managed to enter the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films.

In the year of its release, the "Andromeda Nebula" had less success with viewers than the previous Soviet films in the genre of space fiction — "The Sky Calling" and "The Planet of Storms".

And here, in my opinion, the film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929—1997) was right: "in order to stage films like the "Andromeda Nebula" well, you need a powerful material and technical base. Painted plywood, imitating the architecture and technology of the future, creates an intolerable falsity on the screen" (Revich, 1968: 85).

Film critic Miron Chernenko (1931—2004) in a detailed review on the pages of the magazine "Cinema Art" asserted that "the authors of the film — V. Dmitrievsky and E. Sherstobitov — did not bother themselves too much with searches. They simply transferred to the screen the appearance of the heroes of the novel — their statuesque and uplifting of their dialogues, their physical beauty and clear eyes, their broad shoulders and curly hair. For the role of Gift of the Wind, they were looking for a hero—lover of the thirties and forties and chose Sergei Stolyarov. ... Indeed, let us take a look at our planet as the filmmakers portray it. What's going on on Earth? There can be only one answer: nothing happens, absolutely nothing. All problems have been resolved, all the activities of multibillion—dollar mankind are reduced only to reading reports for underdeveloped civilizations of space and to the discovery of new planets.

The mildest version of the review of the film “Andromeda Nebula” in 1968 was offered only by film critic Romil Sobolev (1926–1991), noting that “an attempt ... to transfer the “Andromeda Nebula” to the screen ... should be welcomed. Of course, if we start comparing the novel and the film, then, perhaps, the filmmakers will be in trouble, because they again failed to convey the full depth of Efremov's social fiction. But the film is interesting for its stunt filming, showing the technology of the future, and, finally, an even attempt to present on the screen what is the so-called adventure line in the novel” (Sobolev, 1968: 14).

Interest in the “Andromeda Nebula” has not faded into the 21st century.

For example, film critic Evgeny Nefedov believes that “Sherstobitov hardly claimed to take intellectual heights ... but it's a shame that the idealization of characters has led to a certain simplification. ... Combined filming and special effects (although the term itself was not in use at that time), the work of stage designers and costume designers, even the choreography of a mesmerizing alien dance — all this deserves very high marks” (Nefedov, 2020).

And film critic Andrei Vyatkin rightly noted that “strictly speaking, the novel “Andromeda Nebula” was never filmed. Was filmed only the first series — “Prisoners of the Iron Star”, the title of which exhausted the content. Adventure director Yevgeny Sherstobitov felt on horseback, filming spectacular scenes on the planet of Darkness, with monsters and an alien ship. Well, the utopia about communism, of course, did not work out due to a false idea. After all, Ivan Efremov's landmark novel is socially outdated, and psychologically, it was monotonous in its time. ... The aesthetics of the film resembled the covers of the then popular magazines such as “Technology for Youth”, in particular, the scene of the rite of the feats of Hercules strongly resembled a pioneer lineup” (Vyatkin, 2003).

Current viewers continue to discuss this film:

Opinions in favor: “The film is great. No wonder Hollywood took many tricks from him. It is a pity that the continuation did not work out” (Maxim).

“The main advantage of the film is that an attempt was made in it to show all Soviet people what the communist future of our country should look like, and even with a rather good performance of the entire cast of the film. I advise everyone to watch this film, both adults and children” (V. Tikach).

Opinions against: “I watched this film in those years when it came out, and I did not like it for its excessive pathos and cardboardness” (Vladimir).

“Personally, I didn't like the film — it seemed weak. The characters talk pathetically, but ... nothing more” (Slava).

“I have never been a fan of Efremov's science fiction, it seemed too pompous in style, and there was no sense of humor. ... And this film also failed ... Most of the actors seem a little old... The episodes on the Iron Planet looked good, but the rest, as in the book, seems boring, naive” (B. Nezhdanov).

Apostate. USSR—West Germany—Austria, 1988. Director and screenwriter Valery Rubinchik (based on the novel by P. Bagryak “Five Presidents”). Actors: Grigory Gladiy, Nikolay Eremenko (senior), Larisa Belogurova, Valentina Shendrikova and others. **1.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Valery Rubinchik (1940—2011) directed 15 full-length feature films, the most famous of which were “The Tomb of the Lion”, “Wreath of Sonnets”, “The Wild Hunt of King Stakh” and “The Comedy of Lysistratus”.

In the late 1980s, a fashion for a genre called a fantastic parable with elements of a horror film arose in Russian cinema. Gone are the days when romantic stories about Ichthyander and astronauts appeared on the screens. Now the heroes of the film, if they left the surface of the earth, it was only to hide in mysterious and gloomy dungeons. Of course, the action of such a picture took place in an unnamed country with a dictatorial regime. Of course, the shooting (often joint production) took place in some exotic corners of the planet.

Then everything looked something like this: the dirtiest streets were chosen, dilapidated houses with walls covered with mold and muddy drops of water falling from the ceilings.

Disheveled characters with eternal bags under their eyes walked through the labyrinths of huge and empty rooms and corridors. They were silent for a long time, staring into the cracked mirrors. Or, conversely, they burst into endless monologues.

Here oak doors, darkened with time, creaked disgustingly, swampy swamp squelched visibly under the feet of the fugitives. On the ground and in the air, mercenaries from the "elimination service" scurried about, armed to the teeth. From time to time, beautiful and mysterious women threw off their elegant veils and in the twilight gleamed with the whiteness of their naked bodies...

Fashion also dictated one more unshakable rule: the shift of time boundaries. If a medieval knight had just skipped in the frame, then a minute later a black Mercedes would emerge from around the corner...

In the credits of such a film, there was always a reference to some well-known literary source, but a modest postscript "based on" made it possible for the authors to bring any philosophical novel or story to a common "terribly fantastic" denominator.

The very same philosophy on the screen either turned into a stream of words, or, on the contrary, hid in meaningful pauses, designed, among other things, to lengthen the picture by meters.

The favorite theme of the genre was the phenomenon of doubles. It doesn't matter: imaginary or real, caused by mystical forces or scientific experiment. I will add one more motive here: resurrection from the dead, ascension to heaven to the magic of an organ or flute ... Then, of course, environmental problems, severe condemnation of the degradation of the individual and civilization in general, and other elements, so to speak, "stalkeriads"...

True, all this, as a rule, was drowned among intricate scenery, long chases and shock scenes, where bloody streams slowly spread, bullets pierced human skulls, grenades and bombs exploded and laser beams sparkled with red lightning...

Another fad of fashion is satirical allusions popularly called "allusions" and "postmodern" quotes from sensational Western movies.

It was difficult for talented actors to play in such films, because their characters are subject to the harsh laws of puppets. The less gifted actors found it easier, but this did not improve the artistic merit of the film.

Perhaps only the operators felt like free birds here, striking their fans with exquisite compositions, unexpected angles and bizarre the play of color and light.

Alas, fashion demands its own. And even such famous masters as Valery Rubinchik sometimes find it difficult to resist the temptation. Before which he, in fact, could not resist in the film "Apostate", staged based on the science fiction novel by P. Bagryak "Five Presidents"...

The opinions of the modern audience about the "Apostate", as a rule, differ significantly:

"The film is very unusual, complex, atmospheric. I am impressed by this film, its mystery, originality, it's brilliant. It's good that Rubinchik made a non-commercial film and looked deeper. The actors played very strongly, the beauty Larisa Belogurova was very impressed with her acting" (E. Samylina).

"Interesting shooting, in my subjective opinion the influence of "Stalker" is felt. The plot itself, with a constant shift in time frames, is so intricate that it is extremely difficult to find a logical chain, however, perhaps this is the option when the more intricate the better" (Eugene).

"I really didn't like "Apostate": a boring, protracted, with a claim to intellectuality, the adaptation of the dynamic story of Bagryak" (Beastman).

Aquanauts. USSR, 1980... Director and screenwriter Igor Voznesensky (based on the story of the same name by S. Pavlov). Actors: German Poloskov, Alexander Yakovlev, Irina Azer, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, Paul Butkevich, Arnis Litsitis, Elena Valaeva, Nikolai Kryukov, Yuri Sarantsev, Artyom Karapetyan, Regina Razuma and others. **8,3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Igor Voznesensky directed 13 full-length feature films.

Igor Voznesensky is one of the most prolific directors of the 1970s and 1980s, making films of various genres, but always remaining in the third echelon of Russian cinema. "Aquanauts" is a

typical product of fantasy "for the poor." The film is set in a fictional Western country. Therefore, to make it more believable, it is played by Baltic actors. The plot intrigue associated with the dangerous experiments of a certain professor is not developed very excitingly and clearly. There is no need to talk about impressive special effects, although the underwater shooting was done with high quality...

"Aquanaut" was clearly not lucky with the year of release, where it got in 1980, when the screens of the USSR were filled with three super hits at once — "Pirates of the XX century", "Moscow Doesn't Believe in Tears" and "Crew". If "Aquanauts" had been released two or three years earlier, its audience would have been much more impressive.

I remember in the mid—1980s I had a rather long conversation with Igor Voznesensky. They mainly talked about his new (for that year) film, "Find Guilty." But, of course, in the conversation we could not help but touch on the "Aquanauts". Igor Voznesensky very interestingly told me about the difficulties of underwater filming, about how the leading film publishers for some reason ignored his picture... In general, it seemed to me that he was very wounded by critical remarks to his films...

Now, many years later, I understand that if Igor Voznesensky's initiatives in the field of fantastic cinema in the 1970s had been truly supported financially, and censorship had not spoiled his nerves, he could have made a lot of films interesting for a mass audience. But alas...

So then he had to shoot not fiction, but "Attention! To all posts..."

The opinions of today's viewers about "Aquanauts", as a rule, are sharply divided into "for" and "against":

"The film is interesting. Exciting plot. There were times when it was really scary considering the film is fantastic. ... The actors there are also good. I love Irina Azer very much" (Lensik).

"The film was released the year I graduated from high school. And since then it has had some kind of bewitching effect on me ... every time I can not tear myself away! ... And the film is really wonderful — slightly naive by today's standards, but very kind and romantic" (Evgeniya).

"Why am I a puritan in terms of film adaptations of literary works, but I support the replacement of an ugly squid with an elegant manta ray with all my limbs. Everything else, in general, is more or less close to Pavlov's text — as far as possible in the pre-computer era (the "costumes" of aquanauts, you must agree, can only be adequately drawn with current technical means). Very decent underwater shooting — not a gram worse than Hollywood of the same time. In a word, the normal European science fiction of its time with a nice general humanistic message" (Sidemun).

"An absolutely amazing movie! I fell on him by accident, in the fifth grade, a lot was not clear then ... This is now, from the height of the past years ... To meet the lost love ... And again to lose it! Irina Azer is amazing! And what music is in the film, it is absolute!" (D. Pyankov).

"Surprisingly boring film. Like almost all Soviet science fiction. Only this song is good from the whole movie" (Kmeed).

"What pisses me off about the film is the ridiculous pathos. All these white clothes, "oaths of aquanauts", some stupid a la pioneer lines, rally chatter and other crap in the same spirit. In the book, an aquanaut is just a job, but here they've turned some circus around" (Balrog).

Barrier. USSR, 1991. Director Zaza Iluridze (based on the story of Pavel Vezhinov). Actors: Rodion Nakhapetov, Vera Glagoleva and others. **Short film.**

Zaza Iluridze (1942—2007) during her creative career she managed to direct only one full—length feature film and a couple of short films ...

"Barrier" — a fantastic film about love and a girl who can fly...

In 1979, the novel by Pavel Vezhinov (1914—1983) was already filmed in Bulgaria, the main male role there was impressively played by Innokenty Smoktunovsky (1925—1994).

Birthmark. USSR, 1986. Directed by Leonid Gorovets. Screenwriter Kir Bulychev (based on his own story "Birthmarks"). Actors: Vladimir Nikolenko, Irina Pulina, Maria Vinogradova and others. **Short film.**

Leonid Horovets (1950—2013) directed eight full-length feature films, the most famous of which was "The Lady's Tailor" (1990). "Birthmark" is his short film debut.

The fantastic comedy "Birthmark" tells about the unusual consequences of an alien ship's visit to Earth...

The situations played out in the film are rather amusing, although the picture does not achieve true comedic brilliance...

Boomerang. USSR, 1980. Directed by Victor Prokhorov. Screenwriter Alexander Lapshin. Actors: Bob Tsymba, Anatoly Solonitsyn, Paul Butkevich, Algimantas Masiulis, Laimonas Noreika, Lembit Ulfsak and others. **Short film.**

Victor Prokhorov directed only three full-length feature films ("Seraphim Polubes and Other Inhabitants of the Earth", "Old Alphabet", "Satisfy My Sorrows"), and he made his debut with the short fantastic film "Boomerang".

In "Boomerang", the racist Sheriff MacLaine gets into a car accident and gets horrendous burns. In the clinic, the skin of the deceased black man Jim Taylor is transplanted to him...

Bright Personality. USSR, 1989. Directed by Alexander Pavlovsky. Screenwriters Igor Shevtsov, Alexander Pavlovsky (based on the story "The Bright Personality", the story "Kloop", the play "A Strong Feeling" by Ilya Ilf and Yevgeny Petrov). Actors: Nikolai Karachentsov, Alexandra Yakovleva, Abessalom Loria, Galina Polskikh, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Mikhail Svetin, Andrei Ankudinov, Borislav Brondukov, Victor Pavlov, Vsevolod Shilovsky, Alexander Demyanenko, Igor Dmitriev, Mikhail Kokshenov, Victor Ilyichev and others.

Alexander Pavlovsky (1947—2018) directed two dozen full-length feature films and series ("Ar—hi—me—ds!", "The Trust That Burst", "Bright Personality", "Marshmallow in Chocolate", "Zemsky Doctor", etc.), but the most famous of which, of course, the "Green Van".

Ilya Ilf and Evgeny Petrov once composed a fantastic comedy with a noticeable satirical bias called "Bright Personality". It was the story of the Russian invisible man. Director Alexander Pavlovsky, having gathered a good ensemble of Moscow and St. Petersburg actors, decided to amuse the audience with the film of the same name. The result is a good mixture of sitcom and comedy of characters with a successful play on the retro style.

Thanks to an incident that happened to one of the employees of a certain state institution, the idiocy of bureaucratic life takes on grotesque, but quite recognizable forms. Before that, Pavlovsky shot an adventurous comedy from the times of the twentieth century called "Green Van". Exercise with "Bright Personality", in my opinion, turned out to be no worse.

However, in the year of the premiere, film critic Natalya Lukinykh wrote that, in "Bright Personality", "apparently, both the director and the performers liked "playing Ilf and Petrov" — and this is already good. It is bad that the game sometimes became excessively fussy, intrusive, excessively theatrical and therefore not very funny" (Lukinykh, 1989: 6).

However, many viewers of the XXI century still like Bright Personality":

"Cool movie. And the humor is interesting, and the songs are not too long. It's a pleasure to watch. And in all roles, even episodic— only stars" (I. Vasiliev).

"The film is brilliant. One side— musical... on the other hand — sharp satire... The most interesting thing is that the film is absolutely relevant today. Take a closer look at the characters' images: do you recognize anyone?" (Evgeniy).

Captain Nemo. USSR, 1975. Directed by Vasily Levin. Screenwriters Vasily Levin, Edgar Smirnov (based on the novels by Jules Verne "20,000 Leagues Under the Sea" and "The Steam House"). Actors: Vladislav Dvorzhetsky, Yuri Rodionov, Mikhail Kononov, Vladimir Talashko, Marianna Vertinskaya, Vladimir Basov, Gennady Nilov, Alexander Porokhovshchikov and others. **TV premiere: March 29, 1976.**

Vasily Levin (1923—1998) directed ten full—length feature films, two of which ("The Tale of First Love" and "Stration's Daughter") were included in the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films. But the main and most popular work of Vasily Levin was the television movie "Captain Nemo" with Vladislav Dvorzhetsky.

"Captain Nemo" was originally planned to be shot for a children's audience, but in the end this picture became interesting for adults as well. Largely because of the leading actor — Vladislav Dvorzhetsky (1939—1978). His acting magic attracted the audience's gaze, his human significance, depth very well coincided with the image of the legendary Captain Nemo, whose adventures have been read for several generations...

But at first Mikhail Kazakov (1934—2011) auditioned for the role of Captain Nemo (and quite successfully). But in the end, director Vasily Levin chose Vladislav Dvorzhetsky. And I think I was right, the film "Captain Nemo" and today has a huge number of fans among viewers of different ages...

Of course, someone is embarrassed today in this film by the lack of special effects usual in the 21st century, someone is dissatisfied with the level of acting of some performers. Some, but not Vladislav Dvorzhetsky. This outstanding master, by his very presence, could raise the artistic level of almost any film.

Frankly, Vladislav Dvorzhetsky was and remains one of my favorite actors. I was lucky, I twice attended his creative meetings and listened with admiration to his stories about filming films, about his favorite roles and directors...

Already in the 21st century, film critic Yulia Ulyanovskaya ironically notes, that "Captain Nemo" "clearly uses the dressing room of the movie "Straw Hat" to dress the actors. If I remember correctly, around that time in Soviet cinema there was a fashion for musicals, and they always sang in all films. Since "Captain Nemo" was made with a pretense, and besides, it was about war and the ideals of good, neither the professor, nor the captain, nor the harpooner sing themselves (it would look somehow ridiculous), but the songs in their lives are still present, serving as a reflection of the thought process in difficult situations. ... The funny thing is that now I am laughing at their game and at the situation in general, and seeing twenty years ago I would not have noticed anything special. ... "Captain Nemo" is all about conventions. ... But: even though the present eye is funny and boring at the same time (and this is possible), this film adaptation, due to its conventionality, detaches from reality and carries the gullible viewer into some ordered and rather cozy space. Subordination is observed there, reason wins, the spoken words are so significant that they are almost material, the traitor and the enemy are explained and roughly punished, and help is rendered to friends — even with the last bit of strength. All this is smeared and sealed with an ideological tear about the balance of humanity and justice, and besides, it ends well. Ah, the seventy—fifth year, I did not know you at all ... Probably, it was a happy time. Now "Captain Nemo" is intended for people who watched it in childhood ... and are ready for a touching attack of light sadness with hysterics in half: "Do you remember how cool it looked then?" (Ulyanovskaya, 2008).

The views of the 21st century viewers are largely confirmed by the observations of Y. Ulyanovskaya:

"This is my favorite movie. I always cry when I look ... I don't care that there are no super—special effects. In such a film, they are not really needed. I can not imagine another actor in the role of Nemo except Vladislav Dvorzhetsky. Successful selection of actors" (Y. Niman).

"The film of my childhood! I still look! Very good music! I can't imagine anyone else other than Dvorzhetsky in the role of Captain Nemo. A film with meaning, makes children think and reflect. I consider it one of the best children's films" (S. Grinenko).

"Now, of course, the whole special—effect component of the film looks just with a smile ... But in Soviet childhood it was a favorite film, and the holidays were not a vacation without it!" (Alexander P.).

"Vladislav Dvorzhetsky is a real Captain Nemo. Such a textured appearance. The music is sad in the film, my heart aches, I want to cry. I do not like the seas and oceans, in the sense that I feel sorry for Ichthyander and Nemo, they are forced to spend their lives in this cold abyss, in this loneliness. But if about Ichthyander — a fiction, then here the background is very even true. Damned colonialists. Damned pale, eternally hungry Europeans, who dragged from other states to their stunted pages of wealth and objects of art. Moreover, they killed people who dared, you see, to resist these invaders" (Leta).

"20,000 Leagues Under the Sea" is one of my favorite pieces by Jules Verne. Therefore, I could not pass by this adaptation. ... What impressed me especially in this film was the absolutely amazing performance of Vladislav Dvorzhetsky. None of the Western performers of this role could convey the image of Captain Nemo so deeply. Although the image of Nemo in the film is still different from the original. On the one hand, he is much more human. Having gone under water, he not only rams ships, but also helps his former associates in India. At the same time, in the film, Nemo is much less emotional than in the novel ... Dvorzhetsky demonstrated not even 100, but 200 percent of his talent. Bravo! ... Well, and finally, it is worth noting the excellent musical accompaniment of the film. Each song is a separate masterpiece. Thus, despite all the differences from the original (both successful and unsuccessful), I would recommend this movie to absolutely anyone. If Jules Verne were alive, even he, I think, would have been pleased with such an adaptation of his book" (N. Volkov).

Chance. USSR, 1984. Directed by Alexander Mayorov. Screenwriters Kir Bulychev, Alexander Mayorov (based on the novel "The Martian Potion" by Kir Bulychev). Actors: Sergei Plotnikov, Igor Shkurin, Maria Kapnist, Dilorom Kambarova, Raisa Kurkina, Veronika Izotova, Victor Pavlov, Sasha Evteev, Lyudmila Ivanova, Maya Menglet, Elena Tonunts, Boris Ivanov, Igor Yasulovich, Sergei Zhigunov and others. **13.8 million viewers in the first year of the show.**

Alexander Mayorov (1942—2017) directed only four full-length feature films, and "Chance" remained his most famous film.

The fantastic comedy "Chance" is the debut of Alexander Mayorov in a feature film. A film with a fabulous plot about the magic elixir of youth, which fell into the hands of people from ... representatives of an extraterrestrial civilization.

The authors do not hide the conventions, the schematic nature of the masks of their characters. The 300—year—old grandfather talks with unhurried pride about his campaigns under the banner of Stepan Razin. A lively old woman with an elegant wave of her hand shows how she circled at the ball with... Alexander Pushkin. These few colors, perhaps, exhaust the depth of the images created on the screen.

This means that this is not what attracted the debutant. But what then?

Rather, a synthesis of genres. Undoubtedly, the combination of comedy and science fiction is fraught with richest possibilities, unexpected plot effects, sharpness of the pictorial series. Meanwhile, the director quite successfully coped with the "fantastic component", failed, as it seems to me, to give the plot a worthy comedic refraction. Other scenes were staged not without a humorous twinkle. However, this light is dim and quickly extinguished in the gloomy everyday episodes of "Chance", of which there are many.

So the heroes of the film have to repeat essentially the same thing — either lament over the unfulfilled, or elegiac recall of the lost...

In the year of the release of "Chance", the Soviet film press greeted him with restraint.

For example, film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929—1997) argued that "fantasy, especially everyday life, addressed today, only makes an impression when, despite the absolute improbability of the initial premise, the action takes place in strict accordance with reality. One must believe in one's own invention, however paradoxical it may be. If this condition had been met, it would probably not have been necessary for the film, for no reason at all, a car from pre—revolutionary

times. Or a duel scene, psychologically completely impossible. The film is made with such details as green leaves blossoming on the plank floor in the place where the elixir of youth was spilled. Alas, such finds are perhaps not enough to make the film's success more convincing" (Revich, 1985: 72).

Film critic Felix Andreev also noted that in "Chance" "film narration at times lacks integrity, the director's manner itself is still inherent in a certain fragmentariness. With solid, dynamic scenes, sluggish, amorphous episodes coexist, as if shot in a hurry. Unfortunately, these include the historical part of the film. ... Sometimes the filmmakers lack imagination and scope. For example, it is difficult to justify the appearance in the picture of some rather pitiful, drawn "flying saucer" and a somewhat shabby alien" (Andreev, 1984: 9).

Film critic Andrei Zorky (1935—2006) spoke more positively about "Chance" (Zorky, 1984: 2—3), but this was apparently obliged by the advertising status of this publication.

Reviews about "Chance" by current viewers are mostly positive:

"Great movie. Very funny and kind. ... You are very sympathetic to the troubles of the heroes" (D. Erokhin).

"This is my favorite movie. What could be better? And there is no need to look for flaws and miscalculations in the direction, you need to watch a wonderful film with gratitude. What is shown is what the authors intended. It differs from the story, but after all, the movie is to reflect its own version on the screen. The main thing is not to spoil or distort the plot. And the film "Chance" was shot with talent. And the actors play incomparably (whoever is not satisfied with their performance, let them look for ideals in other "masterpieces"). The incomparable talent of Alexei Rybnikov with his magical music decorates the film, makes it no less magical, emphasizing the very idea of the unusual plot and capturing the viewer somewhere into the distance for a dream. ... I first saw him in 1984, then again a few years later. Then I waited and searched for many years. Finally found it. Sometimes I turn it on and watch. Never get bored. I can turn it on at any time and plunge into this mysterious atmosphere again, giving a chance for something elusive. And this most elusive thing gives strength in any difficult life situation" (Alexey).

Charming Aliens. USSR, 1991. Directed by Nikolai Fomin. Screenwriters Varlen Strongin, Nikolai Fomin. Actors: Alexander Pyatkov, Irina Malysheva, Alexander Kulyamin, Raisa Ryazanova, Roman Filippov, Timofey Spivak, Alexander Belyavsky, Alexander Pankratov—Cherny, Irina Feofanova and others.

Nikolay Fomin directed three full-length feature films. The last of his films was released in 2008.

In "Charming Aliens" Nikolai Fomin decided to please the audience of fantastic comedies by inviting famous artists to the shooting. The intention is laudable. Needless to say, we have few comedies. Fantastic — even more so. And the plot of the plot is quite funny: an alien in a summer holiday home! But the result... Undoubtedly, I am unable to explain to readers who have not seen (fortunately) this movie, why it is not funny. Humor is a subtle thing. One hundred people in the hall will yawn with frustration, and two or three will tear their tummies with laughter. So, if you want, take my word for it: N. Fomin's film is heavyweight, old-fashioned and, in my opinion, simply mediocre. The melodies sounding in this movie, to the gnashing of teeth, remind the "socialist realist" tunes of the 1970s. Satirical jabs at the thieving bosses also do not make the "Aliens" more attractive.

Today's viewers are also generally not happy with "Charming Aliens":

"The dumbest, arrogant and demonstrative trashy song on the topic of aliens. Crystal ashtray in the role of a "flying saucer", the appearance of an alien with a cellophane bag on his head in some shed (Basement? Of an abandoned church?) With hand flares, "Bigfoot", in search of raspberries and apples flying on parachute straps?) and other special effects that have no analogues in the world. A freebie script "vashchenyach", ... and all the actors are frankly playing the fool in the frame" (Voice of Reason).

"The film, as they say, is a "C" grade! You can see it once, if there is nothing else else! But this creation does not cause much delight!" (Alex).

Children under 16 ... USSR, 1973. Directed by Igor Voznesensky. Screenwriter Vladimir Vasiliev. Actors: Seryozha Zavodchikov, Igor Shakryl, Victor Kozankov, Dima Kuntysch, Elena Valaeva, Evgeny Kindinov, Oleg Golubitsky and others. **Short film.**

Igor Voznesensky directed 13 full-length feature films, two of which ("Aquanauts" and "Attention! All posts ...") managed to enter the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

Fantastic short film "Children under 16...", filmed by order of the traffic police, tells how aliens violate traffic rules.

Choice. USSR, 1976. Directed by Nikolai Lukyanov (based on a story by Kir Bulychev). **Short film.**

Nikolay Lukyanov (1949–2008) directed seven feature-length films and TV series. The fantastic short film "Choice" was shot by him during his studies at VGIK.

According to the plot of "Choice", the main character learns that he is not a human being, but an alien who came to Earth as a baby, for whom his "brothers in mind" returned from a distant planet. What choice will the protagonist make? Will he stay on Earth?

Ten movies later, the same story by Kir Bulychev was filmed by Anna Victorova, her film is called "Alternative" (USSR, 1987).

City of Zero. USSR, 1989. Directed by Karen Shakhnazarov. Screenwriters Alexander Borodyansky, Karen Shakhnazarov. Actors: Leonid Filatov, Oleg Basilashvili, Vladimir Menshov, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Evgeny Evstigneev, Alexey Zharkov, Pyotr Shcherbakov, Elena Arzhanik and others.

Karen Shakhnazarov directed 15 full-length feature films, three of which ("Good Men", "We Are From Jazz", "Courier") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

I have heard more than once that Karen Shakhnazarov's film "City of Zero" is secondary and uses plot twists that have long been mastered by world culture, from antiquity to the present day. And the hero, from the "normal" world, enters the world where there is no usual coordinate system, is already a stamp in itself...

I'll try to argue with that. I'll start with the hero.

Leonid Filatov (1946–2003) seems to me to be the ideal performer of the role of the modest engineer Alexei Varakin, who arrived in the city of Zero for a business trip. Here Karen Shakhnazarov managed to destroy the train of stereotypes, which in the minds of the audience is associated with the roles of Leonid Filatov. For example, many of the heroes of this wonderful artist, who perform their official functions very energetically and assertively, feel rather uncomfortable and constrained in love scenes. The director professionally turns this circumstance to the benefit of the film, depriving the character of L. Filatov of any pressure and strong-willed magnetism, as if he projects the momentary stiffness and melancholic frigidity of the overactive heroes of "The Forgotten Melody for a Flute" or "Step onto All", without exception, the behavior of engineer Varakin.

The result is the ideal hero for a Ferris wheel movie, whose plot movement inevitably returns to its starting point. At the same time, the mythological roots of this "Ferris wheel" are most clearly visible in an episode in the underground museum of local lore, where a gray-haired scientific guide (E. Evstigneev) in a learned tone tells a stray visitor A. Varakin dramatic events of local history — from the sarcophagus of the Trojan king and one of the cohorts Roman Emperor Nero, before I.V. Stalin (with his famous phrase: "Soon the dawn, soon the sun will rise. This sun will shine for us!") And the brave dance of local pioneers of rock and roll ... the authors have created an excellent collection of stamps of Russian politics,

But the myths, alas, are embodied not only in museum mannequins, but in the whole life of such a strange and, at the same time, oh, how recognizable city of Zero.

The director of the plant (A. Dzhigharkhanyan), who has no idea what is going on behind the doors of his office. A prosecutor who dreams of committing a crime. An elderly writer (O. Basilashvili), in spite of his recent opportunism, falls into euphoria because the dance of his youth — rock and roll — has finally been rehabilitated. The insistent voice of the prosecutor, convincing Varakin that, in the name of the highest interests of the state, he absolutely must admit that he is the son of Nikolayev, a chef who committed suicide (or was killed?), Who in turn is a former employee of the Supervisory Inspection and a pioneer of rock and roll. What is it? A ridiculous invention of the filmmakers? If so...

Almost any, at first glance, the most fantastic plot twist of this picture has real confirmation. And when a certain boy informs Varakin in passing that he will never leave the city of Zero, will die in 2015, and on his grave it will be written: "To his beloved dad from the daughters of Yulia, Natasha, Tamara and Zinaida," you understand that this is not a joke either ... The hero of Leonid Filatov is doomed to live in the city of Zero ...

Yes, the authors of "City of Zero" used, as they say, a wandering plot frame, but managed to fill it with a very modern, witty and caustic content. It turned out to be a bright and exciting spectacle...

In the year the phantasmagoric "City of Zero" was released on the screen, the Soviet film press reacted to it with a heated discussion.

Film critic Zara Abdullayeva in the "Cinema Art" magazine: "Why did this film falter? Why, expressive in detail, does not it hold the frame of a solid structure? It's easy to blame a screenwriter stuck in the middle of a movie. But the director also failed to maintain the most difficult balance — really pioneering in cinema — between the drama of the absurd and the absurdity of Socialist Art, which involuntarily came to a satirical review, a stereo poster. Or maybe the problem is more complicated and the catch was hidden in an unbearable task, because the emasculated, dead and, in essence, straightforward nature of Social—Art does not lend itself to translation into a voluminous, dynamic cinematic dimension? One way or another, the audacious idea lacked a completely adequate artistic idea. Namely: to create (neither more nor less) a new cinematic genre, not in the sense of a set of certain components, a parade of techniques and a parade of actors,

Film critic Boris Berman wrote that he "would have sinned against his own conscience by calling City Zero an unconditional success. But I am sure that the film is a fundamental event for our cinema. Not because of the novelty of the problematics — but because the most important artistic task is focused here: a new approach to material requires updating the film language. Karen Shakhnazarov tried to do it. In my opinion, not everything worked out for him. But I am only one of the spectators" (Berman, 1989: 2).

Film critic Andrei Shemyakin drew the attention of the readers of the Soviet Screen magazine to the fact that "from the second half of the movie, attention is not supported by anything, and the scene of choral singing in the hotel is completely fading away. Leonid Filatov has nothing to play — he quickly exhausted all the reactions of surprise, indignation, shock, persecution, fear and fatigue, but in action he was not allowed to turn around, the energetic character of the actor was constrained, and he gave the film less than he could. Finally, there is a lack of fiction, as well as the depth of comprehension of history, and the background figures are absolutely not worked out" (Shemyakin, 1989).

Already in the XXI century, Igor Gulin and Elena Derbeneva considered that "the formula of the film "City of Zero" is simple: "feuilleton + hastily read Kafka + aesthetics of Social—Art, which in the late 1980s turned from elitist fun into a universal means of settling scores with native history. Another component is the protagonist of all late Soviet cinema: a weak—willed middle—aged man with sad eyes, receiving one of his last curses here. ... Bureaucratic difficulties from the first minutes turn into a popular guignol, and by the end of the film they develop into a small apocalypse. "City of Zero" is considered to be one of the films predicting the imminent collapse of the USSR. Although, in general, nothing significant has been said on this topic here. In Shakhnazarov's "Courier", realized two years earlier (also co-authored with Alexander Borodyansky), the wear and tear of the Soviet world was shown in a more subtle way. ... "City of Zero" was filmed in the era of the fall of both external and internal censorship. He persistently presents himself as an auteur cinema — a cinema where the director is free to do whatever he wants. Revenge on censorship completely constructs the flow of the film. It consists of a series of

shock effects. Everything that, if not really forbidden recently, then seemed inappropriate, falls out onto the screen. ... In contrast to the paintings of Abdrashitov—Mindadze, which are largely similar in style, "City of Zero" is not a parable. There is no allegory here, no indication of, perhaps, hidden behind the visible delirium, the invisible terrible meaning. This is really the zero point, the fixation of the death of Soviet cinema. And, perhaps, the birth of the post-Soviet. This is the catastrophe of liberation. External freedom turns into chaos, internal freedom — emptiness. Shakhnazarov's film is usually viewed as the funeral of the past, but no less is it a sentence to the future" (Gulin, Derbeneva, 2019).

And film critic Denis Gorelov emphasized that "City of Zero" is becoming an Aesopian anathema to perestroika. With an augur smile, Karen Shakhnazarov dissects seasonal fashion for the truth of history, the civil world of lions with monkeys and cathedral dances of lancelots with burgomasters on the carcass of a dragon that has died of old age" (Gorelov, 2004).

Those 21st century viewers who liked the "City of Zero" very often write about its predictive function and relevance:

"Great film. And it is especially interesting to watch it now ... It is also interesting that, apparently, the authors did not fully realize that they would make such a prophetic film. When the film was released, it looked like a phantasmagoria, but now everything fell into place, and our very life has become a phantasmagoria. The image of Varakin is the image of the entire Soviet People, which fell into the hands of the Soviet elite. It was she who created all this absurdity" (Toligo).

"Prophetic film. "You will never leave our city and you will die in 2015." Everything is just like that. This is our frozen society. ... is still absolutely relevant. Therefore, the movie is amazing. Personally, I am also impressed by the director's technique, when mystical and surrealistic elements are woven into outwardly ordinary reality. At first glance, this is an ordinary Soviet city. With houses, authorities, a factory. But further in the behavior of the heroes and in the chain of events, oddities begin, which all intensify. The external ordinariness of the scene enhances the feeling of otherworldliness" (A. Yasinsky).

But, of course, there are also viewers who actively dislike "City Zero" due to "incomprehensibility":

"I look and do not understand what he is talking about. ... What does the naked secretary have to do with it? Just to show nudity and somehow diversify the plot? And what about the head in the form of a cake? A very unpleasant scene. The dialogues are kind of boring and uninteresting. The main character (my beloved Filatov), in general, some kind of "dumbfounded" the whole film walks, all the time goes somewhere, runs, swims away, runs away, as if he was hit with a dusty bag from around the corner. From whom is he running, where? It is completely incomprehensible. Maybe from yourself or from reality?" (V. Nikitenko).

"I watched it once and probably won't. All this happening in the film resembles a slight insanity of all heroes with mental disabilities, and why this secretary must at this moment be in the costume of Eve, and not an alien, for example, is also incomprehensible. Probably, this is some kind of commercial step" (Dymok).

Collapse of Engineer Garin. USSR, 1973. Directed by Leonid Kvinikhidze. Scriptwriter Sergei Potepalov (based on the novel by A. Tolstoy "The Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin"). Actors: Oleg Borisov, Nonna Terentyeva, Alexander Belyavsky, Vasily Korzun, Gennady Saifulin, Mikhail Volkov, Vladimir Tatosov, Efim Kopelyan, Grigory Gai, Ernst Romanov, Vitaly Yushkov, Alexander Kaidanovsky, Algimantas Masulis, Valentin Premier Nikulin, etc. **TV premiere — October 15, 1973.**

Leonid Kvinikhidze (1937—2018) became famous for his television films "Collapse of Engineer Garin", "Straw Hat", "Heavenly Swallows", "June 31", "Mary Poppins, Goodbye" and others.

The Soviet press greeted "Collapse of Engineer Garin" with hostility.

For example, film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929—1997) wrote that although Garin "and utters loud words about the lust for power, but if you look at it, in the film he turned out to be a rather gentle guy. True, he decided two people, but solely for self-defense purposes. The factories were not

blown up by him at all. Unless he stole his mistress from a millionaire, but you must admit that this is still a completely different matter than the delusional, truly fascist plans of the novel Garin. The collapse of such a Garin and the collapse of a petty individualist who dreams of enriching himself with his discovery are, as they say, two big differences. Would you like to see such a refinement of the character of the protagonist as a modernization of the novel?" (Revich, 1984).

An even more offensive and biting article was published about "Collapse of Engineer Garin" in the "Crocodile" magazine.

Writer and critic Mikhail Kazovsky (who, by the way, soon began to work in the editorial office of "Crocodile") literally smashed Leonid Kvinikhidze's film in all directions, claiming that "the artist O. Borisov sparkled with eyes, so it was immediately obvious that he was playing a scoundrel. ... The film ended, and the viewer sat dejectedly in front of the TV. "What for? He thought. — Why was it necessary to spoil the book, if nothing is said as a result? Again I was mistaken for a round ignoramus who gladly eats a similar pate from Tolstoy's novel! Tell me, what did this film give me, apart from four ruined evenings?" (Kazovsky, 1973: 5).

However, already in the 21st century, film critic Irina Pavlova assessed "Collapse of Engineer Garin" quite differently: "Both Garin, Rolling, and the beautiful Zoya Monroz in Kvinikhidze's film are romantic figures in the direct understanding of a romantic hero as a person capable of much in the name of passion. In the name of the idea, in the name of their chimeras. But just such heroes must inevitably fall in a matchmaker with an organized, disciplined machine, with philistine mediocrity. It was this notorious tragic doom that made the central trio of heroes — regardless of love or enmity — the objects of painful sympathy. ... Borisov does the impossible — in one role he plays a man of honor, and a petty rogue, and a titan of thought, and an insignificant parvenu. About Borisov's Garin one could say "he is the devil!", If the place of the devil in this plot had not already been taken. ... It is difficult to remember in Russian cinema such an open struggle of passions, such vivid emotional outbursts with which this picture explodes, which is not at all about a hyperboloid and not even about power over the world. The picture is about people who do not know how (and do not want) to rule over themselves. And to match both heroes — a woman in this triad. Such a stylish, so fragile, such a Parisian heroine as Zoya performed by Nonna Terentyeva, also did not know our cinema until then" (Pavlova, 2010: 222).

I also recommend reading a detailed article by film critic Andrei Vyatkin, which provides a deep comparative analysis of two adaptations of the novel "Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin" (Vyatkin, 2020).

In my opinion, Leonid Kvinikhidze's film was far from being as simple and banal as it was presented in the reviews of V. Revich and M. Kazovsky. And the play of Oleg Borisov (1929—1994) in this film I can safely call an outstanding work in its carnival, semi-mystical interpretation. You can read more about this film in my article (Fedorov, 2012).

The views of 21st century viewers about "Collapse of Engineer Garin" are often opposed.

"Pro":

"I really love this show. In my opinion, all the actors are very well chosen: Garin, Rolling (both are simply great), Zoya — beautiful, smart, cold and scorching, as she was ... Captain Janis is good, although he does not appear for long" (Klauss).

"In this film, the title role was played by the brilliant actor Oleg Borisov. And that's it. Garin's personal qualities were conveyed by him with frightening authenticity, this is how this person should look" (Ilya).

"Contra":

"A monstrous perversion of the work! Tolstoy turns a propeller in his coffin! And the strangest thing: the novel is not so much fantastic as it is socio-political, and today it is so modern, relevant and sharp that the current censorship redirect to a different worldview channel would be quite understandable, but in 1973..." (Gefji).

"What a miserable movie! And this is how they imagined France and foreigners! The director put a cap on the actor — an airfield and at least someone pulled him up, said that it was ridiculous and ridiculous. Not to mention other clothes. All the actors are dressed like tramps. ... It has already been noted here — in one shot, trolleybuses and modern cars were visible through the trees. Didn't anyone pay attention to these and many other blunders? In a word, clumsy work. The film, which did not last, was not saved by the great Russian actor Oleg Borisov" (Vladkino).

Comet. USSR, 1984. Directed by Richard Victorov, Yuri Chulyukin. Screenwriters Kir Bulychev, Richard Victorov. Actors: Anatoly Kuznetsov, Nadezhda Sementsova, Alena Belyak, Dmitry Zolotukhin, Vladimir Basov, Svetlana Radchenko, Natalya Martinson, Valentin Smirnitsky, Fedor Stukov, Yuri Chulyukin, Pavel Arsenov, Georgy Millyar and others. **2.2 million viewers in the first year of the show.**

Richard Victorov (1929–1983) directed 11 full-length feature films, some of which were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

Yuri Chulyukin (1929–1987) started in fiction films as a successful comedian ("Unyielding", "Girls"), and this, in my opinion, was the best period of his career. In total, he directed 14 full-length feature films, four of which ("Unyielding", "Girls", "Royal Regatta", "Let's Talk, Brother...") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

Yuri Chulyukin was not at all going to shoot the fantastic comedy "Comet" (although there is only a robot out of the fantastic, and the action itself takes place on the southern beach), but the main director of Soviet Sc-Fi films for children and youth, Richard Victorov, suddenly died before he could complete the picture. So Yuri Chulyukin had to connect to the "Comet" at the final stage...

Of course, "Comet" is not one of the best films by Richard Victorov; moreover, it bears traces of censorship interference (which Kir Bulychev has repeatedly recalled).

But "Comet" has its fans today: "A wonderful film, how wonderful all the films of Richard Victorov are!" (A. Khakimov).

Communit. USSR, 1925. Directed by Yakov Morin. Actors: Lyantse, Banovsky, Vladimir Shakhovskoy, V. Arnoldov, Semyon Bryumer and others. **The film has not survived.**

Dandelion Wine. USSR, 1972. Director and screenwriter Rodion Nakhapetov (based on the novel by R. Bradbury). Actors: Maria Durasova, Vladimir Zeldin, Mahmud Esambaev, Inga Volodina, Andrey Musin and others. **Short film.**

Rodion Nahapetov directed 14 full-length feature films and TV series ("With You and Without You", "Don't Shoot White Swans", "Umbrella for the Bridal", etc.) "Dandelion Wine" is his thesis at the State Institute of Cinematography.

Today Rodion Nakhapetov's debut work looks, of course, naive and discipleship, but not devoid of charm and poetic charm.

Film critic Sergei Kudryavtsev draws attention to "miscalculations, in general, forgivable for a debutant: work with children is not very successful, some music and dance scenes are unnatural. But the feeling of the irreversibility of lost time still captivates, which is conveyed both by the actress Maria Durasova, playing the role of Mrs. Bentley, and in the plastic-montage image of things that have aged together with the mistress, and in a finely stylized old photograph with the girl depicted on it, who is looking at us with a sad and attentive look. The director succeeded in the main— to reveal the meaning of the story: a memory of childhood, of a long-vanished past — like wine made from dandelions, from something light and airy, ready to dissolve in space from just one careless movement or sigh" (Kudryavtsev, 2007).

Viewers' responses to Dandelion Wine are generally positive:

"Wonderful movie! Musical. ... the atmosphere is amazing. ... Unusual cinema" (Sazditsec).

Day of Spirits. USSR, 1991. Directed by Sergei Selyanov. Screenwriters Mikhail Konovalchuk, Sergey Selyanov. Actors: Yuri Shevchuk, Borya Golyatkin, Gennady Garbuk, Victor Semyonovsky, Olga Grigorieva and others.

Producer Sergei Selyanov has only three full-length directorial works. One of them is the fantastic parable "Day of Spirits".

The previous film by Sergei Selyanov — "Day of the Angel" (1980) — has been waiting for its premiere for almost ten years. Work on it was carried out in an "underground", semi—handicraft way, according to a purely friendly, royalty—free principle. Selyanov continued the paradoxical parable of his manner in the film "Day of Spirits". Having invited the leader of the "DDT" group, Yuri Shevchuk, to the main role, he counted not only on his dissident image, but also on his acting data. The calculation turned out to be correct. Yuri Shevchuk organically feels himself in the surrealistic element of the insane asylum, where his hero falls, over whom the dark personalities of the "apparatus" appearance want to conduct some bad experiments...

In my opinion, Shevchuk especially succeeded in the scenes of the riot: the heart—rending cry of his hero causes explosions and fires (the motive of the Nightingale the Robber?). As for directing, it seems that the best of all are retrospective scenes, reminiscent of the bizarre film world of "Angel's Day", where times and mores are mixed, where the absurdity of our existence appears in an allegorical and folklore version...

In the year the "Day of Spirits" was released on the screen, the Soviet film press took an active part in discussing it.

The film critic Valentin Mikhalkovich (1937—2006) (Mikhalkovich, 1991: 64—68) gave a high assessment of the phantasmagoric imagery of "Day of Spirits" in the "Cinema Art" magazine.

The journalist Eduard Grafov was convinced that the main thing in "Day of Spirits" is "it is some kind of strange, but with all the surreality of the real world of people inhabiting the film. They were all extraordinarily real in this mystical brew" (Grafov, 1991: 2).

Film critic Larisa Malyukova noted that the main character of the "Day of Spirits" is "a phenomenon. An "outsider" doomed to loneliness, who, however, is in a constant and tireless search for his adequacy to the world. With a painful effort, he breaks out of the "toy" village, and immediately turns out to be closed in the next circle. Here, in a special institution behind a high fence, experimental psychics and sorcerers live and are being investigated, and all this anomalous fraternity is under the vigilant attention of the KGB officers. The circles diverge concentrically — and the next one is closed by the frames of a big city. But even this space turns out to be hostile to the hero" (Malyukova, 1991).

And the film critic Alexander Kiselev in general, came to the conclusion that "to assess this film is a completely meaningless exercise. It is delightfully self—contained and complete. And if you do not like the cinema of Sergei Selyanov, then this picture will seem utterly disgusting. And if you like the cinema of Sergei Selyanov, on the contrary, you will be delighted with the film" (Kiselev, 1991: 41).

Day of Wrath. USSR, 1985. Directed by Sulambek Mamilov. Screenwriter Alexander Lapshin (based on the story of the same name by Sever Gansovsky). Actors: Juozas Budraitis, Aleksey Petrenko, Anatoly Ivanov, Grazhina Baikshite, Svetlana Svetlichnaya, Konstantin Zakharchenko, Maryana Polteva, Vladimir Ivashov, Evgeny Dvorzhetsky and others. **10.8 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Sulambek Mamilov directed only five feature films, of which only the detective "Especially Dangerous" managed to enter the thousand of the highest—grossing Soviet films.

A person finds himself in a mysterious zone, where extremely strange and supernatural events take place with him ... The situation is familiar from many science fiction books and films. The authors of the film "Day of Wrath" are trying to offer us their own interpretation.

...A certain TV director gets permission to visit a mysterious restricted area. On the journey, he is accompanied by a local forester and an uncommunicative bearded man. At every step they are in danger — screams and threats from the thicket, wolf pits. The people they meet behave more than strangely — they hide, shy away from conversations. They are scared, angry, hostile.

The director skillfully whips up an alarmingly tense atmosphere: the slowly unfolding action is interrupted from time to time by the invasion of non—human "otarks". Created by the evil will of a maniac professor, they are soulless, cruel, and their incredible abilities are directed towards one goal — to turn all people into werewolves — obedient robots...

The plot was based on interesting possibilities not only of a fascinating fantastic show, but also of a psychological, philosophical work. However, in the end, "Day of Wrath", in my opinion, turned out to be too slow for an action movie and too superficial for a philosophical parable.

Analyzing the "Day of Wrath" already in the XXI century, film critic Sergei Fomenko reminds that "At the dawn of perestroika, a fantastic film based on the story of Sever Gansovsky really frightened the still inexperienced Soviet viewer, forcing him to follow the twists and turns of the storyline with trembling in his heart and with dead silence in the cinema. Subsequent events of Soviet history completely shaded the memory of a fictional nightmare with no less eerie events of reality ... The director himself actively plays on the fear of the unknown: it is curious that, despite the seemingly trivially bearish appearance, the otarks never get into the camera lens. Instead, the viewer will see ominous silhouettes, roar and ... voices. The very "gramophone voice" described in Gansovsky's story is brilliantly conveyed in the film adaptation and is, perhaps, the strongest boo effect in the movie. Acting in the general context of fear of facing the unknown. ... At the same time, in its pessimism, the film went beyond the story: the final episode realizes what in the story was only Betly's dying hallucination. Otarks are already among us. They strove to transform themselves into people, and they turned into people. Now our leading scientists are otarks. Even the brilliant Fiedler, who offers a truly totalitarian idea — to eradicate feelings in the name of curbing the aggressiveness of the otarks and ... improving the rest of humanity. But he insidiously keeps silent that the aggression of the otarks comes precisely from their mind, unlimited by their conscience. Better a sensually—walking slob Sharikov than a forest of clubfoot (and evil) geniuses. Their destruction is no longer a matter of preserving humanity, but a matter of preserving humanity. ... Of course, dystopias will always be relevant, but the modernity of the "Day of Wrath" is that this story reminds us of the danger of neglecting the eternal question of the nature of humanity in a language we understand. And we talk about the "Day of Wrath" in order to preserve its message, its humanistic warning to descendants — in one word, to be remembered" (Fomenko, 2017).

As for the opinions of the current audience, they are divided between "pro" and "contra":

"The first Soviet sci-fi thriller I've watched. I remember that there was deathly silence in the cinema, and adrenaline was in the air — people, to put it mildly, were stunned by what was happening on the screen. After the session, my friends and I laughed kindly at what we saw, but deep in our hearts, at the very bottom of everyone there was a sticky spot of fear, and a colony of ants periodically ran down the back ... A wonderful film that I still remember" (Nikitich)...

"There is tension in the air. I agree that in the absence of high-quality special effects, Soviet filmmakers were able to frighten with minimal means with sounds, rustles, etc." (A. Pozdeev).

"Stupid movie. Nothing is clear. Everyone is silent, making faces, no special effects. Apparently, they filmed for a penny — for a penny and it worked" (Checkmark).

Dead Man's Letters. USSR, 1986. Directed by Konstantin Lopushansky. Screenwriters: Konstantin Lopushansky, Vyacheslav Rybakov, Boris Strugatsky. Actors: Rolan Bykov, Iosif Ryklin, Victor Mikhailov, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, Svetlana Smirnova and others. **9.1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Konstantin Lopushansky directed seven full-length feature films ("Visitor of the Museum", "Russian Symphony", "Ugly Swans", "Role", etc.), of which "Dead Man's Letters" received the greatest fame.

"Warnings from the Future" — the nightmares of war and space wars — have long become familiar on the screens of the world. This is a science fiction of a special kind, even in the most humane films it scares by its relevance, as it is today, when there are many so-called "local conflicts" on the planet.

At one time, the leading topic in Russian science fiction was the topic of new space discoveries and research, scientific progress. However, director Konstantin Lopushansky for his full-length debut chose the plot of the nuclear madness of the Earth, the collapse of human civilization. Why?

Only the film "Dead Man's Letters" itself can answer this question.

The yellow—brown tone of underground bunkers, the alarming howl of sirens, destroyed city streets, lonely figures of the few survivors — in gas masks, with weapons in their hands ... In these frames, filmed by cameraman Nikolai Pokoptsev, there is no approximation, fantastic convention. The director builds the action of the film in a strictly realistic, everyday way.

Here I see the principledness of the stylistics of the modern "Leningrad school": after Alexei German, Semyon Aranovich, Victor Aristov and Alexander Rogozhkin, Konstantin Lopushansky refuses any kind of "smoothing" of nature and the interior, seeks to prove the action, as if filmed with a hidden camera, without fear of naturalistic details ... In "Dead Man's Letters" these details sometimes produce a shock effect, as, for example, in the scene of an underground children's hospital or in the episode when a helpless female cry is heard in the city burning after a nuclear explosion: "Somebody, give me a gas mask!" But otherwise the picture would undoubtedly lose a lot in the emotionality of the furious protest against the possibility of an atomic hell on the planet.

Konstantin Lopushansky, in fact, refers not only to the future, but also to the not—so—distant past of the early forties of the twentieth century, projected by the imagination, when the Second World War claimed tens of millions of lives, including millions of children. Therefore, documentary footage of the times of fascist aggression seems quite natural in the film.

The protagonist of the film, an old professor (Rolan Bykov), mentally addressing his probably long-dead son, is trying to figure out how outstanding scientists were able to turn ingenious discoveries into instruments of death, and what he did himself to avoid this terrible war. Through the fogged-up glasses of old-fashioned glasses, the professor sadly looks at his former colleagues, who either make loud revelatory speeches, or doomedly try to adapt to the new "conditions of existence".

The motive of hopelessness is gaining strength in scenes when swollen manuscripts of old books and scientific research slowly float through flooded basements, when the professor, realizing that even ingenious formulas are no longer needed by anyone, in a few days easily solves problems over which thousands of leading mathematicians have been struggling for decades and physicists. And finally, when a certain official in a gray dressing gown with an impassive expression in his eyes refuses to accept children into the saving bunker, dooming them to inevitable death...

But all the same, the authors leave the hero with a saving hope. Rolan Bykov surprises with a variety of acting palette: he uses meager plastic means, slowly and quietly pronouncing the words of a monologue, he gives us a chance to believe that the children he saved, withdrawn, silent and hungry, will stay alive and will never repeat the fatal mistake of the older generation.

And it's even difficult to say what is more in the episode where the professor with the children meets the New Year at the Christmas tree improvised from wires and old radio components — tragic sadness or warmth. The camera peers into the faces of the professor and the children, and an unspoken question to the audience seemed to be frozen in them: "Can you really allow this to happen?"...

The Soviet film press assessed this film by Konstantin Lopushansky very positively.

Anatoly Makarov wrote about this picture in "Soviet Screen": "What strikes the most in "Dead Man's Letters" is maturity. The maturity of thought, first of all — thought that is honest almost to the point of cruelty, knowing neither good compromises, nor healing illusions, not afraid to look into the abyss. The science fiction genre in cinema has taught us the visible conventions of space landscapes and plastic alien interiors. Here, the reality is so genuine that sometimes you have to cling to the salutary thought — what a blessing that there is a fantastic world on the screen. However, the possible, the probable, is what haunts. Torments, runs down the back with chills. And here I see evidence of the civic maturity of the authors. It is especially valuable that this matured is obviously achieved through suffering, and is justified by a high level of truly philosophical thinking,

In many respects, film critic Georgy Kapralov (1921—2010) agreed with Anatoly Makarov, arguing that "the film "Dead Man's Letters" affects the viewer, rather, the general atmosphere, and its, if I may say so, "documentary", tangible details and details ... and, although some of his characters remain almost conventional signs, he has a bewitching power. The film is devoid of a plot spring, at times it is dragged out, but its creators were driven by genuine civic courage by the imperative feeling of artists who must tell people what worries them" (Kapralov, 1988: 85).

Film critics of the XXI century still appreciate this picture.

So Vladimir Gordeev, for example, notes that “in addition to the atmosphere itself..., there is something beautiful in the film, which, perhaps, cannot be found in modern films, and even more so in “post-nuclear” films. The central characters of the Letters are noble. Dying through someone else's and, of course, partly through their own fault, they are not imbued with hatred for all of humanity. In this regard, the film is paradoxical and tragic. Dealing with humanity in one fell swoop, the director never ceases to love him. Hence the conclusion that Lopushansky's film is not just another opportunistic film statement from the Cold War, not a gloomy prophecy and an attempt to play on the viewer's fears and scare him even more, and not even quite a "warning film", but, first of all, a humane cinema" (Gordeev, 2009).

Andrei Volkov notes that the "Dead Man's Letters" are distinguished by an unusual form. This is an uncomfortable claustrophobic movie, the depressing atmosphere of which is so strong that it affects the feelings of the viewer, even in the absence of external horrors. There are no scenes of action in the work of Lopushansky and not close, and the centrifugal force is the chronicle of the hopeless existence of mankind underground and rare forays to the surface. There is no light at the end of the tunnel, so it is clear from the very beginning that we have before us a chronicle of the gradual dying of mankind, only stretched out for years or, perhaps, decades. The visuals of the film are also uncomfortable. The movie is distinguished by a monochrome image, as in the "Stalker" that inspired Lopushansky, and the shooting was made using color filters. The scenes in the bunker are painted dull yellow and resemble sepia, as in photographs of the 19th century, and the scenes on the surface were completely shot using an acid blue scale. The director avoids close-ups, making the characters a part of the interior. Ultimately, this works for his idea of the spiritual death of humanity, because such an existence cannot be called life. The professor is one of the few who tries not only to think about their daily bread, but also to preserve the remnants of humanity. Although he understands that this is the end. "Dead Man's Letters" is a striking anti-war statement that depicts a man-made apocalypse. Nuclear war is completely meaningless from all points of view, but there are those who are ready to risk humanity in order to defeat the enemy. According to Lopushansky, the use of nuclear weapons is a moral impasse, a form of collective suicide. The director largely reproduces Sakharov's views: a policy devoid of a moral core will ultimately destroy us all. There are no winners in war. This is spiritual death" (Volkov, 2020).

Today's viewers are generally very positive about "Dead Man's Letters":

"Awesome movie. ... The film is brilliant in everything" (I. Smirnov).

"A very important and relevant film! I watched it back then, in the 1980s, God forbid this to happen..." (Brave).

"The most terrible film in Soviet cinema. Having watched it at a relatively mature age, I absolutely do not want to watch it again. Too painful impression leaves this, undoubtedly one of the greatest works of cinematography. At the same time, such films are needed, necessary for realizing the fragility of everything that surrounds us. ... The film is wonderful. The film is great. The film is a landmark" (O. Derbin).

"The film is very depressing, but, nevertheless, it is necessary to watch it. And watch for all, especially illiterate politicians. I still remember how in the 1980s, as a child, I was very afraid of a nuclear war ... Let it be only in the movies and never come true!" (O. Fesenko).

Death of a Sensation. USSR, 1935. Directed by Alexander Andrievsky. Screenwriter Georgy Grebner (based on the play "RUR" by Karel Chapek). Actors: Sergei Vecheslov, Vladimir Gardin, Maria Volgina, Anna Chekulaeva, Vasily Orlov, Sergei Martinson, Sergei Minin, Pavel Poltoratsky, Alexandra Khokhlova, etc.

Alexander Andrievsky (1899–1983) directed four full-length feature films, of which Robinson Crusoe (1947) was one of the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

Film critic Ekaterina Khokhlova wrote that “the most interesting in the film were the moving robots ... The skill with which they were made amazes modern viewers as well. ... "Death of a Sensation" is a picture typical of the mid-1930s, when the recording technique was still imperfect. Therefore, the game episodes, where the actors are forced to adapt to sound recording equipment, are distinguished by theatricality characteristic of the cinema of that time. Even such a professional

as Vladimir Gardin, who played the role of Jack Rippl, the brother of the protagonist, the inventor of robots, did not escape this. At the same time, silent scenes, edited in the best traditions of Soviet silent cinema of the 1920s, amaze with the skill shown by the novice director” (Khokhlova, 2010: 24).

Film critic Vladimir Gordeev noted that the film “Death of a Sensation” is “fascinating, spectacular, ... What is nice: there are a lot of robots in the film, they are really big (two human heights) and, on the whole, well made. ... The working class in this film is distinguished by retrograde sentiments and in every possible way opposes technical progress. At the same time, the screenwriter gives a bold and comforting hint that any worker can retrain into an engineer, because, be that as it may, the automation of production is inevitable ... Which, in principle, was confirmed by the history of human civilization” (Gordeev, 2011)...

Viewers of the XXI century are still ready to ardently discuss "Death of a Sensation":

“A terrific technotriller for its time. The film inspired the enthusiasts who built the first Soviet humanoid robot in 1937, which was exhibited at the World Exhibition in Paris. A lot of parallels with today's time: transfers to a shorter working week, links to the crisis, robots demolishing a workers' settlement at the direction of the owners. In addition, this is actually the first show of hackers in the movies (workers break the code for controlling robots) (Oleg).

“The story is amazing! There is, of course, a lot of revolutionary propaganda, and inappropriate music plays at the end (spoiling the impression a little). But before us is really a feature film! ... How accurate everything is ... how beautifully arranged! Great film. A real classic” (Konstantin).

Death Ray. USSR, 1925. Directed by Lev Kuleshov. Screenwriter Vsevolod Pudovkin (based on V. Kataev's novel "The Lord of Iron"). Actors: Porfiry Podobed, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Sergey Komarov, Vladimir Fogel, Alexandra Khokhlova, Semyon Khokhlov, N. Stravinskaya, Andrey Gorchilin, Pyotr Galadzhhev, Leonid Obolensky, Mikhail Doller and others.

Lev Kuleshov (1899—1970) directed 17 full-length feature films, some of which ("The Extraordinary Adventures of Mr. West in the Country of the Bolsheviks", "By Law"), are considered pearls of the Great Mute.

Film critic and culturologist Neya Zorkaya (1924—2006) believed that Soviet film criticism of the 1920s in vain considered the fantastic detective a complete failure of the master, second floor. A special Kuleshov style was developed: the lack of selection of the old screen was replaced by a selection so tough that it passed into convention. Again, the film combines two planes — "Russian" and "Western". The action takes place alternately in the Moscow region and in a certain cinematic abroad — either in America or in Germany. At the mysterious dacha of the engineer Podobed, not far from Moscow, there are spacious rooms, sophisticated machines. In a fictional screen country — a production environment ... an acute social motivation appeared: the amazing apparatus "death ray" is necessary for the workers of the "Helium" plant to destroy the exploiters, and the owners — to suppress the uprising. So a tangled and rather chaotic intrigue is tied around the “death ray” (Zorkaya, 1966).

Already in the 21st century, film critic Ekaterina Khokhlova noted that in “Death Ray” “there are excellently filmed mass scenes depicting the struggle of workers against the Nazis, the brilliant Vsevolod Pudovkin as Abbot Revo, the excellent work of the cameraman Alexander Levitsky, but as a whole the film did not work — mainly because of a confusing and indistinct scenario” (Khokhlova, 2010: 252).

It is curious that there are practically no audience reviews about the "Death Ray" on the Kino—theater.ru portal, which, however, is quite typical for most silent films.

District Domino Competitions. USSR, 1989. Director and screenwriter Mikhail Borshchevsky (based on the story of the same name by Kir Bulychev). Actors: V. Kuraskua, Anatoly Skoryakin, Vyacheslav Kirilichev, Yuri Ovchinnikov, etc. **Short film.**

Mikhail Borshchevsky directed only three feature films, of which only one full-length.

"District Domino Competitions" is a kind of perestroika phantasmagoria, in the genre of which many Soviet films of the late 1980s — early 1990s were filmed. Everything would be fine, but this film was shot, in my opinion, at the level of provincial amateur performances of not the best kind...

So there is nothing surprising in such, for example, a viewer review: "I'd better not watch this film, some kind of nonsense, I wasted my time" (Anton).

Do You Exist, Mr. Jones? USSR, 1961. Directed by Leonid Piver (based on the work of the same name by Stanislaw Lem). **TV. Short film.**

Leonid Piver (1927—2015) directed three feature films and many TV shows.

The main character of this film, Harry Jones, is a race car driver whose body parts are replaced with prostheses, including electronic ones, after each accident.

Document "R". USSR, 1985. Directed by Valery Kharchenko. Screenwriter Alexander Jurowski (based on the novel of the same name by Irving Wallace). Actors: Osvalds Berzins, Evald Hermakūla, Romualds Ancans, Klara Belova, Mikk Mikiver, Elle Kull and others. **TV premiere on August 7, 1985.**

Valery Kharchenko (1938—2019) directed 16 feature films and TV series. "Document "R" is his only experience in the genre of political fiction.

"Document "R" is one of the last Soviet counter—propaganda films. In the course of the plot, at the beginning of the 21st century, evil and very influential forces in the United States want to kill the president and establish a dictatorship...

During perestroika, filmed in the style of the usual ideological film stamps of the 1970s — first half of the 1980s, "Document "R" did not arouse much interest among the audience, but today it has many fans:

"The film was surprisingly prophetic. From the modern destruction of "all kinds of human rights" in the event of an emergency, and the creation of humanoid societies, like "Argo City", to which the true masters of the world strive, up to the implantation of chips, the introduction of biopassports and other "robotization of homo sapiens": everything is predicted amazingly accurate! TV inserts are very eloquent: isn't it this, sorry, vomit that the media is stuffing us with? Deceive future slaves, create reservations for the future. And for the illusion of happiness, revel in "Coca—Colas" and trudge to the "Michael Jackson". The "democratic" regimes of the West, in fact, turn out to be more totalitarian than those regimes that are commonly considered "dictatorial". But in fact: there is no difference. "Fascism (more broadly — just a dictatorship) will come as a result of elections." In the meantime, choose your stall for the future ... more comfortable.

"The film is very stylish. Everything is clear enough and well thought out. When I watched it as a child, it felt like it was filmed abroad. Here I saw for the first time videos with real American TV commercials. ... Well, they knew how to shoot a movie in the Scoop before!" (A. Sergienya).

Dog's Heart. USSR, 1988. Directed by Vladimir Bortko. Screenwriter Natalia Bortko (based on the story of the same name by Mikhail Bulgakov). Actors: Evgeny Evstigneev, Boris Plotnikov, Vladimir Tolokonnikov, Nina Ruslanova, Olga Melikhova, Alexey Mironov, Roman Kartsev, Angelica Nevolina and others. **TV premiere: November 20, 1988.**

Vladimir Bortko during his creative career, he has directed 18 feature-length films and TV series ("The Blonde Around the Corner", "The Idiot", "The Master and Margarita", "Taras Bulba", etc.). His most popular film was and remains a brilliant adaptation of Mikhail Bulgakov's story "Dog's Heart" (1988).

Film critic Valery Bondarenko wrote about this adaptation of "Dog's Heart" as follows: "Devastation is in our heads! When they begin to urinate past the toilet, it is devastation!" This and other "counter—revolutionary" phrases of Professor Preobrazhensky firmly entered our consciousness during the years of perestroika — they entered, rather, from the screen than from the pages of a book. I won't be mistaken if I say: the film *"Dog's Heart"* (directed by V. Bortko) is one of the best (if not the best, as time has shown) films of the perestroika years. ... The filmmakers performed an experiment on the viewer, paradoxically similar to the research of Philip Filippovich Preobrazhensky. First, you associate yourself with a she—lu—wondrous hungry dog, then suddenly you jump into the costume of a wealthy intellectual, a professor, and now the viewer's consciousness measures everything by his yardstick, seemingly sound, but socially rather limited. Without these Bolsheviks in "leather", headed by the careerist, demagogue and small cattle Shvonder (R. Kartsev) the world seems to be quite harmonious. Why did they suddenly appear and won it, these Bolsheviks? ... In V. Bortko's film there is no answer to this! ... In the mid—1980s, the 1925 model was really alien to us, wild and ridiculous. Here he is dancing in a soldier's underwear with a balalaika at the ready, singing mocking ditties in the face of the "scientific community". Here's a dirty stick to women. Here he is shaking his rights ... We hadn't yet met the "lads" — the Hams of the 1995 model — the new, as it were, masters of life. They will not dance to the balalaika, they will wear Armani jackets, but their manners, slang and all the concepts will be the same, Sharik, in fact. Only their ditties and thieves' "sufferings" will they pompously call "Russian chanson". I am sure: now we will "read" this picture in a different way, we will find new meanings. And this "multi-layered" movie is a great merit of the performers of the two main roles. Vladimir Tolokonnikov fits in the image of his hero, as it were, several creatures. This is a half-man — an idiotic Sharik, and an inveterate tavern hooligan — an "artist", and a tabloid rogue in lacquered boots, in a creepy, pimp some sort of tie, and, finally, a gloomy Soviet "employee" in a "leather" and a cap. Oh, this is not only to strangle cats! Such a person will happily throw people into the "funnel", but it is necessary, and "slap" without trembling hand — and as many as he is ordered. At the end of the film, Polygraph Poligrafich Sharikov has all the features of a 1937 Chekist. This metaphor is carried out emphatically, constantly. Genuine "scary", "predatory", "carnivorous", which Tolokonnikov so convincingly conveys to the viewer, forced Bortko to opt for this then little—known actor... Nature itself serves as a guiding thread in the maze of the hero's transformations. Tolokonnikov conveys a dark, wild natural element that rages in the soul of his character, in his human / dog's heart. The actor plays the instinct of survival and self—affirmation. Sometimes his hero is ridiculous and pathetic, but much more often — ominous. It seems that the role of Sharikov is not only the best for Vladimir Tolokonnikov, but it is almost the most energetically saturated image of the "boor" in all of our cinema. Into what ancient past and into what then already the near future of the "wild" 1990s did Tolokonnikov — Sharikov look with his gloomy, baked gaze? ... If his game is a natural element itself, then Evgeny Evstigneev builds the image of his hero on the finest interweaving of nuances. This delicacy of the drawing is not just the way the actor is used to presenting his character and era. Here the method acquires a certain special, fundamental meaning. Philip Philipovich Preobrazhensky in Evstigneev is the result of the development of culture, knowledge about life and man and — *respect* for oneself and people. Because respect is the essence, the real content of this result. The traditionalism and humanism of the Eustignean hero is the natural wisdom of a man of culture. True, this wisdom is limited in its own way and certainly does not save one from the vital pressure of the elements: the wise professor is more than once completely lost in front of the "tram boor" Sharikov. And if not for the strong fists of his assistant Bormental (actor B. Plotnikov) ... And the everyday lordly "babble" of the luminary of Preobrazhensky's science entirely depends on the goodwill of a high—ranking patient — a Soviet nobleman, in whose appearance the features of Stalin, Kaganovich and ... Sharikov are amusingly combined! It is not culture that curbs the element, but the victorious element of the street uses culture. Moreover, culture itself is by no means a defense against the impulsive instincts of the street and nature ... Here the filmmakers clearly deviate from what Mikhail Bulgakov wanted to say. But after all, they already knew how everything ended after the 25th year ... For 20 years the film has not aged one iota. However, just as the issue of social justice has not disappeared into the past either" (Bondarenko, 2009: 17-20).

Film critic Sergei Kudryavtsev has an equally high opinion of the film by Vladimir Bortko, who considers this film adaptation "perhaps the best version of Bulgakov's works, which exactly corresponds to the writer's intention" (Kudryavtsev, 2007).

Alexander Vergelis recalls that this film "there was something to get excited about. Professor Preobrazhensky's monologue about the devastation sounded as topical as possible in the conditions of the growing perestroika mess. The images of Sharikov and Shvonder embodied the entire negative of the annoying Soviet reality. And the lordly Preobrazhensky and polished Bormental became the personification of "Russia, which we have lost." Only the scene of the professor's lunch in the half-starved perestroika time was perceived as a picture of a lost paradise. But it is not a matter of relevance alone. Perhaps, "Dog's Heart" is the best thing that Bortko did in the cinema. The film turned out to be funny and sad at the same time, its "cult" status was determined regardless of the socio-economic realities of the second half of the 1980s. ... For three decades, there has been a clear shift in perception. This is evidenced by the many new responses about the film on the Internet, in the media and in the same kitchens where the European-style renovation has long been done, but the walls still retain the aroma of the original incense. The Orthodox Church added its powerful bass to the chorus of critical voices. The evaluative pendulum swung in the opposite direction, making yesterday's favorites of the public, Bulgakov's Aesculapians, almost geniuses of evil. And, on the contrary, by significantly transforming the figure of Sharikov. ... I dare to suggest that today the more or less cultured viewer of this film no longer looks like a satire on early Soviet society. Having laughed a lot about Shvonder and his company, having admired the polished fragments of the old world, the viewer discovers in the motion picture the tragedy of a thinking creature, by someone else's will, who became a victim of an experiment monstrous in its unnaturalness. At the same time, yesterday's scarecrow Sharikov in the eyes of many becomes almost a martyr. In any case, for me personally, the character of Vladimir Tolokonnikov, peering into his reflection in the mirror under the tragic music of Vladimir Dashkevich, evokes much more sympathy and even sympathy than before. Probably because in his ridiculous figure the spirit of a little man who has been hovering over the fields of Russian literature for two centuries has been embodied. Perhaps there are objective grounds for such a transformation. Yes, Sharikov is morally undeveloped, uncultured and generally unpleasant. His ignorance is aggressive, he is a militant boor. The legacy of the criminal Klim Chugunkin appears in him too clearly, organically combined with the psychology of a homeless mongrel. But is he to blame for this? Is the Gorky tramp to blame for not only not being taught in the gymnasiums, but also systematically humiliating him, killing his human dignity for years, and ultimately suddenly putting him on a pedestal, proclaiming him the messiah and giving him a punishing sword?

Bulgakov is a convinced evolutionist who watched live how the vivisectioners of the revolution wielded in feverish anticipation of a miracle. And the miracle, meanwhile, did not happen. There was "the sweetest dog", it turned out "boor and a pig." According to Bulgakov, you just have to wait until the dog itself turns into a man. And if it doesn't turn, it doesn't matter: each has his own place. Progress will take care of stray animals. And "any woman" can give birth to a person. ...

The film images of Professor Preobrazhensky and Doctor Bormental initially entered the mass consciousness as standard samples of intelligence. Meanwhile, the professor is rather the antipode of the intellectual. In spite of his typical origin for the various intelligentsia (his father is a cathedral archpriest), he is a snob with pseudo-aristocratic manners and an inveterate social racist. He openly admits that he does not like the proletariat. That is, the poor working people of the urban population are unpleasant to him. This is fundamentally at odds with the orthodox worldview of the Russian intelligentsia, which experienced an eternal guilt complex before the "people" and was initially focused on selfless service. The viewer was deceived by the external surroundings — manners and speeches. Philip Philipovich is much more like a rich and superficially Europeanized Russian merchant, than an intellectual. Moreover, from European ideas he assimilates not the most humane. Preobrazhensky is, in fact, a social Darwinist" (Vergelis, 2016).

However, the opinions of film critics are one thing, and the viewers' opinions are another. The sharp satire of Mikhail Bulgakov and its cinematic version made by Vladimir Bortko, in fact, divided the audience into two irreconcilable camps: to put it simply, supporters of socialism with

its propaganda of equality and adherents of capitalism with its rights and opportunities for the elite.

Of course, among the current audience there are a lot of supporters of "Dog's Heart":

"A wonderful film ... In my opinion, Preobrazhensky's profession does not matter, he personifies an intelligent man in the street who has achieved prosperity through his labor and wants to enjoy the fruits of this labor. And as a counterbalance to this image — Shvonder, who is uneducated, does not want to work, it is easier for him to take away, confiscate, condense. ... But I think the main advantage of this film is the magnificent, brilliant play of Evgeny Evstigneev, who did not play Preobrazhensky, but was Preobrazhensky for a while. With all the arrogance, snobbery inherent in this character, and at the same time, a professorial analytical mind and medical cynicism. I watch the film several times a year and never cease to admire his performance" (Anda).

"I've been watching this film since childhood. True, when I was a primary school student and was not familiar with Bulgakov's work, I perceived this film as a comedy, mainly paying attention to the episodes when the dog turned into Sharikov... Years later, I understood the true meaning of Bulgakov's book and, accordingly, the film. And the film is made beautifully, in Bulgakov style. Bortko is a very good director. ... This is, so to speak, an anti—revolutionary work, in which Bulgakov, allegorically, using the example of the transformation of a dog into a man, proves that it is impossible to change life for the better by revolutionary methods. Sharikov is a collective image of our Russian downtrodden people, which as a result of the revolution rose from the bottom, but culturally and morally remained at the same level of development. So it turned out that power was in the hands of such Sharikovs. As for Professor Preobrazhensky, he is by no means a positive hero. After all, the professor, not accepting the new power, cursing it, serves it... This is Preobrazhensky's "heart of a dog", he cowardly serves the new power, which he hates... Of course, the author puts the main anti—Soviet thoughts into Preobrazhensky's mouth (there is no one else!). He is the main accuser of the Soviet regime... How superbly the actors played! And, of course, I never cease to admire the talent of Evstigneev, better than Preobrazhensky than he, I cannot imagine" (A. Alekseeva).

"A wonderful film by V. Bortko based on the excellent book by M. Bulgakov. The idea of the relationship between the intelligentsia and the people is fully disclosed. The main character of this work is, of course, Philip Filippovich Preobrazhensky. He's smart, talented, brilliant if you like. But is he kind? Is he responsible? In my opinion, no. Yes, he earns his living by his hard work. He heals people, taking money from them, and has every right to do so. Lives beautifully in seven rooms, goes to the Bolshoi Theater on "Aida". He scolds the Soviet power, like all intellectuals, drinking vodka in the kitchen and eating it with pickles. And then, currying favor with a high party official outwardly similar to Stalin. As it is in our way, as it is in Russian. In some ways, Philip Philipovich is very reminiscent of Academician Ivan Petrovich Pavlov. He also scolded Soviet power in the USSR, and when traveling abroad, he said that the Soviet regime was a brilliant experiment that the Bolsheviks were putting on, and we should not interfere with this. And yet, the European luminary, puts a monstrous experiment on the transformation of a dog into a man. This is terrible! ... Nothing personal, just science. And who's the monster? Preobrazhensky or Sharikov? Lenin is also a great natural scientist, only he set experience over the whole country. Let's look at Ilyich not as a politician, but as a natural scientist. A very interesting picture is obtained. ... And Sharikov is a cast of our long—suffering people, with all its advantages and disadvantages. True, the disadvantages are more accentuated. Polygraph Poligrafovich is boorish, drunk, irresponsible, cunning. Yes, and also a careerist. ... And our intelligentsia is ambiguous, like Preobrazhensky and Bormental. ... Now about the film. A brilliant production with an unmatched cast. The great Evstigneev played beyond praise, but other artists are good as well. Plotnikov, Ruslanova, and, of course, Kartsev showed themselves at a high professional level. The role of Tolokonnikov stands apart. His Sharikov is complex and contradictory, he is not just a boor in the professor's chambers" (Andrey).

But there are also ardent opponents who believe that:

"This film is too opportunistic and politicized. ... and the hero of Evstigneev seems unpleasant, especially in comparison with the traditionally noble image of a Russian doctor" (Zoya).

"An unpleasant film that preaches class hatred. A bastard professor who profits from implanting monkey ovaries on lustful old women. With this money, he relishes relishing while people around are starving and sick. He does not help the people around him, does not heal sick children, but only rants about his exclusivity. Then he creates some semblance of a person and releases him into life, without bearing any responsibility for this. When problems arise, he kills his creation. He's a criminal! This story of Bulgakov is a stupid and evil allegory reflecting his anger at the world around him and devoid of any intelligible meaning. It is ridiculous to try to present this momentary unfinished little thing of Bulgakov as a serious conceptual work. The idea that if a person was born in the lower classes, then let him remain there, is completely stupid, undemocratic and harmful. Moreover, I repeat that Professor Preobrazhensky comes out on the film as a fair bastard, and not a role model. He disgusts me with his smacking and self—admiration!" (Boris).

"This work is anti—revolutionary in relation to the 1917 revolution, but revolutionary in relation to the Yeltsin coup of the 1990s. This film became the ideological program of the "democrats", their banner. Primitive imagery — the movie labels came in very handy. This is Sharikov, this is Shvonder, and this (with reverence) is Professor Preobrazhensky. Primitive people need primitive images. How many times have I heard: "No, you are not Professor Preobrazhensky!" Primitiveness did not even allow these people to understand that Preobrazhensky is by no means a positive hero... Our "elite" speaks about ball—balls at every step, implying, as a rule, ordinary people. ... The question arises: why did people who called themselves "democrats" (now, however, they are more often called "democrat") liked this film so much, whose idea is the superiority of some classes and the inferiority of others? Poisonous burps from this film still occur. ... The film has provided the townsfolk and political opponents with insulting labels as a polemical weapon. "You are Sharikov!" Says one. "You are Shvonder!" Is the answer. Ideas preaching class inferiority have long been refuted by science and prohibited by law. When someone says that the "Sharikovs" and "Cooks" once came to power, that is why everything became so bad, then it is reasonable to object: after all, the "Sharikovs" and "Cooks" led the country well — created a superpower, won the war with Hitler, who conquered almost all of Europe, created a nuclear weapon that ensured the survival of the people, went into space... How did they do it, I wonder? But what did the non—Sharikovs do to the country, we see and know. Over the past twenty years, not a single important plant has been built! It seems to me that right now there is a transformation of the population into stupid, undeveloped and uneducated "Sharikov". Including thanks to films and TV series sponsored by our "elite" (non—"Sharikov"). And no one questions the talent of V. Bortko and the quality of the actors' performance" (Spiridon).

Dolphin's Cry. USSR, 1987. Directed by Alexey Saltykov. Screenwriter Nikolai Cherkashin (based on his own story "The Secret of "Archelon"). Actors: Ivar Kalninch, Donatas Banionis, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Yuri Vasiliev, Paul Butkevich, Rostislav Yankovsky and others. **16.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Alexei Saltykov (1934—1993) during his creative career has directed 16 films, ten of which ("My friend, Kolka!", "Chairman", "Woman's Kingdom", "Director", "There is no return", "The Ivanov family", "Siberian Woman", "Wormwood — bitter grass", "Emelyan Pugachev", "Dolphin's Cry"), were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

The detective—Sci-Fi "Dolphin's Cry" is the director's experience in this genre, as he is better known by the audience mainly for psychological dramas. However, in the last years of his life, Alexei Saltykov was drawn to action—packed stories...

"Dolphin's Cry" performed counter—propaganda tasks of the era that re-erupted in the first half of the 1980s of the Cold War: in the course of the plot, a dangerous epidemic began on the western missile carrier ...

Like most of the films by Alexei Saltykov of the 1970s — 1980s, "Dolphin's Cry" was greeted by the Soviet film press in general negatively.

For example, film critic Larisa Kalgatina wrote in the "Soviet Screen" magazine that, "balancing between poster straightforwardness and psychological research, the film probably interprets the myth of Archelaus, who faithfully served the Macedonian king and was cunningly

deceived ... dozens of templates, with amazing spontaneity, reanimates common ideas about a decaying society, straightening problems to a scheme, to reusable statements. In this capacity, the film itself, like a sad dolphin, floats somewhere alongside its easily readable idea, not penetrating into its essence, but artlessly commenting on it with both “bad mine” and “bad acting” (Kalgatina, 1987: 15).

A similar opinion was expressed by film critic Valentina Ivanova (1937–2008), arguing that “the movie is more likely only a claim to the title of a detective — the plot in it develops in a slow and not very exciting pace. As for the definition of “political”, it is exhausted only by the declared material, no more, that is, the good intentions of the authors. ... [The film] remained at the level of a certain socially fantastic grotesque” (Ivanova, 1987: 15).

Returning to “Dolphin’s Cry” in the 21st century, film critic Evgeny Nefedov noted that “the director had every opportunity to achieve — even taking into account the probabilistic (in fact, fantastic) nature of the situation — the maximum likelihood of plot twists and turns. What, I wonder, prevented him? Why do some fragments and details raise vague doubts about their reliability, or even do they are perceived by plug—in numbers, almost Eisenstein's attractions? ... Alexey Saltykov, whose creative path began very brightly a couple of decades earlier, frankly “did not pull” such a responsible topic” (Nefedov, 2018).

Today's viewers also note mainly the shortcomings of this film:

“The film was directed by A. Saltykov — the director is very uneven. This film is the same. Often his journalism turns into posterity, and some episodes are completely untrue, caricatures. The capitalists, the military of this film, as if stepped into it from posters, drawings of “Crocodile”. Ragged editing and (in my opinion) — unsuccessful work of the operator prevent this picture from being accepted as completely successful. But nevertheless it is remembered as a stern warning to humanity” (A. Grebenkin).

“The film is undoubtedly a failure — I perfectly remember the bewilderment of everyone in the cinema” (Leningradets).

“For such “creativity” all those involved should be disqualified for life” (Gennady B.).

Dominus. USSR, 1989. Directed by Alexander Khvan. Screenwriter Ivan Loshchilin (based on the story “The Spit” by Ray Bradbury). Actors: Victor Evgrafov, Elena Evseenko and others. **Short Film.**

Alexander Khvan directed 28 feature films and TV series. In the 1990s, after he directed the films “Dominus” and “Duba—Duba”, he was called the hope of Russian cinema. Unfortunately, in the last two decades, A. Khvan has mainly been filming ordinary television series...

“Dominus” still impresses today not only with its magical pictorial range, but also with its directorial skills: a dark fantastic parable about the terrible price of choosing between poverty and well—being, captures and does not let go until the very end...

The mesmerizing “Dominus” caused a stormy controversy in the film press. Moreover, an unprecedented case: the magazine “Cinema Art” devotes two articles to him at once.

Film critic Sergei Lavrentyev assessed the film by Alexander Khvan ambiguously, emphasizing that “Dominus” paradoxically testifies to both the brilliance of total formalism and its so—called “poverty”. As it should be in a formalistic work, the events taking place on the screen are extremely mysterious and inexplicable at the everyday level. This circumstance, I must say, makes it difficult to retell the plot ... Khvan makes a movie. And he does it really well. Perhaps, like no one else in our modern cinema, he feels the plastic nature of screen art. The form of the film, its matter exist here, as it were, independently of the will of the director, who is called upon to breathe life into this form, to spiritualize it. ... Bradbury interferes with Khvan — it is obvious. It also interferes with him because it is difficult for a viewer who is even a little familiar with the history of cinema to imagine a formalistic film set in America in the thirties. After all, it was the thirties that became the heyday of Hollywood, which produced pictures in which there was not even a hint of formalism. Cars of the thirties, men's hats, women's dresses — all these attributes are associated in our minds with spoken, theatrical, acting films. In the plastic film, they look all the more unconvincing because the actors do not play a significant role here” (Lavrentiev, 1991: 45—48).

Film critic Nina Tsyrukun was even stricter. She was convinced that “when A. Khvan in the finale gives a picture of the global harvest of death, its purely quantitative demonstration in the form of “statistics” clearly reveals its wretchedness and extra—artistic character, completely foreign in the film itself. Khvan clearly decided in vain to resort to an anachronistic Soviet cliché that would have crossed out the film if it had not been completed without this postscript” (Tsyrukun, 1992: 38).

But the then editor—in—chief of the magazine "Soviet Screen" Victor Demin (1937—1993) gave "Dominus" the highest rating: “The owner gets the house in the meadow, on the one hand, for nothing, on the other, as a condition for a mysterious experiment. ... The paper nearby assures even more solemnly that the one who was the first to find the deceased can use his property, house and field, and not be distressed, no matter what miracles occur here. The pendulum has reached its limit in one direction. Desired received. The dream has been found. You can be accommodated with the kids, hurry to the mowing tomorrow from dawn, then find out from the postman where is closer to go to the fair — isn't this life, whoa? The director has already signaled to us: no, this is not life. This is some kind of test, and the terms of reckoning for the loser are still unknown. This house is too quiet, its swinging cabinet doors creak too abruptly and loudly, doors slam too strangely and suspiciously at times, I am sure that after Khvan's next work, we will recall this work more than once, fantastically subtle in every detail. She has an amazing quality — she is remembered not as a film, not as life, but as an undoubted dream that once came to you. I don't know more praise” (Demin, 1990: 7—8).

Today's viewers have a rather reserved attitude to the rather difficult “Dominus”:

“A transcendental parable, a dark phantasmagoria, a production—dream ... “Dominus” is the fruit of a combination of sleep at dusk and light delirium at night. ... Together with too contrasting and bright, as if burned—out film, the effect is simply psychedelic. ... It seems that there is nothing else in the world, these people are the last on Earth, and the end of the world begins behind their house. The creators of the picture hardly realized how disturbing, metaphysical it would turn out. It is not easy to watch it because of the bright flashes, the transition from contrasting color to sepia” (K. Serebryany).

“The movie was shot in dark, depressing tones with a clear desire to do something like a horror movie. At the same time, a significant part of logical harmony and intelligibility was lost behind purely external effects” (Horseofhell).

Don't Fly Away, Earthling! USSR, 1991. Directed by Vadim Kostromenko. Screenwriter Dmitry Kostromenko. Actors: Lena Naumchik, Grigory Goldstein, Alla Oding and others. **Short film.**

Vadim Kostromenko directed nine full-length feature films. Short film "Don't Fly Away, Earthman!" — his only one film of the fantastic genre.

In this film, aliens decide to kidnap ... a Soviet school teacher.

The idea, of course, is interesting, albeit strange, but the film itself was made, in my opinion, in the manner of ordinary films for children of the Gorky studio.

However, many viewers like this movie today:

“The film is a little naive, a little crazy ... In the end it evokes a bright feeling” (Andrew).

“I liked the film. Especially, taking into account the amendments: the most terrible year is 1991. Devastation, poverty...” (A. Gorbylev).

Dr. Abst's Experiment. USSR, 1969. Directed by Anton Timonishin. Screenwriter Alexander Nasibov (based on his novel “Mad Men”). Actors: Sergei Desnitsky, Laimonas Noreika, Zhanna Vladimirkaya, Gennady Voropaev, Uldis Pucitis, Vytautas Tomkus, Vyacheslav Voronin, Peeter Card, Olev Eskola, Les Serdyuk, Evgeny Vesnik and others. **29.4 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Anton Timonishin (1921–1969) directed only three full-length films (two of which — "They were known only by sight" and "Dr. Abst's Experiment" were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films), all these films were united by the military theme.

Film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993) wrote that the on-screen world of "Dr. Abst's Experiment" "directly gives off the underworld ... Remember? The Soviet officer ended up in a kind of underground grotto, where the most real madmen lived under the supervision of the psychiatrist Abst, who, on mature reflection, should also be considered insane. Since this secret base of the Nazis can only be approached by a submarine, it is better to call it underground—underwater. Monotonous gray stones hang in every frame. The cave is a cave, but perhaps during his stay here Dr. Abst was able to build a brick wall, a wooden flooring, a cemented citadel with windows at least in some corner? Windows — where? Gray—black vaults, complete darkness when the electricity goes out, water a stone's throw from the dwelling, under a huge dome, without daylight, in the beams of searchlights. And the wave here is not real quiet, soft ... Harmony? No matter how it is! Pure chaos. An unnatural order of misanthropic elements" (Demin, 1980: 76-77).

Already in the 21st century, it was clearly noticed that "Dr. Abst's Experiment", "filmed almost simultaneously with another black and white low-budget zombie horror — "Night of the Living Dead" by George Romero — first showed the emergence of zombies as a result of military experiments. ... The sudden flight of the young actress Zhanna Vladimirskaya (playing the role of Martha) to the United States interrupted the successful distribution of the film" (Moskovitza, 2007).

It is curious that the actress Zhanna Vladimirskaya (1939–2017), after emigrating to the United States, began working at the "Voice of America" radio station, where from 1984 to 2006 she was the host of a number of programs ("In the World of Cinema", "Country Music", "Broadway Masterpieces", "Jazz Club", "Traveling America"). "Dr. Abst's Experiment" was her last film work.

As a rule, current viewers do not have a high opinion of the "Dr. Abst's Experiment": "As a child, I could not cope with either S. Nasibov's book or a film based on it — everything seemed fake, far-fetched, too fantastic. Now I have reviewed the film (mainly for the sake of Sergei Desnitsky, whose few screen works I like) — and remained with the same opinion. It is well known that the Nazis conducted experiments on people, but did they create such obedient warriors — "madmen"? I doubt it... The good actor L. Noreika failed to create a vivid image of the sinister Dr. Abst. In general, it turned out to be an average military detective, very far from reality" (A. Grebenkin).

Dragon Hunt. USSR – Nicaragua, 1987. Directed by Latif Fayziev. Screenwriter Nikolai Ivanov. Actors: Alisher Pirmukhamedov, Mirdza Martinson, Albert Filozov, Bakhodir Yuldashev, Boris Zaydenberg, Lembit Ulfsak and others **15.2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Latif Fayziev (1929–1994) directed 20 full-length feature films, three of which ("The Adventures of Ali Baba and 40 Robbers", "The Legend of Love", "Dragon Hunt") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

The political detective story with elements of fantasy, "Dragon Hunt", tells the story of how the Americans want to overthrow the government of one of the Latin American countries (a transparent allusion to Nicaragua) with the help of a new climate weapon capable of causing hurricanes... True, in ordinary life, the US special services and American paratroopers somehow got along with more traditional methods, but after all, cinema is for that and cinema!

Film critic Miron Chernenko (1931–2004) wrote about the artistic level of this film with mild irony (Chernenko, 1987: 6-7).

But the viewers of the "perestroika" USSR watched this movie with interest, although, of course, this interest would have doubled if it had managed to come out three or four years earlier...

The views of 21st century viewers about "Dragon Hunt" are sometimes opposite:

"Yes, this "thing" is stronger than "Repentance" and "Cold Summer of 53..." (Epiphanes).

"Mediocre, obviously low-budget, political detective of the Soviet perestroika period. So, look over and forget!" (Alex).

Dream to Meet. USSR, 1963. Directed by Mikhail Karyukov, Otar Koberidze. Screenwriters: Alexander Berdnik, Ivan Bondin, Mikhail Karyukov. Actors: Nikolai Timofeev, Otar Koberidze, Larisa Gordeychik, Boris Borisenok, Nikolai Volkov and others. **12,7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

This is the last of two fantastic films ("The Sky Calling" and "Dream to Meet") about space flights, directed by director Mikhail Karyukov (1905–1992).

As for the actor Otar Koberidze (1924–2015), as a director he shot six full-length feature films. I believe that if O. Koberidze had dared to continue to work in the genre of science fiction, the popularity of his films would have been completely different...

Viewers' opinions about "Dream to Meet" today are quite contradictory:

"I, who watched this film in my distant childhood, in the era of the first flights into near space, still seems interesting. Maybe it is a little primitive from the current point of view, but it is a film of its time, and to us guys, still not spoiled by movies of this subject, who read fantastic stories and stories to holes, this was the first real science fiction about space travel in the near future" (M. Khusainov).

"In my youth I was eager to see this film, but when I saw it, I was completely disappointed. The plot seemed primitive and uninteresting, the aliens were not really shown, the alien spacecraft looks more like a "Whirlwind" or "Buran" vacuum cleaner than the technology of the future. Only the songs were good, they are still alive, and the film died long ago. In general, screenwriter Oles Berdnik had a reputation as a mediocre science fiction writer" (B. Nezhdanov).

"In my opinion, "Dream to Meet" is one of those films that one should get acquainted with "hot on the trail", and the further from the time of its creation, the worse the perception. First of all, the wretched, clichéd plotter, at whose service such powerful expressive means are thrown, is depressing. Special effects, however, are not particularly boasting, but everything else is at its best: both the music ... and the scenery — one dust storm on Mars is worth a lot! — and beautiful, soulful faces of the actors, their sincere living in the images of characters" (Elenitsa).

"Today it looks like an archaic, although, probably, if I were a boy in the 1960s, I could be interested in mock-ups of spaceships, space was in vogue then — after all, only two years have passed since Yuri Gagarin's flight" (Sven).

It is curious that after the American alterations of the Soviet fantasy films "The Sky Calls" and "The Planet of Storms" followed by a rework of the film "Dream to Meet" in the American version, this story received the enticing title "Queen of Blood" (1966, directed by Curtis Harrington).

The studio that released "Queen of Blood" did not have the means and technical capabilities for complex filming of space objects and the construction of impressive scenery, so they were taken from the movie "Dream to Meet". But episodes with American actors were added, and, of course, space monsters (where without them!). It is curious that in "Queen of Blood" the main role was played by Hollywood actor Dennis Hopper (1936–2010), who by that time had not yet had time to become famous in "Easy Rider" (1969).

Thanks to the Internet, today's viewers can compare the film "Dream to Meet" with "Queen of Blood":

"To make a fantastic film with spaceships, Martian landscapes and alien interiors, paying only for the work of the actors and the rental of shooting equipment (the junk acting as the scenery, very likely, was brought from the nearest landfill, so it was hardly necessary to pay for it) — this is the main American dream of all Hollywood producers! Roger Corman rushed towards this dream ... In order to cut costs, he took the Soviet film "Dream to Meet" and gave it to Curtis Harrington to be torn apart, who supplemented the Soviet picture with several scenes on the "Ocean" spacecraft and in the moon city, filmed in extremely poor scenery and several close-ups cut into crowd scenes, so that the faces of American actors appear in the midst of overtly socialist "landscapes." I can imagine how the red stars on the rockets pissed off Harrington. But I had to endure, because there was nowhere to take more missiles — in the sense, they would have to pay for them. ... Harrington was unable to get rid of the Soviet scenario — "Queen of Blood" two-thirds copies the plot of

"*Dream to Meet*" I could not, or maybe not intend to — judging by the weakness of motivation and the senselessness of the dialogues in the "American" part of the movie, no one here even thought of paying someone money for the script. ... In short, the American part of the movie gives a lot of reasons to giggle" (Svedok).

Dungeon of Witches. USSR—Czechoslovakia, 1990. Directed by Yuri Moroz. Screenwriter Kir Bulychev. Actors: Sergey Zhigunov, Marina Levtova, Nikolay Karachentsov, Dmitry Pevtsov, Igor Yasulovich, Zhanna Prokhorenko, Vladimir Talashko and others.

Yuri Moroz has been working in cinema since 1986. On his account there are already 15 full-length feature films and TV series. Among them are notable action—packed series "Kamenskaya", "Apostle", "Inquisitor", "Operation Satan".

In the fantasy film "Dungeon of Witches", astronauts find themselves on a distant planet, where various tribes are fighting for power ...

The Soviet film press reacted to this imitative in relation to American film production, but technically weak movie, mostly negatively.

So the film critic Alexander Kiselev argued on the pages of the "Screen" magazine that "it seems that "Dungeon of Witches" "is assembled from waste Western products... But even if the cubes of foreign production and the picture are moderately beautiful, then here it is not considered a work of art a hand is raised" (Kiselev, 1991: 7).

Already in the 21st century, film critic Vladimir Gordeev wrote that "despite its complete squalor, the film is a monument to the Soviet film industry. He is the last of the Mohicans on the meager list of Soviet space fiction with its naive romanticism and dreams of a bright future" (Gordeev, 2010).

The views of the 21st century viewers about "Dungeon of Witches" are clearly divided into pros and cons.

"I love this film... The actors are so young, beautiful, and all as one talented, the music is wonderful and the performance, and the plot itself is clean... I looked in one breath... And even now I do not miss the opportunity" (Tatiana).

"Dungeon of Witches" is an attempt by Soviet filmmakers to play on a Hollywood field. ... All the wretchedness and scarcity of the technical component of Soviet film science fiction is in the eye. Decommissioned moments disguised as planets, dinosaurs made of cardboard, cartoon special effects.... This film became the swan song of Soviet science fiction" (A. Kiriltsev).

"Can I express myself without being ashamed of expressions? The film is complete bullshit! First of all, the very type of the pumped up Zhigunov looks more like a clown than a real positive hero who fights against evil. ... Well, that's why it was necessary to copy the West? The power of our cinematography is not in imitation of the American special effect! Quite differently. Our paintings are incomparably richer in the spiritual sense, in philosophy, in penetration, in empathy for the characters. And we somehow forgot about it overnight. ... As a result, we have what we have. They lost their spirituality, but did not acquire the scope and staginess of special effects. And "Dungeon of Witches" is the worst example of such blind imitation. ... You just can't shoot like that" (Mikhail).

Eclipse Days. USSR, 1988. Directed by Alexander Sokurov. Screenwriters: Yuri Arabov, Arkady Strugatsky, Boris Strugatsky (based on the story by A. and B. Strugatsky "A Billion Years Before the End of the World"). Actors: Alexey Ananishnov, Iskander Umarov, Irina Sokolova, Vladimir Zamansky, Victor Belovolsky and others. **0.7 million viewers in the first year of demonstration in cinemas.**

Alexander Sokurov directed 16 full-length feature films, the most famous of which were the dramas "The Lonely Voice of Man", "Eclipse Day", "Moloch", "Taurus", "Russian Ark", "The Sun", "Alexandra", "Faust" and "Francophonie". His philosophically complex films were not favorites of the mass audience, but they always found a lively response from the audience of film clubs and in the press.

Eighth Day of Creation. USSR, 1980. Directed by Suren Babayan. Screenwriters Suren Babayan, Friedrich Gorenstein (based on the stories of R. Bradbury "The Martian Chronicles", "April 2026", "Long Years"). Actors: Afanasy Trishkin, Yuri Bogatyrev, Vladimir Kocharyan, Ara Ter—Grigoryan, E. Krasnoshchekova and others. **Short film.**

Suren Babayan directed seven full—length feature films, mainly in the genre of a philosophical parable.

Suren Babayan's fantastic film "The Eighth Day of Creation" is based on stories by Ray Bradbury. The main character, who has lost his relatives, is trying to replace them with biorobots...

Even today, this film amazes with the skill of the pictorial series and the wonderful, psychologically subtle acting of Yuri Bogatyrev (1947—1989).

Suren Babayan, it seems to me, is a director of visual, atmospheric cinema that requires empathy and compassion...

Electronic Grandmother. USSR, 1985. Directed by Algimantas Puipa. Scriptwriters Olga Rukenglaz (based on stories by Ray Bradbury). Actors: Ingeborga Dapkunaite, Ina Rosenaitė, Darius Palekas and others. **TV.**

Algimantas Puipa directed 22 full-length feature films. "Electronic Granny" is his only one fantasy genre movie.

According to the plot of this fantastic television movie, intended for a children's audience, the girl Agatha is buying an Electronic Granny...

The attitude of the 21st century viewers to this film is ambiguous:

"A very kind film. Adults may not like it, but it was not conceived for them either" (M. Romanova).

"Extremely boring movie! Above my strength!" (Azmun).

"The picture is so different from the story of the robot grandmother that it is just right to evaluate it as an independent work. ... But there was something in this movie that in childhood really hooked me: a fish in the sand and an unfortunate grandmother who was thrown somewhere in a closet! These scenes are not that impressive now. And what is the matter here: the fact that we, as adults, no longer have the patience to delve into the interests of the heroes, or that the whole specificity of the movie does not allow us to do this, each viewer decides in his own way. The confused plot and some strange desire of the authors to protect the young characters from the consciousness of death and old age and turn their life into a continuous holiday, in my opinion, interfere with the picture. But the film won't leave me indifferent" (Sveta).

End of Eternity. USSR, 1988. Directed by Andrey Ermash. Screenwriters Andrey Ermash, Budimir Metalnikov (based on the novel of the same name by I. Asimov). Actors: Oleg Vavilov, Vera Sotnikova, Georgy Zhzhonov, Sergei Yursky, Gediminas Girdvainis, Boris Ivanov, Boris Klyuev and others. **4.0 million viewers in the first year of distribution.**

The film career of **Andrei Ermash**, the son of Philip Ermash (1923—2002), who held the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, from 1972 to 1986, for obvious reasons, at first was on the rise. After the debut short film "The Return of the Doctor", Andrei Ermash directed two full—length science fiction films — "Moonlight Rainbow" and "End of Eternity". But on December 26, 1986, Philip Ermash left his high post, having managed before that to start the filming process of "End of Eternity", which was released in April 1988. Alexander Kamshalov (1932—2019), who replaced Philip Ermash as chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, was not so favorably disposed towards his son, and as a result, "End of Eternity" became the end of the cinematic path of Andrei Ermash, who at that time was only thirty years old...

In the center of the plot of the film "End of Eternity" was the problem of time travel, beloved by science fiction writers...

The premiere of this fantastic movie took place in April 1988. And if all three leading Soviet film magazines — "Soviet Screen", "Companion of film-goers" and "Cinema Art" were significantly silent about the release of "End of Eternity". And it is understandable why — by the beginning of the release of this film, Philip Ermash had not been the chairman of the State Committee for Cinematography for over a year...

The views of the 21st century audience about "End of Eternity" differ significantly:

"End of Eternity" is a very good and very interesting subtle psychological film of the Sci-Fi genre. The film correctly criticizes the demonism of those who try to control and manage the life of mankind with the help of a time machine and with the help of time management during the existence of mankind in all future centuries" (A. Markov).

"The words of Noyce (in I. Asimov's novel "End of Eternity") about the perniciousness of the system in which people can choose their future, in the film by Andrey Ermash were replaced with words about the perniciousness of choosing the future of all people by only a handful of them. ... What is happening now, when a bunch of people decide which country can have nuclear technology" (Flom).

"The film is very controversial. Firstly, unlike the terribly drawn-out "Moonlight Rainbow", "End of Eternity" turned out to be quite dynamic and very interesting. If "Moonlight Rainbow" is just an attempt to make a fantastic movie, and an unsuccessful one, ... then "End of Eternity" is already a film. Vavilov played Harlan very convincingly. Asimov would be pleased, I am sure, with such an embodiment of his hero. Sotnikova ... a little empty, but her image in this film was not originally embedded with special intellectuality. ... What really hinders is not just an imitation of Tarkovsky, but "quotes" from his painting "Stalker". A scene in the 20th century was filmed in the area of an abandoned power plant on the Jagala River, Estonia. Moreover, the place where Harlan comes out to destroy Eternity, and the place where the heroes of "Stalker" make a halt are one and the same place, if you look at the corresponding segments of both films, then everything is the same, even the broken tiles. It is not clear why Ermash needed this: firstly, it was completely not in the style of the film, and secondly, in the novel, the heroes find themselves in a stunningly beautiful place in the rocks, and there is no waste of a pulp and paper mill (which is located next to an abandoned power plant on the Yagala River) does not float on the water there. Most likely, there was a banal attempt to show off, and, perhaps, envy of the master of Russian cinema — Andrei Tarkovsky. Anyway, if you remove this scene at the end of the film, it makes a wonderful impression" (Nikitos).

Eolomea. DDR—Bulgaria—USSR, 1972. Directed by Herrmann Zschoche. Screenwriters Willie Brueckner, Angel Wagenstein (based on the book by Angel Wagenstein). Actors: Cox Hubbema, Ivan Andonov, Rolf Hoppe, Vsevolod Sanaev, Petr Slabakov and others. 1.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.

Herrmann Zschoche directed 28 full-length feature films and TV series. His last work was released in 1997.

The action of the fantastic drama "Eolomea" takes place in the distant future, when spaceships with astronauts ply the vastness of the universe...

The Soviet film press was practically not interested in this color large-format fantasy movie of co-production, very similar in style to the Soviet space cinema fantasies of previous years.

To date, "Eolomea" has been forgotten by film critics, and the responses of today's viewers to it are far from delight:

"The film is positioned as a fantastic detective story, and begins with the fact that suddenly 9 (!) spaceships disappear simultaneously in one sector of space. However, this secret never gets either suspense or a consistent investigation when the chain of events is unraveled. Instead of this, the cinema suddenly plunges into the heavyweight style ... The problem is that for the authors of the film the main intrigue of the film is so obvious ... that they do not take the time to throw false options to the viewer or wind up some kind of suspense around this mystery ... Having lost our

minds on Earth, and then in space, we get an answer without any mental stress and worry about the missing 9 ships, from which we did not expect at all. In the end what is supposed to make the movie more dynamic weighs it down tremendously and the most cheerful episodes are the main character's small talk with a colleague on an asteroid base and the flashbacks with the main character's love story with a smart blonde who finally unravels the disappearance of the ships" (Sweden80).

"It seems that it has everything for a fantastic movie: intrigue with the missing ships, not bad models with interiors, beautiful costumes, and even a fake station on an asteroid. But, unfortunately, there is no main thing — the feeling that you are watching science fiction. Painfully everything looks boring and somehow mundane, as if we are talking not about the romance of space exploration, but about storing containers near a beer stall" (Fridmon).

Escape of Mr. McKinley. USSR, 1975. Directed by Mikhail Schweitzer. Screenwriter Leonid Leonov (based on his own story of the same name). Actors: Donatas Banionis, Zhanna Bolotova, Angelina Stepanova, Boris Babochkin, Alla Demidova, Vladimir Vysotsky, Alexander Vokach, Sophia Garrel, Leonid Kuravlev, Tatyana Lavrova, Victor Sergachev, Vladimir Kenigson, Olga Barnet, Yuri Volyntsev, Igor Kashvasha, Igor Alexey Safonov, Nikolay Volkov, Natalia Leble and others. **11.4 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Mikhail Schweitzer (1920—2000) directed 16 films, five of which ("Dagger", "Someone else's relatives", "Warrant officer Panin", "Sunday", "The Golden Calf") were among the most popular Soviet films, and the audience remembered, of course, for screen adaptations of literary classics ...

The satirical direction of Mikhail Schweitzer's film "Escape of Mr. McKinley" was predetermined by the script by Leonid Leonov (1899—1994), exposing the "vices of bourgeois society." But the director added Vladimir Vysotsky's ballads to the Leonov story of the "little man" who had come to a dead end in life, which gave the farcical—fantastic plot an additional philosophical dimension.

They say that Schweitzer took a lot of effort to convince the venerable screenwriter to leave Vysotsky in the frame. However, many of his songs, for censorship reasons, alas, were not included in the picture.

Perhaps Donatas Banionis played his McKinley without much brilliance. However, Boris Babochkin in the role of a millionaire was psychologically convincing and ironic.

Due to the complexity of the form and "counter—propaganda" bias, "Escape of Mr. McKinley" caused conflicting opinions among the public. As for Mikhail Schweitzer, it seems that both before and after "Escape..." he had paintings of more significant artistic potential.

At the same time, the Soviet film press greeted "Escape of Mr. McKinley" quite benevolently.

For example, the famous literary critic Lev Fink (1916—1998), in his review published in the journal "Cinema Art", wrote that "the task facing the director is extremely difficult: to acquaint the mass audience with the artistic world of one of the most difficult and deep writers of our time. Mikhail Schweitzer succeeded in many things: for the first time the screen spoke in Leonov's way" (Fink, 1976: 76).

Film critic Lev Rybak (1923—1988) also supported the screen experiment of M. Schweitzer, who for the first time in his director's biography turned to the genre of fantastic parables in the film "Escape of Mr. McKinley": "The unusual picture of Leonov and Schweitzer is built on extreme aesthetic principles; its action is immersed in reality — its plot is woven from fantastic events. The film was shot in an authentic environment, recreated with maximum concreteness, but immediately transformed into a conventional and generalized image of place and time. As if everything we see really could have happened somewhere in the Western world. Something incredible is happening on the screen in realistically outlined circumstances, unthinkable from the standpoint of ordinary logic, but quite convincing as an artistic metaphor, true in its moral (or immoral) essence" (Rybak, 1977: 105).

Today's audiences still argue about "Escape of Mr. McKinley's":

“In my opinion — a great work by Mikhail Schweitzer. It was difficult for him to work with the uncompromising and serious Leonid Leonov (a great writer of the 20th century!), But he went for an experiment, a scandal and won” (A. Grebenkin).

“In addition to the main, official content, the film has a hidden subtext opposite to the official one. I can imagine with what lust all these Soviet hipnyaks and dudes were imbued with "European values" and laughed at the "fool" Banionis when they watched this film. In every shot and sigh, one can feel admiration for the West, admiration for all these prostitutes, bars, an abundance of alcoholic drinks, rich old women, millionaires and expensive cars. And with what love do the actors play prostitutes and millionaires? It's not like boring scientists, simple-minded workers or “semi-official” party workers” (Dazyabadov).

“The film is certainly anti-Western, and all superficial, odious, naive, and implausible. Even then, life in Europe was very different. Instead of the truth, there is only a wrapper, which is slipped into the viewer, without inner filling. A certain spiritless consumer society is shown, more reminiscent of mannequins, and Vysotsky additionally hints at this. The film leaves a nagging feeling of melancholy, hopelessness, as if the authors were warning naive Soviet viewers: "Don't sit on a tree stump, don't eat a pie" or "You don't go there, you go here, otherwise the snow will fall into the head...". And there is still some hard-to-explain feeling of stopped time, like a prophecy that came true in nature in the vastness of our country: "We dreamed of a Western way of life, envied beautiful deceitful pictures, wanted Coca-Cola, inflation, denomination, bars, whiskey”.

Escape to the Ends of the World. USSR, 1991. Directed by Alexander Mayorov. Scriptwriters Vladimir Akimov, Alexander Mayorov. Actors: Alexander Rosenbaum, Tengiz Archvadze, Alexander Ivashkevich, Ekaterina Strizhenova and others.

Alexander Mayorov (1942–2017) during his career, he has directed only four full-length feature films, including films of the fantastic genre.

In my opinion, the fantastic film "Escape to the End of the World", in which the characters travel in time, does not belong to the best works of Alexander Mayorov. The picture turned out to be amorphous, casually filmed and edited, with a rather primitive acting...

The Eternal Man. USSR, 1988. Directed by Edgar Virapyan. **Short film.**

Edgar Virapyan directed only two films, one of which — the short-length debut "The Eternal Man" belongs to the genre of surreal fiction. Today this movie is practically unknown to a wide audience.

Executor 977. USSR, 1989. Directed by Otar Litanishvili. Screenwriters David Akhobadze, Otar Litanishvili. Actors: Gogi Todriya, Nugzar Kurashvili, Khatuna Ioseliani and others.

Otar Litanishvili directed only two full-length feature films, one of them in a fantasy genre.

In the fantastic film "Executor 977" on a certain planet, the population is rigidly divided into the elite and the performers...

Experiment 200. USSR, 1986. Director Yuri Moroz (based on K. Bulychev's story "Jubilee—200"). Actors: Alexey Petrenko, Alexander Feklistov, Olga Gobzeva, Vadim Zakharchenko, Alexander Berda, Vladimir Sychev, Victor Rakov, Andrey Gusev and others. **Short film.**

Director Yuri Moroz has been working in cinema since 1986. On his account there are already 15 full-length feature films and TV series. Among them is another fantastic film—

"Dungeon of witches", notable action—packed series "Kamenskaya", "Apostle", "Inquisitor", "Operation Satan". The short film "Experiment 200" was his film debut.

Fantastic film "Experiment 200" — a story about scientific experiments to transform monkeys into humans — shot with a confident director's hand. Among the cast of the film, I would single out Alexei Petrenko (1938—2017), who psychologically convincingly played the role of a scientist conducting risky experiments.

Extraordinary Adventures of Karik and Valya. USSR, 1987. Directed by Valery Rodchenko. Screenwriter Alexander Alexandrov (based on the novel of Ian LARRY). Actors: Vasily Livanov, Anna Dikul, Alexei Chertsov, Elena Popova, Victor Mikhailov, Olga Volkova, Mikhail Svetin, Leonid Yarmolnik and others. **TV premiere on March 25, 1988.**

Valery Rodchenko (1938—2015) directed four full-length feature films, the most famous of which was the fantastic television film "Extraordinary Adventures of Karik and Valya".

After drinking the elixir invented by Professor Enotov, children become super-tiny and enter the world of insects...

The audience usually remembers this film with warmth:

"The film is nostalgia The swan song of the Soviet children's cinema ... In my opinion, the special effects were at a high enough level for those times. And is it really about special effects? The film, like the book of Jan LARRY, teaches us to take care of nature, not to lose heart in difficult times ... And the heroes are wonderful — gentle, touching Valya, decisive and resourceful Karik, a wise and kind professor" (Nastya).

"A good, kind film, like all children's films in the USSR. As a child, I did not see it, but I saw it already as an adult. Of course, the film loses to the book, but, nevertheless, the creators successfully coped with the task. The children played just great!" (Zakhar).

Ferris Wheel. USSR, 1989. Directed by Marina Tsurtssumia. Screenwriters Ivan Loshchilin, Marina Tsurtssumia (based on a story by Ray Bradbury). Actors: Boris Yukhananov, Ignat Chikov, Dima Brodov and others. **Short Film.**

Marina Tsurtssumia during her career she shot only three full—length films. The film adaptation of Ray Bradbury's fantasy story "Ferris Wheel" was the director's debut in short films.

The story of how the owner of the "Ferris Wheel" ride one day discovers that it turns backward, and with each turn he loses a year of his life, is told in Marina Tsurtssumia's film in the genre of a gloomy phantasmagoria. In short, a typical arthouse of the early 1990s...

Five of the Brave. USSR, 1971. Directed by Leonid Martynyuk. Screenwriter Ales Osipenko. Actors: Alexander Primako, Raimundas Banionis, Tanya Shchigelskaya, Kostya Lenevsky, Lenya Shepelev, Nikolai Nikitsky and others. **8.1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Leonid Martynyuk (1932—2013) directed eight full-length feature films, of which only "The Five of the Brave" can be attributed to the fantastic genre.

In this rather uncomplicated film, designed for a children's audience, schoolchildren by the power of their imaginations from the 1970s become underground members of the era of the Great Patriotic War. In 1973, this plot move was repeated in a film of a similar artistic level — "If It Happens to You" (1973, director Igor Nikolaev).

Many viewers of the XXI century even today treat the "Five of the Brave" quite warmly:

"I looked with pleasure. A bit naive, there are, of course, implausible moments, as in any adventure film about the war. But, firstly, it is designed for a children's audience, and secondly,

there is more truth in it than in any modern film about the war. Well, the children — the main characters play beyond praise” (N. Volkova).

“Bomb film. I love it. In general, I love the military cinema of the USSR. Despite all the obvious historical (form, weapons, etc.) bloopers” (Dor).

But, of course, this movie has opponents:

“Cinema seemed stupid even in childhood” (Kabnb).

“Too fantastic. For a comedy movie, it would still be appropriate, but to seriously look at young supermen, who have an anti-aircraft gun in the bushes with shells, and a hypnotist in time, and the Germans, all as one, oblique, you know, is difficult. The film is intended for a children's audience. That says it all” (Oleg).

Five Seconds Before the Catastrophe. USSR, 1978. Directed by Anatoly Ivanov. Screenwriter Pyotr Popogrebsky. Actors: Pavel Pankov, Valentina Talyzina, Alexander Movchan, Stepan Oleksenko, Paul Butkevich, Eugenia Pleshkita, Vitaly Doroshenko, Nikita Podgorny, Laimonas Noreika, Olga Mateshko, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, etc. **2.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Anatoly Ivanov (1939—1996) directed 11 full—length feature films. All of them did not have mass audience success and could not exceed the bar of seven million viewers in the first year of the demonstration (which in the USSR, unlike in Russian times, was considered a failure).

In the production—fiction film "Five Seconds Before the Catastrophe" there was a talk about a certain Western Nobel laureate (Pavel Pankov), who created a sensational substance capable of revolutionizing science and practice...

The Soviet film press reacted rather harshly to this not very bright film product of the Cold War.

For example, film critic Valery Kichin wrote in "Soviet Screen" that "having drawn their traditional eccentric (scientist!) Hero, having settled him on the outskirts of people and granting him the role of the supreme judge, the authors do not seem to think too much about the essence of such a position. ... The fantastically stupid characters and their fantastically inexplicable deeds took the film too far from common sense. Well, how exactly from this film will some young soul make up his first idea about science, about scientists and about global problems that concern the world?" (Kichin, 1978: 5).

Flight to Thousands of Suns. USSR, 1963. Directed by Alexey Erin. Screenwriter V. Ponomarev. Actors: Victor Birtsev, Misha Ess. **Short film.**

Alexey Erin (1912—2001) directed only one feature film — the fantastic "Flight to Thousands of Suns".

In "Flight to Thousands of Suns", an inquisitive boy in his dreams sees himself as the commander of a spaceship...

Go Ahead, Manya! USSR, 1991. Directed by Roman Ershov. Screenwriters Igor Vinnichenko, Roman Ershov. Actors: Sergei Bekhterev, Yulia Menshova, Evgeny Vesnik, Alexander Slastin, Leonard Varfolomeev, Georgy Millyar, Roman Filippov, Victor Bychkov, Evgeny Morgunov, Anatoly Azo, Stanislaw Sadalsky and others.

Roman Ershov directed only three full—length feature films, of which only the detective "Strangers Don't Go Here" entered the 1,000 highest—grossing Soviet films.

Fantastic comedies (as well as films of the non—comedy genre) about the Frankensteins of the twentieth century are put on stream, both in America and in Europe. A humanoid robot fighting criminals, taking revenge on its human creators, falling in love and demonstrating

countless miracles (rate of fire, titanic strength, the ability to read minds at a distance, hypnosis, etc.) is one of the wandering clichés of the fantastic genre.

Director Roman Ershov, it seems, decided to replenish the library of entertaining films about artificial intelligence. This time, the heroine of his film "Go Ahead, Manya!" became a laboratory—grown woman, programmed to fight the mafia and other criminals.

The action of the movie takes place in the USSR in the early 1990s, languishing with racketeering, swindlers of all stripes and other rabble. All domestic adversities are presented in the film in the grotesque form characteristic of comedy. The plot provides a lot of chases, fights, shootings, explosions and other attributes of "action". However, it all looks awkwardly heavy on the screen. One gets the impression that the director of the film believes that the use of the familiar clichés of science fiction films in concentrated doses already gives a parody effect in itself. In fact, talent is also needed for a parody ...

The film press reacted to this film by Roman Ershov very cool.

For example, Vladimir Martynov (1963—2020) wrote that "the pile of tricks in the picture is so excessive and sometimes chaotic ... And betrayal of taste is a more regrettable fact than betrayal of sexual solidarity" (Martynov, 1992: 3).

The opinions of today's viewers about this movie are generally negative:

"Yeah, it's hard to name a more infamous 1990s film! A shame!" (Ukhmylkin)

"I remember well the beginning of the 1990s, nevertheless, I didn't like the film at all then. What's so funny? All the humor boiled down to a demonstration of the heroine's naked and then plump ass. It is difficult to call it eroticism, even more so a comedy" (Svetlana).

"There was a semblance of freedom, so then newfangled video movies with all kinds of flies were swept off the shelves. ... And it turned out sloppy, uninteresting and unfunny. ... Well, and of course the audience was actively attracted by the naked ass of the actress. How, if not a naked fifth point to awaken the audience's interest? Then it was at the height of fashion" (Mikhail).

But this film also has its fans:

"A wonderful film and very funny. There would be more such films" (A. Mamatov).

"This is a great, light and funny film! Script writers, film crew, actors are great fellows. After all, for such a timing, they fit a dizzying number of gags!" (Andrei).

Gold Chain. USSR, 1987. Directed by Alexander Muratov. Screenwriters Alexander Muratov, Vladimir Sosyura (based on the novel of the same name by Alexander Green). Actors: Vladislav Galkin, Valentinas Masalskis, Boris Khimichev, Povilas Gaidis, Igor Slobodskoy, Svetlana Romashko, Vladimir Golovin, Vladimir Simonov, Eleonora Koriznaite, Janis Zarinsh, Arnis Licitis, Juris Strenga and others.

Alexander Muratov directed 23 full—length feature films, none of which had tangible success with a mass audience.

Marked with a stylish pictorial solution and excellent decorations, the film adaptation of the famous novel by Alexander Green "Gold Chain" could probably become Alexander Muratov's highest—grossing movie, if it had been filmed in the 1960s — 1970s. But it was released in November 1987, an actively "perestroika" year, when the audience was already carried away by completely different topics and problems...

Viewers' opinions about the film "Gold Chain" today are mostly ambiguous:

"An excellent film, the music is very well chosen, the atmosphere of mysticism is on top" (Vyacheslav).

"The film is my favorite, as is the actor Vladislav Galkin. Impressed by the film, Xavier made a game on his laptop, where you can ask a question on the keyboard and the computer will answer with an iron voice" (A. Karpov).

"The impressions are ambiguous. ... probably the lack of budget did not allow the authors to properly "swing", but after all, the scope, the feeling of complex space and incredible luxury is one of the feelings that the author tries to convey to readers when describing the house of Ganuver... But the selection of the actors was quite successful, V. Masalskis as Ganuver. There is something of

Green's in him... The manner of demeanor, the expression of the artist's eyes convinced me, although when reading I imagined this character to be different" (Thea).

"I reviewed the film and understood very clearly: in no case it was impossible to do two things. You cannot "kill" the main character and make all of Ganover's friends betrayed, except for Sandy. It was impossible to make the words of the swindler August Trenk true — that everyone here is actually the same as him. Much can be explained by the trends of the times, the feeling of the era ... but I cannot recognize this surrender of the spirit, which the director went to. His decision is so contrary to Green, against his dream that affirms the sanctity of Love and Friendship in spite of everything that hopelessly spoils the otherwise beautiful film" (S. Lebedev).

Goldfishs. USSR, 1981. Directed by Alexander Mayorov. Screenwriters: Alexander Mayorov, Kir Bulychev (based on the fantastic the story of Kir Bulychev "Goldfish are on sale"). Actors: Elena Maksimova, Nikolay Parfyonov, Galina Polskikh, Mikhail Kononov, Alyosha Gusev, Tatiana Bozhok, Sergey Balabanov, Valentina Titova, Igor Yasulovich and others.

Alexander Mayorov (1942—2017) directed only four full—length feature films, and "Chance" remained his most famous film.

"Goldfishs" is a fantastic comedy about goldfish who fulfilled wishes...

The film was noted for the masterful direction of Alexander Mayorov and good acting, especially Nikolai Parfyonov (1912—1999) and Mikhail Kononov (1940—2007). However, these actors almost always knew how to organically fit into the context of any film...

Great Space Journey. USSR, 1975. Directed by Valentin Selivanov. Screenwriters: Sergei Mikhalkov, Valentin Selivanov (based on the play by Sergei Mikhalkov "The First Three, or Year 2001"). Actors: Lyudmila Berlinskaya, Sergey Obraz, Igor Sakharov, Luciena Ovchinnikova and others. **7.1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Valentin Selivanov (1938—1998) directed only two full—length feature films, of which the most popular was the fantastic film "Great Space Journey" with the memorable music by Alexei Rybnikov, designed for a children's audience.

Reviews of today's viewers about this fantastic film about children who flew into space are mostly positive:

"Brilliant film with brilliant music! Now, unfortunately, it is impossible to shoot such a thing ... people are different, actors are opportunistic, there is no that kindness, that soul and warmth, which were imbued with films of the USSR era" (Roman)

"I am still watching this film with great pleasure. On old Soviet children's films I was brought up and raised as a normal person" (G. Shpak).

"As a child, I adored this film ... Now the film, of course, looks naive, but the songs of Alexei Rybnikov are simply incomparable and magnificent" (A. Chirkov).

Green Doll. USSR, 1980. Directed by Avtandil Kvirikashvili. Screenwriter Vytautas Zhalakevicius (based on the story "Doll" by Ray Bradbury). Actors: Donatas Banionis, Juozas Kiselyus, Alexander Abdulov, David Mkrtychyan, Algimantas Masiulis, Albert Filozov. **Short film.**

Avtandil Kvirikashvili directed only three films and in 1993 left the cinema. "Green Doll" is his only science fiction film.

Stylistically, the "Green Doll" was shot clearly under the influence of "Solaris" by Andrei Tarkovsky. To begin with, Donatas Banionis (1924—2014) looks on the screen as an aged Chris Kelvin — a tired, pessimistic scientist who is trying to unravel the secret of a certain green mummy that his young colleague has become.

Two more famous Baltic artists are involved in the film — Juozas Kiselyus (1949—1991) and Algimantas Masiulis (1931—2008), who also add a western flavor to the cast. The character

"hatched" from the mummy was psychologically charming and somehow surprisingly defenselessly played by Alexander Abdulov (1953–2008).

In my opinion, Avtandil Kvirikashvili's directorial debut was promising, but, alas, there was no creative take-off further ...

Guest from the Future. USSR, 1984. Directed by Pavel Arsenov. Scriptwriters Pavel Arsenov, Kir Bulychev (based on the science fiction novel by Kir Bulychev "One Hundred Years Ahead"). Actors: Natalya Guseva, Alexey Fomkin, Ilya Naumov, Vyacheslav Nevinny, Mikhail Kononov, Maryana Ionesyan, Elena Metelkina, Evgeny Gerasimov, Vladimir Nosik, Igor Yasulovich, Georgy Burkov, Valentina Talyzina, Natalya Varley, Andrey Gradov, Elena Tsyplakova and others. **TV: March 25, 1985.**

Pavel Arsenov (1936–1999) directed ten full-length feature films, but his most famous work was the fantastic series for children "Guest from the Future".

"Guest from the Future" aroused the admiration of a mass audience and controversy among film critics and film critics.

Film critic Alla Romanenko noted that in the series "Guest from the Future" "all the moves and turns of the plots are known from children's literature: chases, escape of heroes, tracking down criminals, dangers, ... rescuers in the form of a cool team, etc. And yet, the main success was the charm of the performer of the role of Alice — Natasha Guseva. ... But the most charming in this film is the Image of the Future, where wonderful people live, and minor flaws like bureaucratic inventory and formalism are found only in a robot... There is no need to fear such a future" (Romanenko, 2010: 39).

However, the film critic Andrei Vyatkin categorically disagrees with the opinion of Alla Romanenko, who called his article "Why is the series "Guest from the Future" bad?" and justified his opinion by the fact that the film turned out "a shameful failure of Soviet science fiction" (Vyatkin, 2020), as its surroundings turned out to be too plain and poor.

And she took the "Guest from the Future" very seriously Maria Yavorskaya, who accentuated the ideological and political components of the film: "The Soviet system was perceived as eternal and unchanging. This gave birth to the description of the future through the eternity of the present. The future of Kolya and his classmates could not radically differ from their present, since even Alice's "amazing future" is part of the "eternal" Soviet system, the ideal image of a socialist state, despite all its exoticism and differences from Soviet everyday life, unusual for a Soviet schoolchild ... The film also contains the theme of the inviolability of the Soviet system. Here it manifests itself through the establishment of continuity between the present and the future. Alice's phrase in a dialogue with Yulia: "We are you" becomes a call for the construction of a future that depends on what each of the Soviet people has done today, and correlates with the idea of building a communist future. The connection between eternity and the future is also reflected in the shots of futuristic Moscow, the panorama of which remains unchanged after a hundred years" (Yavorskaya, 2019).

However, viewers, as a rule, treat the "Guest from the Future" very warmly even today. Moreover, there are even fan-clubs of the book, film and the main character — Alice:

"This movie is just super! I am already 20 years old. It would seem that everything, basta, here to fall into childhood ... But, in fact, I really love this film, and always cry very much at the end. ... This is a childhood film. ... I think it doesn't matter how old you are: you can always watch your favorite children's film, plunge into childhood. It's just superb that there are such films. They are real!" (M. Queen).

"The most beautiful film. He returns to the bright past. And although this past is now accepted to scold..., it was ours, it was bright. ... Then we lived and breathed easily, deeply, despite the inevitable difficulties, lived merrily, were happy and free. All were more or less equal, there was no greed, rudeness and stupidity that flourished in our time. Life was wonderful, it is a pity that it is now far from us. The new generation will not understand us, let it be. But we were happy. And it seems to me that many will support me" (A. Melnikov).

However, among the audience there are, of course, supporters of the negative point of view: "I didn't like the film either in childhood or years later. The main character — except for huge eyes and nothing to remember, there is almost no game, everything is so perfect, correct and boring to a yawn. The plot is stretched out, uninteresting, with a claim to a philosophical idea of a perfect universal future, etc. Not an ounce of real, as they say, driving adventures. I will not say anything about the scenery, entourage, shooting on location, since the budget deficit was clearly felt. Well, how can we do without communist ideology — red ties, vigorous friendly pioneers, a flag over the Kremlin! Hence, such a rejection of this film, because reality spoke of the opposite — the pioneers were not always so friendly, and (oh, horror!) many boys already smoked, swore obscenely and almost did not wear ties. Girls, as a rule, were not like Alice either".

Gum—Gam. USSR, 1985. Directed by Oleg Eryshev. Screenwriter Leonid Paley (based on the fantastic story by Evgeny Veltistov). Actors: Volodya Mitrofanov, Denis Zaitsev, Illarion Naydenko, Vika Bocharova, Ivan Dorrer, Nikita Eryshev, Ksenia Balandina, Mikhail Boyarsky and others. **TV premiere on November 2, 1985.**

Oleg Eryshev (1933—1995) directed eight feature length films, many of which were television performances.

In the fantastic TV movie "Gum—Gam", intended for a children's audience, a schoolchild meets an alien boy...

Unfortunately, the impression of an interesting plot of the film, in my opinion, deteriorates significantly due to poor direction and bright, but lacking in taste, coarsely thick makeup of the main characters...

However, this film still has many fans today:

"This is one of my favorite childhood films. This is a bright, kind, sometimes a little sad film" (A. Bogdanova).

"The film is magnificent, wonderful, amazing, kind, a little sad, I watched it many times, one of the best Soviet children's films of the 1980s" (Andrey).

His Name was Robert. USSR, 1967. Directed by Ilya Olschwanger. Screenwriters Lev Kuklin, Yusef Princev. Actors: Oleg Strizhenov, Marianna Vertinskaya, Mikhail Pugovkin, Alexey Dranitsyn, Marcel Marceau, Nina Mamaeva and others. **17,5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Ilya Olschwanger (1923—1979) directed seven full—length feature films, but only one of them — the fantastic comedy "His Name was Robert" — was included in the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films.

The audience and the press reacted to this comedy quite warmly.

Film critic Galina Senchakova praised Oleg Strizhenov, who played two roles in this film — the scientist and the robot he created, and complimented Marianna Vertinskaya, whose role in the film demanded "grace and lightness, in a word, everything that Vertinskaya is endowed with in abundance" (Senchakova, 1967).

Film critic Andrei Vyatkin wrote that after watching this film, Arkady Strugatsky asked: "Isn't it a parody of the machine—Robert, which begins to feel its imperfection and is trying to become richer than the original?" And then A. Vyatkin continued this "fantastic questionnaire": "And today we have the right to ask: "A parody of whom? "It is clear to whom — to the Soviet person. ... But, as always, the success of the film played an unkind service, confirming the mass character, which means "frivolity", "lightness" of the science fiction genre, and the picture, following other SF films made "for everyone," migrated to children's screenings" (Vyatkin, 1995).

And already in the 21st century, film critic Alexei Vasiliev notes that in the film "His Name was Robert", the role of Oleg Strizhenov "suggests that he walks woodenly in a blue suit and answers all the requests of those around him: "I understood the task". Plastically, Strizhenov consistently and with visible pleasure gives the idol. But his skin, the settled features of his features

are different all the way. They all the way add up to a new textured type. Now he is a mannequin, then a young man of absurd handsomeness like "Oh, I'm good! So what is it? Pig faces are all around me! ... "Then suddenly the whole scene takes place with a face that is loose, rumped, but not hungover — such are those of people who are insecure about themselves. Then he is just a lost boy who needs to be fed and called a mother. Then he is a self—confident and indifferent record holder, taking the gold of the Olympics with his usual gesture. That his face is covered with some kind of accounting pettiness, squeezed limp, like the chess champion Karpov. That is the generous, fresh, unexpected dreaminess of an almost 40—year—old man of a boy lounging on the grass at noon" (Vasiliev, 2018).

Reviews of the film "His Name was Robert" by current viewers are mostly positive:

"Stylish movie! Unusual. This is not about the propaganda of the achievements of Soviet technology. The point is in the presentation of the material and the director's ability to show that the USSR is not a stronghold of evil, but a collection of talented young people and beautiful girls. I think if in those years the film was watched abroad, many changed their opinion about our reality for the better. I will say this, the film modernized the life of the 1960s. Brought closer to the West, in a good sense of the word. Vertinskaya is a darling!" (Patr).

"The film is up—to—date even now! It has a lot: a rational sci—fi component, and romance, and humor, and an enviable free faith in the brightest tomorrow ... Alas! — which does not exist nowadays. Therefore, what a pleasure it is to once again plunge into the atmosphere of the film! Moreover, the main idea is for all times: the soul and feelings of a person are not replaceable by any technical innovations" (Adele).

"Interesting, good film. He was especially loved as a child, when he appeared on the screens of cinemas. We retell each other the quotes of the characters of the film, played by M. Pugovkin and O. Strizhenov. All in all, a fantastic comedy, a rare genre. And today you already look and understand that something is missing" (A. Akhmatov).

Hotel "At the Dead Mountaineer's". USSR, 1980. Directed by Grigory Kromanov. Screenwriters Arkady and Boris Strugatsky. Actors: Uldis Pucitis, Juri Jarvet, Lembit Peterson, Mikk Mikiver, Karlis Sebris, Irena Kryuzaitė, Sulev Luik, Tiit Härm, Nijole Ozhelite and others. **17,5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Grigory Kromanov (1926—1984) always gravitated towards action genres. His main hit was the romantic "The Last Relic" — 44.9 million viewers. The screen version of Yulian Semyonov's novel "Diamonds for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" also attracted a significant audience — 27.7 million viewers. In total, he directed six full—length feature films, three of which ("The Last Relic", "Diamonds for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", "Hotel "At the Dead Mountaineer's") were included in the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films. And there is no doubt that, had it not been for the director's early death, he would have managed to shoot several more movie hits, all the more so because, judging by the "Hotel "At the Dead Mountaineer's", he has completely mastered the synthesis of science fiction about aliens and a horror film...

...Police inspector Glebski faces an almost insoluble problem. In a hotel cut off from the whole world by a mountain avalanche (a traditional "confined space" situation for detectives) a crime was committed, and not without the participation of representatives of an extraterrestrial civilization.

Some of the guests — people, others ... Who is who? Is it possible to judge aliens from space by earthly laws? Where is the line between call of duty and elementary humanity?

Creating a pictorial solution to a fantasy film is not an easy task. Even during the filming, director G. Kromanov said that the main principle of the production would be the style of hyperrealism: everything on the screen should be super authentic, every detail, every little thing...

The idea was a success. Using light-color flashes and halftones, specular reflections and neon flares, cameraman Juri Sillart makes it possible that everything happens as if in a very real setting, but this reality of a fantastic world... The mountain peaks surrounding the hotel seem to be fragments of distant planets ... unusual music through which words in some incomprehensible language can hardly make their way. The figures of the dancing, wriggling in the mirror reflections of chilly purple hues, create the impression of being detached from the Earth, a fabulous flight...

The visual solution is completely subordinated to the drama: behind the imaginary fun of the hotel guests, you can feel the hidden drama...

The so-called "average domestic detectives" have taught us to the weakened tension of intrigue. At the most decisive moment, a magic wand comes to the aid of the hero of the picture: unexpected help, carelessness of the enemy, a wrench that has turned up at his hand, etc. The directors "spare" the nerves of the audience.

"Hotel..." was built according to different laws. The tension in the film gradually but steadily increases as the action unfolds. The atmosphere of a close, but inaccessible mystery is capable of capturing even viewers familiar with the story of the Strugatsky brothers...

Film critic Mikhail Trofimenkov believes that "this is a wonderful film, corresponding to the Strugatsky brothers" (Trofimenkov, 2008).

As for the opinions of modern viewers, they, as often happens, differ:

"I love this film very much. ... Gloomy atmosphere, colorful characters and strange music. This film must be watched at night. ... There is no place for irony or humor. This is a fantastic thriller. ... The film is very poignant, and the issues raised in it do not become outdated. Cinema for all time" (Reinmud).

"After reading the book, it's impossible for me to watch this film personally. Without knowing the source material, it can still arouse interest. But after the story the Strugatsky were so ... not completely impressed" (Ines).

"The film is good. Made in the Baltic style seriously. But personally, when watching, I lacked that ironic intonation that accompanies the wonderful detective—fantastic story of the Strugatsky brothers. Well, and, of course, in the film it is impossible to reflect all the nuances of the book, and the images of the characters formed upon reading almost completely run counter to those that live on the screen. But this is a subjective opinion" (S. Uvarov).

"First I read the book and did the right thing, then I watched the film. Disappointment, of course" (Nadelia).

How to be Happy. USSR, 1986. Directed by Yuri Chulyukin. Screenwriters Georgy Kushnirenko, Yuri Chulyukin. Actors: Nikolai Karachentsov, Lev Durov, Marina Dyuzheva, Vsevolod Shilovsky, Vladimir Shevelkov, Elena Valyushkina, Tatiana Peltzer, Lyudmila Chulyukina, Semyon Farada and others. **11.2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Yuri Chulyukin (1929—1987) started in fiction films as a successful comedian ("Unyielding", "Girls"), and this, in my opinion, was the best period of his career. In total, he directed 14 full—length feature films, four of which ("Unyielding", "Girls", "Royal Regatta", "Let's Talk, Brother...") were included in the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films.

In the fantastic comedy "How to Become Happy", a certain inventor in a sly ironic performance by Lev Durov (1931—2015) designed an apparatus capable of unmistakably determining people's abilities...

This picture became the penultimate in the career of Yuri Chulyukin: in 1987 he flew to the capital of Mozambique Maputo for a week of Soviet cinema, where, among other films, the film "How to Become Happy" was to be shown. The entire Soviet delegation was accommodated in one of the best local hotels, and on March 7, Yuri Chulyukin was found dead in the hotel elevator shaft ... Rumors about the reasons for his death are different, but apparently no one will ever know the truth...

The Soviet film press received the film "How to Be Happy" rather warmly.

For example, Olga Muravyova kindly wrote in "Soviet Screen" that in the film "How to Be Happy", important for all the problems of choosing a profession, intrigues of the goal of life, disclosing the talents and abilities inherent in a person" (Muravyova, 1986: 15).

Film critic Nikolai Savitsky also considered that "How to Be Happy" is "a funny, inventively staged show with the participation of great actors ... But the questions that the movie casually touches on are serious. Bright, comedic form, grotesque sharpening, caricature ... not a hindrance.

On the contrary, in the element of a popular, entertaining genre, the seriousness and significance of the author's intention emerge with particular clarity" (Savitsky, 1986: 6).

But the opinions of the audience of the XXI century about this film differ significantly:

"Great movie. These are my childhood memories, then I watched it in the cinema. Since then, I often think about it, I really want to revise it, but I don't know where. Let the film be naive, let it be simple. But in this naivety and in this simplicity is all the charm. And do not philosophize slyly. The simpler, the clearer. How great it would be if in your life there was a chance to know in advance which side of life you need to turn your face to, in order to enjoy it to the fullest, to be glad that you do your job better than anyone else! A dream, not an invention! I would very, very much like to receive a note about my hidden talent" (K. Ovchinnikova).

"Now you can only watch this with bewilderment: how good actors took part in such delirium. In terms of production, in the first place, in terms of the script — in the second place. And the actors apparently felt it, because even Peltzer, Durov and Karachentsov played poorly, I am silent about the others" (Sergei).

Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin. USSR, 1966. Directed by Alexander Gintsburg. Screenwriters Alexander Gintsburg, Joseph Manevich (based on the story of the same name by Alexei Tolstoy). Actors: Evgeny Evstigneev, Vsevolod Safonov, Mikhail Astantov, Natalya Klimova, Vladimir Druzhnikov, Mikhail Kuznetsov, Yuri Sarantsev, Pavel Springfield and others. **20.8 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Director Alexander Gintsburg (1907—1972) began his creative career as a cameraman. On his account were the shooting of such famous films as, for example, "Valery Chkalov" and "Two Fighters". In 1953, he made his debut as a director, but then managed to direct only three full-length feature films, of which only one — the adaptation of the fantastic story by Alexei Tolstoy "The Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin" — managed to enter the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

The film "Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin" was released all-Union in February 1966 and immediately became popular with viewers, especially fans of science fiction and action movies.

However, the film press reacted negatively to this, in my opinion, extraordinary film adaptation.

For example, film critic Valentina Ivanova (1937–2008) spoke negatively about "Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin": "We saw an amazing spectacle in our dull meticulousness. ... Only at the end of the film, in a long panorama of a deserted island with two miserable figures of almost savages loitering around it ... only in this end for a minute did something of Tolstoy's crushing sarcasm peep through. A glimpse appeared and ... And the light came on in the hall" (Ivanova, 1968: 199–200).

Film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929–1997) first approached A. Gintsburg's film from an ideological angle: "In A. Tolstoy's novel "Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin", the era of the 1920s is superbly conveyed, the attitude of a writer who sided with a young revolutionary country. In "Hyperboloid" the strongest is not the scientific, but the social side: the mechanics of bourgeois relationships, the stock market game, capitalist morality and economics. But just the social side completely dropped out of the film of the same name, and again the simplistic detective side remained" (Revich, 1968: 83).

But then, 16 years later, having removed the ideological pathos from his text, Vsevolod Revich again emphasized that "despite the cast of the actors, which are rare in sonority of names, the film did not succeed. A typical mistake was made by the filmmakers of large works of prose. The desire not to miss the main plot moves leads to fluency — the character flashed, the event flew by — and further, further, rather; there is not enough screen time to peer into faces, to understand the essence of events" (Revich, 1984).

A modern look at "Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin", which provides a deep comparative analysis of two film adaptations of the novel, can be read in a detailed article by film critic Andrei Vyatkin (Vyatkin, 2020).

Today's viewers assess the "Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin" quite positively:

"Great film! Seen as a child, the best impressions to this day. Excellent production. And what a stellar cast! Such films should be shown to our children. The Golden Fund of Our Cinema" (A. Garcia).

"The film directed by Guntzburg is filmed more subtly and thoroughly than the series "Collapse of Engineer Garin" based on the same novel by A. Tolstoy. Guntzburg deliberately shoots a film in the 1960s in the tradition of the 1920s — 1930s, with noble heroes, insidious villains, seductive beauties, evil capitalists ... This is perfectly conveyed by the actors and cameraman, who shoots a black and white movie with light and shadow, tones, half—tones — as in the good old films. ... The Kvinikhidze series is also very good, but this film is closer to the original source" (A. Grebenkin).

I was a Satellite of the Sun. USSR, 1959. Director: Victor Morgenstern. Screenwriters Vladimir Kapitanovsky, Vladimir Shreiberg. Actors: Pavel Makhotin, Vladimir Emelyanov, Grigory Shamshurin, Anatoly Shamshurin, Georgy Vitsin and others.

Victor Morgenstern (1907—1986) directed only one full-length feature film — "I was a Satellite of the Sun".

... Research probes were launched into space, and an outstanding Soviet scientist died in an attempt to return them to Earth. Years passed, and now his son, a young explorer Andrey, is also engaged in space problems ...

Many viewers today treat this fantastic film with warm nostalgia:

"Great movie. ... Purely Soviet — with the ideology and pathos of that time, with a touchingly nagging note of personal relations. Vitsin's unique role as a scientist. Prototypes of video recorders and even desktop computers, a person on board a ship, anti—meteorite guns — all this even before Gagarin's flight. I always enjoy watching such humanistic films" (Raymond)

"The film is entertaining, some virgin naive and inept, but interesting to watch. In some places, it's even funny. The message is amazing — optimism in its purest form!" (Check mark).

Ideal Crime. USSR, 1990. Directed by Igor Voznesensky. Screenwriter Zinovy Yuriev (based on his own novel "Complete Rework"). Actors: Remigius Sabulis, Elena Proklova, Alexander Vokach, Vladimir Steklov, Vytautas Paukšte and others.

Igor Voznesensky directed 13 full—length feature films, two of which ("Aquanauts" and "Attention! All posts...") managed to enter the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films.

In this "perestroika" fantastic detective story, some criminals, commissioned by the "powerful of this world", are cleverly making false evidence on people who need to be eliminated...

The views of the 21st century viewers about the "Ideal Crime" are very contradictory:

"The film is amazing! Magnificent ..., as they say: "Contemporaries, learn." ... The brightest impression of the cinema of youth" (Materialist).

"The plot of the film is idiotic. But acting and intrigue make it very interesting" (I. Vasiliev).

"The cinema seemed too childish ... The very idea, the very idea, is much more interesting than the embodiment on the screen. I have not read the book, but the way the story is told, the sequence of scenes, some inconsistencies, improbable development of the plot, weak acting — all this I associate with the crisis of the then cinema" (Alexander).

If this Happens to You. USSR, 1973. Directed by Igor Nikolaev. Screenwriter Vyacheslav Naumov. Actors: Sergey Obraz, Ekaterina Malinina, Seryozha Komolov, Volodya Tsvetkov, Vladlen Paulus, Svetlana Konovalova and others. **5.4 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Igor Nikolaev (1924—2013) directed seven full—length feature films, but of them only the film "If It Happens to You" can be attributed to the fantastic genre, reminiscent of the film "Five of the Brave" by Leonid Martynyuk, released two years earlier.

According to the plot of the fantastic film "If this Happens to You", designed for a children's audience, schoolchildren of the 1970s unexpectedly find themselves at the front of the Great Patriotic War...

The film did not have much success for the audience of the 1970s, apparently, it did not have enough entertainment and bright acting works for this...

There are still viewers these days who remember this film:

"The film, first of all, is about how schoolchildren realized that war is not a hurray, hurray, and it is not a whip. They saw the robbers—invaders (they didn't even disdain to pull off the girl's jacket), saw what battle and death were, and guessed that it was not so easy to get a machine gun and a leather jacket. Everything is in order here. Adventures in the spirit of "Elusive Avengers" in such a film, it seems to me, is inappropriate, the emphasis is on the fact that children have no place here" (Slava).

"I am a huge fan of Soviet cinema, including those for children. But "boring" about this film is putting it mildly. ... I, except for a couple of moments, never believed that the children were in the war, that shells really explode there, bullets are whistling, people are dying. Of course, the writers of "We are from the Future" clearly watched this movie. But "fat" dramatic flaws, some kind of faded direction and acting (especially, the "wounded" tanker) nullify the whole feeling of war. It turned out to be such a walk through the enemy's rear" (Theatrpod).

Incredible Case. USSR, 1990. Directed by Rashid Malikov. Screenwriter Sergei Beglerov. Actors: Bahram Matchanov, Khusan Sharipov, Andrey Bubashkin, Andrey Shitikov, Ingrida Mikyalionite and others.

Rashid Malikov directed 11 full-length feature films and TV series.

In the fantastic comedy "Incredible Case", three aliens arrive on Earth ...

Today this film is practically forgotten — both by film critics and by the audience...

Invisible Man. USSR, 1977. Director and screenwriter Gleb Selyanin (based on the novel of the same name by H.G. Wells). Actors: Rostislav Katansky, Mikhail Danilov, Galina Volkova, Boris Ulitin, Mikhail Svetin, Anatoly Ravikovich, Olga Volkova, Anatoly Puzyrev and others. **TV.**

Gleb Selyanin (1926—1984) has directed three dozen TV films, including the fantasy genre.

This television adaptation of the famous science fiction novel by H.G. Wells is now largely forgotten.

Here is one of the few viewer reviews:

"This production was very good for its time. Actors present their characters in a very convex and colorful way.—this well compensates for the intimacy of the action. ... I saw him in those years at least three times, and each time I got pleasure from living again the whole storyline— the play of the actors and the atmosphere of the production involuntarily forced one to plunge into the emotions and twists and turns of the plot" (Atarist).

Invisible Man. USSR, 1985. Directed by Alexander Zakharov. Screenwriters Alexander Zakharov, Vladlen Kagarlitsky (based on the novel of the same name by H.G. Wells). Actors: Andrei Kharitonov, Romualdas Ramanauskas, Leonid Kuravlyov, Natalia Danilova, Oleg Golubitsky, Nina Agapova, Victor Sergachev, Yuri Katin—Yartsev, Emmanuel Geller and others. **20.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Alexander Zakharov started his creative career as an animator and production designer. In fiction, he has only one full-length directorial work — the adaptation of the science fiction novel by H.G. Wells "Invisible Man".

If this film had been released 10–20 years earlier, it would undoubtedly have expected much greater success, but at the box office in 1985, The “Invisible Man” (unlike, for example, the “Amphibian Man”) was able to attract to cinemas total twenty million viewers, significantly behind not only the highest-grossing Soviet film in 1985 — the comedy “The Most Charming and Attractive”, but also from “Black Arrow” and “Winter Cherry”. Even the huge popularity in those years of the leading actor Andrei Kharitonov (1959–2019) did not help...

The opinions of today's viewers about the “Invisible Man” differ significantly:

“The film is disgusting. ... Gentlemen, have you read the novel by H.G. Wells? ... Well, I will report to you, and this director Zakharov is mediocre! To turn a talented novel into complete nonsense. ... A completely stupid, mediocre script was not saved even by talented acting works” (Arseniy).

“My favorite film. I consider it a little-known undeservedly (probably for connoisseurs). The plot is more interesting than the book. Great actors, close-ups, music. A beautiful “live” film — you can see what has been done with soul and love” (Ilyas).

“While watching the film, the feeling of fear does not leave, ... and the end is replaced by a feeling of complete despair. This film perfectly shows the tragedy of a person who was not understood by society, who was ahead of his time; the power of scientific knowledge in the hands of a greedy and selfish person is shocking. The actors play great” (Ilya).

Iron Heel. Russian Federation, 1919. Directors: Vladimir Gardin, Tamara Glebova, Andrey Gorchilin, Evgeny Ivanov–Barkov, Leonid Leonidov, Olga Preobrazhenskaya. Screenwriters: Vladimir Gardin, Anatoly Lunacharsky (based on the novel of the same name by Jack London). The film has not survived.

Vladimir Gardin (1877–1965) directed nearly seven dozen films, most of which were shot by him before 1917. To participate in the “Iron Heel” V. Gardin attracted film school students.

Tamara Glebova (1894–1944) was mainly known as an actress. As a director, she only directed three silent films.

Actor Andrei Gorchilin (1886–1956) was a co-director of only one film — “Iron Heel”.

Director Evgeny Ivanov–Barkov (1892–1965) directed 13 feature films and “Iron Heel” was his directing debut.

Actor Leonid Leonidov (1893–1941) made only two films, both during the silent film period.

Director, actress and screenwriter Olga Preobrazhenskaya (1881–1971) directed 14 full-length films, the last of which (“The Guy from the Taiga”) was released on the screens of the USSR in May 1941.

The fantastic film “Iron Heel” was intended to accompany a theatrical performance and told about how people of the future study the history of the 20th century, where the American imperialists, fascists and the final world socialist revolution appear.

Island of the Rusty General. USSR, 1988. Directed by Valentin Khovenko. Screenwriter Kir Bulychev (based on his story “Island of the Rusty Lieutenant”). Actors: Ekaterina Prizhbiljak, Alexander Lenkov, Mikhail Danilov, Lyudmila Artemieva, Stanislav Sokolov, Sergei Skripkin, Vladimir Balon and others. **TV premiere on May 1, 1988.**

Valentin Khovenko (1940–2003) directed six full-length feature films, of which the most famous were the films “Eyes” and “A Pistol with a Silencer”.

In the fantastic film “Island of the Rusty General”, the main character, schoolgirl Alisa Selezneva, familiar to readers and viewers from “Guest from the Future” (though she was played there by another actress) is captured by evil robots...

“Island of the Rusty General” did not achieve the success of “Guest from the Future”, and the opinions of current viewers about it are very contradictory:

"A very good movie. It has both humor and seriousness. It is interesting for both children and adults who have not lost the ability to think" (Antarxis).

"It was rather weak even for that time. Perhaps the budget did not allow, but many things could be worked out much more interesting. ... I would remove all the cartoon overlays, it would be at least a little better" (G. Azarov).

It's Hard to Be a God. Germany—USSR—France—Switzerland, 1990. Directed by Peter Fleischmann. Screenwriters: Jean—Claude Carriere, Dal Orlov, Peter Fleischmann (based on the novel of the same name by the Strugatsky brothers). Actors: Edward Zhentara, Alexander Filippenko, Anne Gauthier, Christina Kaufman, Andrey Boltnev, Pierre Clementi, Mikhail Gluzsky, Elguja Burduli, Werner Herzog, Regimantas Adomaitis and others.

The famous German director Peter Fleischmann was the director of this adaptation of the cult science fiction novel by the Strugatsky brothers, and a powerful ensemble of German, French and Soviet actors starred.

The picture was shot for a long time and was released on Soviet screens only in 1990.

The Soviet film press reacted to her quite condescendingly.

For example, film critic Victor Demin (1937—1993) wrote a rather unusual article for himself, in which he in every possible way tried to avoid any evaluations of the film (Demin, 1990: 6).

But film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929—1997), in principle, positively assessed this adaptation, stressing that "Peter Fleischmann, stubbornly overcoming bureaucratic redoubts, recently completed a joint (with the USSR) two—part film that retained the name of the Strugatskys' novel. The tragedy of the novel by Anton—Rumata is that he drove himself into a spiritual dead end, never being able to convert the holy humanistic principles in which he was brought up from childhood. In P. Fleischmann's film, we see a slightly different initial disposition. Yes, the people of Arkanar are downtrodden, yes, temporary workers devoid of conscience do whatever they want with them. Yes, the image of the "gray cardinal", the actual ruler of Arkanar Don Reba, created by A. Filippenko, goes beyond the regional and medievalist framework, acquiring the sinister features of tyrants of all times and peoples. On this part, there are no fundamental differences with the book. And here's what's new. Strange, but the appearance of the opposing side does not delight us either. Highly developed and omnipotent earthlings not only do not know how to help the population of the planet, but, it seems, do not even want to know it" (Revich, 1990: 13).

The opinions of 20th century viewers about the film "It's Hard to Be God" differ significantly:

"Awesome movie! ... Of course, the film has discrepancies with the text of the book ... but the amazing cast and skill of the actors made this film full of tension and beauty ... The landscapes of Arkanar amaze with their uniqueness, and the battles and the laser beam in one of the last scenes decorate the film with additional dynamics" (A. Kuzmin).

"This adaptation seemed to me unsuccessful. Rarely is it possible to improve something by fixing the ending. After all, the Strugatskys' novel is deeply tragic ... And it's not clear with the scenery" (Zabar).

Ivan Vasilievich Changes his Profession. USSR, 1973. Directed by Leonid Gaidai. Screenwriters: Vladlen Bakhnov, Leonid Gaidai (based on the play by Mikhail Bulgakov). Actors: Yuri Yakovlev, Leonid Kuravlyov, Alexander Demyanenko, Savely Kramarov, Natalya Selezneva, Natalya Krachkovskaya, Natalya Kustinskaya, Vladimir Etush, Mikhail Pugovkin, Sergey Filippov, etc. **60, 7 million viewers in the first year of screening in cinemas.**

Leonid Gaidai (1923—1993) directed 17 feature films, 12 of which ("The Diamond Arm", "The Prisoner of the Caucasus, or Shurik's New Adventures", "Operation Y" and Other Adventures of Shurik", "Ivan Vasilyevich Changes His Profession", "Sportloto—82", "It Can't Be!", "Twelve Chairs" , "For matches", "Absolutely serious" (almanac, directors of other short stories — E. Ryazanov, N. Trakhtenberg, E. Zmoyro, V. Semakov), "Business people", "Dangerous for life!", "Private detective, or Operation "Cooperation") entered the thousand of the highest grossing Soviet films.

"Ivan Vasilyevich Changes His Profession" — a free adaptation of the satirical comedy by M. Bulgakov in the enchanting direction of Leonid Gaidai, in the first year of demonstration in cinemas alone, it crossed the bar of 60 million viewers (during the entire existence of the USSR, only seven Soviet comedies were able to do this) and immediately caused heated controversy among film critics.

The "Pravda" praised the film with restraint, but at the same time noted that Leonid Gaidai "sometimes changes the taste. For example, a woman takes off her wig and turns out to be ... bald. Is it funny? May be. But somehow unattractive. A certain viewer will probably have other comments on certain particulars. There is also no particular: we are again offered an old friend Shurik, but neither the director nor — especially — the actor A. Demyanenko managed to make this meeting interesting" (Kozhukhova, 1973: 4).

But on the whole, film critics were unanimous in their positive assessment of the film. (Bogomolov, 1973: 7–8; Zorky, 1974: 78–79; Clado, 1973: 4; Rybak, 1973: 20).

Film critic Mikhail Kuznetsov (1914–1980) noted that "comedy is not only funny, it is also smart and sharp!" (Kuznetsov, 1973: 2).

And Evgeny Gromov (1931–2005) stressed that "L. Gaidai caustically ridicules arrogance and bureaucracy, impudence and vanity, tyranny and stupidity. The episode when Ivan Vasilyevich pulls out the director Yakin (M. Pugovkin) with his staff is magnificent. Karp Savelyevich is used to considering himself a king and a god, especially on the set. And here on the back. Helpful! Or the scene with the dental technician Shpak (V. Etush). "A very stupid slave" — Ivan Vasilyevich seals him. And it becomes absolutely clear to us what kind of small man this polished demagogue and grabber is. Such monsters, disguised as a human, were sharply ridiculed and exposed by M. Bulgakov" (Gromov, 1973: 8).

The well-known film critic and film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993), sharp-tongued, also reacted very favorably to comedy: "Today's comedy film cannot boast of a large number of successes ... Against this alarming background, the comedy—joke of L. Gaidai is an unconditional and remarkable success" (Demin, 1975: 81). "The fantastic machine that our old friend Shurik (A. Demyanenko) invented, of course, is not a time machine. She, a parody machine, juxtaposition of times, their travesty shining through each other, has only one goal — to recognize the unfamiliar in the familiar, in the familiar — absurdity ... — sounds strange only from the lips of the sovereign, directed to the servants. The feast turns out to be a banquet, the reception of ambassadors can be interrupted for a lunch break, the dignified hawthorns here are not averse to walking in the most dashing neck, and as soon as you get tangled in the bell ropes, the bells will ring off by themselves first "Chizhik—Pyzhik", and then solemnly, with a soul — "Moscow Nights". The world is doubling, transforming, a little more — and it will close on itself, on the verge of an absurd comic" (Demin, 1975).

Of course, in those years, Soviet film critics in their articles could not go beyond the "red flags" of censorship and wrote very carefully about the satirical allusions of Gaidai's film.

And only in the XXI century E. Nefedov drew the readers' attention to the fact that "Ivan Vasilyevich Changes His Profession" — "a picture that serves as a true encyclopedia of Soviet life during the beginning of the so-called "Stagnation", a storehouse of catchphrases and characteristic situations, has itself become an integral part of the cultural context. ... The director also manages to speak out against the investigations of other artists who built global concepts on historical material, such as Eisenstein, whose ingenious creation about "Ivan the Terrible", especially the episode of the oprichniks feast, is gracefully parodied" (Nefedov, 2006).

It is curious that "in the USA this comedy is known mainly under the titles "Ivan Vasilyevich: Back to the Future" and "Ivan the Terrible: Back to the Future". And in retrospect, the movie is really perceived as the forerunner of Zemeckis' extravaganza ... Moreover, it can be said with a clear conscience that with their "unscientific—fantastic, not entirely realistic and not strictly historical film" (as the credits say), Soviet filmmakers managed to plug their Western colleagues into the belt — playfully and easily!" (Nefedov, 2006).

Along with other best comedies by Leonid Gaidai, "Ivan Vasilyevich Changes His Profession" today remains one of the most popular films for New Year's and holiday TV shows. And this is no coincidence: talent is forever ...

Viewers today like this comedy very much:

"My favorite movie. Gaidai's incomparable adaptation of Bulgakov's play, the action of which was postponed to the 1970s. The picture is replete with hilarious moments, and many phrases from it have become popular. And, of course, there is a cast of favorite actors involved ... A masterpiece that you can watch endlessly" (Watchdog).

"This is what happens when a brilliant director takes on the adaptation of a work of a genius writer. It turns out a movie masterpiece for all time, a movie masterpiece that you simply cannot help but fall in love with, a movie masterpiece that you cannot help but watch when shown. I think this film was originally doomed to success ... when the plot is based on a play by the brilliant Mikhail Bulgakov, when the music of the brilliant Alexander Zatsepin sounds in the film, and the genius of Soviet cinema and a great comedy master Leonid Gaidai sits in the director's chair. Real, our, cult, folk cinema!" (Durand).

"My favorite movie since childhood! A unique, magnificent, timeless masterpiece with a capital letter! Many of Gaidai's films are like that. He is the greatest and most brilliant director! There will be no more such great films and directors!" (M. Ryabov).

June 31st. USSR, 1978. Directed by Leonid Kvinikhidze. Screenwriters Nina Fomina, Leonid Kvinikhidze (based on the story by John B. Priestley). Actors: Natalia Trubnikova, Nikolay Eremenko, Vladimir Zeldin, Vladimir Etush, Lyudmila Vlasova, Alexander Godunov, Lyubov Polishchuk, Igor Yasulovich, Emmanuel Geller, Mikhail Kokshenov, Vladimir Soshalsky and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1978.**

Leonid Kvinikhidze (1937–2018) became famous for his television films "Collapse of Engineer Garin", "Straw Hat", "Heavenly Swallows", "June 31st", "Mary Poppins, Goodbye" and others.

At first, everything was fine with this musical fantasy called "June 31st": the premiere on New Year's holidays, the success with the audience ...

But on August 23, 1979 who played one of the roles in "June 31st" the famous ballet dancer Alexander Godunov (1949–1995), during the Bolshoi Theater tour in New York, asked for political asylum, and the film was immediately sent to the shelf for several years...

Alexander Godunov was not the first star of Soviet ballet to emigrate to the West, but unlike Rudolf Nureyev (1938–1993) and Mikhail Baryshnikov, his further fate turned out to be dramatic. At first he was accepted by M. Baryshnikov into the troupe of the American Ballet Theater, but in 1982, but after a quarrel with him he had to leave... Since 1985, Alexander Godunov began his career in Hollywood ("Witness", "Die Hard", etc.). The famous actress Jacqueline Bisset became his close friend. But, alas, in May 1995 he was found dead in his apartment...

Already in the 21st century, film critic Irina Pavlova wrote about "June 31st" as follows: "The Soviet viewer at that time did not need to be taught to" read between the lines. "June 31st" — a film that almost entirely consisted of what is "between the lines." For those who now watch this music movie only as a romantic drama about great love, it is difficult today to see in it what everyone who turned on the TV on New Year's Eve 1978 could easily see in it. ... And yet the story of love, finding its way through time and distance, is more important. ... The music for this fairy tale was written by Alexander Zatsepin, creating a musical image of a huge Universe through which lovers need to break through, composing exquisite musical themes for the ancient Parador and ironic hits to characterize today's reality" (Pavlova, 2010: 223).

The views of the 21st century viewers about "June 31st" are far from unambiguous:

"This is a wonderful, lyrical picture, a fairy tale for adults, with amazing music, great acting and dancers' plasticity. You can see rare footage with Alexander Godunov, who had such a tragic fate. I don't think this film will ever get old" (M. Morozova).

"The film is amazing, to be honest, at one time made a much stronger impression than the work of Priestley itself. The songs are the most charming! It will never become outdated, I always review it with pleasure" (Elina).

"I also really love this film. What are the actors! And the music! I recognize the songs only performed by Antsiferova" (Tatiana).

"I personally didn't like it: the plot, the actors, the music. I do not like it when waving hands and feet is passed off as a dance, and the air and aspiration are called singing. In one of the scenes, the main character complains that all the suitors are bad for her. One of them, she said, has empty eyes. We have not seen all these gentlemen, but she has empty eyes. The entire film the girl looks straight ahead, and nothing else. Demonstrates texture. The texture, of course, God forbid everyone, but looking at it for two hours in a row — and you still wonder why I'm bored? ... Other actors have nothing to play. The actors are good, but the characters are none, sucked out of the finger" (Anyasha).

Just Awful! USSR, 1982. Directed by Alexander Polynnikov. Screenwriter Yaroslav Kharechko (based on the play of the same name by Yuri Sotnik). Actors: Dmitry Zamulin, Semyon Morozov, Fyokla Tolstaya, Galina Venevitinova, Alla Budnitskaya, Leonid Kuravlyov, Lydia Ezhevskaya, Alexander Shirvindt, Natalya Krachkovskaya, Elizaveta Nikishchikina, Evgenia Khanaeva, Georgy Georgiu and others.

Alexander Polynnikov directed 23 films and series, but the audience will remember him mainly from his debut directorial film "Take Care of Women".

In fantastic comedy "Just Awful!", the sixth grader Anton and his father with the help of the "Wishmaster" machine changed roles: the schoolboy became a veterinarian, and his father became a schoolboy. It is curious that in the previous film adaptation of the same play by Yuri Sotnik called "Two Days of Miracles" (1970), instead of fiction, there was a fairy tale, since the exchange between father and son was carried out by young fairies.

Viewers of the XXI century film "Just Awful!", as a rule, like:

"Bravissimo! The film is made with conscience. The plot is original and addictive. The actors are flawless. The humor is subtle, added to taste both for the kinderyats and for the "ancestors". Shirvindt in his own style. Perhaps without a pipe. But, as played by Dima Zamulin! Thin. Emotionally. Directly. There was no camera for him, as if they were filming the natural life of a 12—year—old boy along the way. Well, the scenes "instead of dad" are a masterpiece!" (Basilio).

"What a great family movie! The actors are wonderful, so many ideas, and such subtle texts. And the dress of the grandmother's secretary, but in the 1980s it was a sensation... And, of course, Dimochka Zamulin, the love of my childhood" (Fedia's mother).

Kid. USSR, 1987. Directed by Alexey Borodin, Yulia Kosareva. Screenwriter Dina Danilova (the story of the same name by Arkady and Boris Strugatsky). Actors: Tatiana Kuryanova, Yulien Balmusov and others. **Premiere on TV June 23, 1987.**

Alexei Borodin directed seven TV films. **Yulia Kosareva** directed the only one film — "Kid".

On a distant planet, astronauts discover the Kid, very similar to an ordinary earthly boy...

Kind of Contacts. USSR, 1987. Directed by Valery Obogrelov (adaptation of K. Bulychev's story "May I ask Nina?"). Actors: Ernst Romanov, Anastasia Nikolskaya and others. **TV, short film.**

Valery Obogrelov directed over thirty full-length TV films. "Kind of Contact" was his directorial debut on television.

On New Year's Eve 1987, the protagonist of the fantastic film "Kind of Contacts" in a psychologically convincing performance by Ernst Romanov calls on the phone and talks to a girl who lives in the military in 1942 ... In 1979, this story by Kir Bulychev (1934—2003) was already filmed under the title "Something with the phone."

I will cite only one fragment from a typical audience response to this TV movie: "When there is a telephone conversation between the past and the future, when the hero tries to

comprehend the inexplicable, as if touched by the ripples of time, her image appears and disappears. A wavering, almost invisible thread in the form of a telephone wire, thrown across space and the thickness of time. ... It is surprising that the hero of a modern man is not very surprised by this fact, taking this whole fantastic situation for granted. ... The situation, which is fantastic in thought, is dissolved in a leisurely, heartfelt monologue led by heroes on different shores of time" (Alexander Piebald Dog).

Kin—Dza—Dza! USSR, 1987. Directed by Georgy Danelia. Screenwriters Revaz Gabriadze, Georgy Danelia. Actors: Stanislav Lyubshin, Evgeny Leonov, Yuri Yakovlev, Levan Gabriadze, Olga Mashnaya, Irina Shmeleva, Lev Perfilov and others. **15.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Georgy Danelia (1930–2019) directed 15 full-length feature films, eight of which ("Seryozha", "The Way to the Pier", "I Walk Through Moscow", "Don't grieve!", "Afonya", "Mimino", "Autumn Marathon", "Kino—Dza—dza!") entered the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films.

In the fantastic comedy "Kin—dza—dza", through the absolute plausibility of the external details of "ordinary" fiction, Georgy Danelia continues the theme of his previous work "Tears were falling...", as if answering the question: what would have happened if the fragments of the crooked mirror of the trolls could change human civilization, according to the devil's understanding, turning it into a kingdom of lack of spirituality, immorality and shamelessness.

This is exactly how a planet with a mysterious name appears on the screen, where the inhabitants explain themselves mainly by two words "Ku" and "Kyu", and the ultimate dream is made up of yellow pants, before the proud owner of which every inhabitant of this desert with rare dungeon hatches, over which sometimes rusty barrel-shaped aircraft are flying by...

The camera of cameraman Pavel Lebeshev, which more than once surprised us with exquisite color and compositional solutions in the paintings of Mikhalkov and Solovyov, is restrained and stingy with visual effects: we are immersed in an almost monochromatic yellow—gray range of sands and gloomy underground interiors. And only once the screen will flare up with a scarlet fire of flowers on a luxurious green meadow, where beauties in white translucent clothes will walk with a smooth gait to the ironic music of Gia Kancheli. But this will be another planet, where the director himself, in the role of its wise ruler, will offer a very radical way of fighting Evil: depriving himcarriers of the usual shell and turning them into gentle and silent plants.

So, the topic of crisis, degradation and moral decline of civilization. In modern science fiction, it is one of the most common. Did he say what's the new Danelia film? If we approach this question formally, then the answer arises in the negative. Indeed, inhuman civilizations in art have always been condemned. The reader and the viewer were warned of the danger, called upon to preserve intelligent life and culture...

But no one reproaches the artist for the fact that he sang the great feeling of love for the millionth time? The clash of earthlings with the customs and morality of "Kin—dza—dza", the conflict of worldviews and tastes is shown in the film with an inventive comedic invention.

Perhaps not a single film by G. Danelia has caused such controversy in the press as the fantastic comedy—parable "Kin—dza—dza!"

For example, film critic Peter Smirnov film "Kin—dza—dza!" liked: "Everything will be funny. Highly. To tears. And then, suddenly, some piercing feeling of sadness, which always arises in Danelia's comedies, will settle in us. After all, for some reason we grieved together with the hero of the film, which seemed to assert just the opposite, "Don't grieve!" And we got tired of the carefree existence together with the plumber Afonya. And we yearned together with Mimino in luxurious international airports for a small Georgian village. life of a modern rogue Buzykin, running his endless autumn marathon. Maybe because laughter to tears suddenly turns into laughter through tears. But not detachedly accusatory, but sympathetic—understanding, filled with faith in a good beginning in a person, faith in sensual—understanding, full of faith in a good beginning in man. Faith in a cleansing soul ... the formula "laughter — tears" (compare the title of the films — "Do not grieve!" and "Tears were falling"). ... Paradoxical as it may sound, it is in the distant galaxy Kin—

dza—dza that our earthly affairs and problems become more clearly visible ... It is not for nothing that they say: great things are seen at a distance. Great love for the so—called ordinary average person. Love, tinged with inimitable, purely Daneliev's irony and light sadness" (Smirnov, 1987: 6–8).

Screenwriter Leonid Gurevich (1932–2001) also referred to the film "Kin—dza—dza!" very warmly, emphasizing that "the disadvantages of domestic cinema technology sometimes become the source of the advantages of cinematography. In this case, they generate a clear and precise film idea. Before us, obviously, is a civilization that has devoured technology, and then regurgitated it. The filmmakers challenge conventional technological parades in dozens of films about the future. ... As a result, it is not the sci—fi cinema genre itself that is parodied, but some of the realities of such films, and the authors do not care about the genre. They are not laughing at the future, but at our modern technocratic ambitions. ... The main thing ... in ... the movie ... is a spectacle of the human fall, decay and degradation of the personality. ... It seems to me that the uneven breathing of the film, its individual lengths and incongruities, stem from the same thing: from the director's tragic sensation of the loss of human warmth.

Valentin Mikhalkovich (1937–2006) approached "Kin—Dza—Dza!" respectfully, but with restraint: "Unthinkable, incredible events happen in the film, but in the end it turns out that nothing happened. Then you start to think: what is the movie about? That a passive, inert environment does not crave change, how did Uef and Bee, saved by Mashkov, refuse to take advantage of the freedom? But in the film, no one tried to change this environment. About the fact that the bursts of energy among the creators are short—lived and ineffectual? But the hero never bothered to show this energy. And if he is like that, you don't support him and you don't sympathize with him" (Mikhalkovich, 1987: 11).

But film critic Mark Kushnirov in his voluminous review in the magazine "Cinema Art" in relation to "Kin—dza—dza!" was very skeptical, believing that this "film is one of a number of ornate genre formations. You can call it "fantastic comedy", but with the same right and "utopian tragicomedy" and "philosophical comic parable" and "satirical fantasy" and ... whatever you like. Everything will be inaccurate, cumbersome, approximately. But maybe this is the homespun truth? If such heterogeneous principles are organically merged into a single and indivisible — for which there is no precise and laconic definition, then ... it means that we have one more discovery, and we must, like it or not, suppress the desire to trust the first impression. This means that the path to the certainty of sensation and understanding of a given thing is much more complicated than the everyday one. ... the specifics (subject and verbal color) of the depicted being seems to me far from always clear, comprehensively thought out and justified from the point of view of its everyday life ("topsy—turvy"). A lot of nuances seem to me random, unnecessary. Crushing and littering the serious perception of the cataclysm experienced by the planet Plyuk. In general terms, everything is clear, transparent (even sometimes too much), but in the details there is a lot of "vanity of vanities". ... I do not argue that such an arbitrary—eccentric, free—flowing mixture and overlappingness creates a certain playful reality, but one should not delude oneself with its integrity and indispensability. This given is, of course, not "absurd", not "fantasy in the spirit", not "topsy—turvy" — so, a little bit of everything. If we were talking about stage action, this would be a visual sign of a "skit". ... Honestly, by the end of the film, I was no longer surprised at anything — on the one hand, I got tired, on the other, I finally understood the "rules of the game" (or, rather, the absence of rules). Free (here it would be more accurate — reckless) and playful flight of improvisation — that's the whole logical background of a good half of the plot impulses. ... It is difficult to count on some heartfelt spectator emotions — and the authors certainly counted on them (after all, it was not a skit, in fact, they created) — when the coherence of the background, and the coherence of characters, and the coherence of twists and turns are really provided only by irony.

Irony, of course, is a powerful tool — and with the assistance of other figurative means, it is able to create both high style and organic architectonics. The question is how unique it is. Here the irony, as I feel it, is pop, caricature, strongly diluted by external "decoys". The very case about which it was said: when there are not enough arguments, irony comes into play.

A noticeable pinch of pretense, sham entourage deliberately excludes a more or less serious, respectful perception of both the torments of the heroes, and their exploits, and, most importantly,

emotional experiences. Their adventures go on and on, we have long understood the essence of the displayed reality — we understood the simple philosophy of the “plukans” and correlated it properly with our reality — but the director, clearly carried away with decorative tasks, continues to amuse and frighten us with pictures of decay, strikingly reminiscent of Tyuz's amusements, then the extravaganza Ptushko. The effort is clearly disproportionate to the result. ... Excessive efforts of the director to make both that, and another as visual, public (demand) as possible led, it seems to me, to not the best result. Both turned out to be funny to a certain extent, but too obvious — therefore, almost not dramatic. And, therefore,

Film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993) summed up the discussion about the film, noting that “the film directed by Georgy Danelia caused controversy, which, incidentally, is customary for this artist. Opponents of the film note the lethargy, lack of elaboration of the plot in the middle of the narrative, are upset by the impurity of the fantastic genre, delicately hint that at the exit of the design, in the sump of ready-made ideas, there were only a few not so new thoughts. Not enough, to be sure. However, in Moscow cinemas, where “Kin—Dza—Dza!” Is being held, noticeable queues line up. ... The plot can be both. Genres are just created in order to break them, turn them inside out, parody. As for historical, geographical or some other meticulousness, isn't it easier to address all your claims, first of all, to science? For whatever art exists, it abhors the copyist passion for duplication. ... “Puppet Theater” — in relation to the film — this may sound like a reproach, an aesthetic stigma. Or, on the contrary, just indicate the nature of his poetics — the juicy aphorism of laconic remarks, the clarity and directness of almost poster-like characteristics, the abundance of familiar material, which in this context is reinterpreted or completely rethought” (Demin, 1987).

In the 21st century, film critic Natalya Miloserdova again turned to the film “Kin—dza—dza!”, Arguing that “if at the time when the picture came out, it was perceived as bitter, but — a parody of modern society, today it is obvious — it was prophecy: for our present reality is similar to that of Plukan as a reflection on the original. ... But as always, Danelia does not leave the viewer without hope. As always, he regrets and loves his heroes” (Miloserdova, 2003).

Opinions of today's viewers about the film "Kin—dza—dza!" mostly positive, although there is, of course, an audience alien to Daneliev's fiction:

“Kin—Dza—Dza!” just a wonderful film, one of my favorites. This philosophical and satirical comedy, in which so much good-natured humor will win the heart of every person, if he knows kindness and a sense of humor!” (Gleb).

“A brilliant dystopia in Soviet cinema. It seems to me that the film made its way to the screens thanks to the beginning of perestroika and the weakening of ideological control over the cinema. Otherwise, they would certainly be seen in a scene on that blooming planet where unwanted people are turned into cacti, a caricature of communism and a hint of psychiatric hospitals for dissidents. Over time, the film began to take on new meaning. For example, I am very much afraid that the planet Plyuk will turn out to be the most realistic option for our future ... Completely ruined ecology, poverty, lack of culture (idiotic entertainment of the planet's inhabitants, do not our equally idiotic entertainment programs resemble?) on a national basis. Read the word “ecyloppus” on the contrary, what happens? Obviously something like the word “police”.

“Masterpiece movie! A real source of catchphrases that sound so modern today. For example, not only the word “chatlanin” has organically entered the lexicon of the inhabitants of Internet chat rooms, but a lot of other funny words and phraseological units are used in the youth environment. I myself watched this movie three times in the cinema, as soon as it appeared in the box office. ... How many times I revise, so many times I admire the masterfully created alien and, at the same time, such a familiar terrestrial entourage” (I. Andreev).

“No, I understand that this is satire. A harsh satire on our lives. But this is not mine. I love the wonderful actors from this movie. I respect Danelia for his work. But the only attempt to cross Tarkovsky's “Solaris” and Gaidai's “Behind the Matches” did not suit me personally. ... No, in some scenes humor slipped through ... but nothing more. I love smart comedies. But, smart comedy is a cocktail of humor and morality. This is in “Kin—dza—dza”, but only the proportion is not observed” (Andrey).

Last Alternative. USSR, 1978. Directed by Vladimir Latyshev. Screenwriters Vladislav Nechaev, Vladimir Latyshev (based on I. Asimov's novel "The Naked Sun"). Actors: Igor Komarov, Georgy Vasiliev, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Lyudmila Kryachun, Vladimir Erenberg and others. **TV.**

Vladimir Latyshev (1934—1990) directed two dozen films, performances and television films. He has two fantastic television performances — "Last Alternative" and "Return from the Stars."

The low—budget TV show "Last Alternative" tells the story of how people grow up on a distant planet surrounded by a robot, and personal contacts between people are considered indecent. And here the murder is committed...

Loyal Robot. USSR, 1965. Director and screenwriter Ivan Rassomakhin (based on the play by Stanislaw Lem). Actors: Sergey Yursky, Vladislav Strzhelchik, Vladimir Erenberg and others. **TV.**

Ivan Rassomakhin (1921—2007) directed 22 TV films.

Today "Loyal Robot" looks like a rather curious experimental adaptation of the fantastic play by Stanislaw Lem, with pedalized black and white graphics and an interesting acting performance by Sergei Yursky.

Theater critic Tatyana Marchenko (1927—2012) wrote that in "Loyal Robot" Sergei Yursky "played a tragedy of personality in an impersonal world. Among the selfish, selfish, parasitic creatures, called people by inertia, the mechanical servant Robot seemed the only truly human being, vainly seeking the ideal. Only the viewer was entrusted with the secret, true life of the Robot. A close—up caught his eloquent gaze, a tragic fracture of his eyebrows, a tense fold of his lips ... The eccentricity of plasticity and exotic habits of this electronic creature, shaded by the actor's humor, only exacerbated the feeling of his inner being" (Marchenko, 1977: 62—63).

Madman and Angel / Orult es angyal. Hungary—USSR, 1989. Director: Tamas Toth. Actors: Zoltan Ternyak, Gyorgy Cerhalmi, Geza Balkai, Assan Koyat, Anita Zhukovskaya and others.

Tamas Toth — Hungarian director, on account of which several films, staged jointly with Russian filmmakers.

The phantasmagoric comedy "Madman and the Angel" is Tamash Toth's directorial debut in cinema (graduated from VGIK in 1990, workshop of Sergei Solovyov). Then he shot other films related to the Russian theme — "Natasha", "Children of the Iron Gods", "Wolf", "Homeland".

Madmen's Trial. USSR, 1962. Director and screenwriter Grigory Roshal. Actors: Vasily Livanov, Irina Skobtseva, Victor Khokhryakov, Vladimir Belokurov, Vladimir Emelyanov, Andrei Konchalovsky, Alexander Smirnov, Lidia Sukharevskaya, Mikhail Kozakov, Vladimir Balashov, Yuri Yakovlev, Maya Bulgakova, Harry Duntz, Ariadna Shengelaya and others. **8.6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Grigory Roshal (1898—1983) directed more than two dozen films. But the first part of the three—part film adaptation of the novel by Alexei Tolstoy "Walking through the agony" under the title "Sisters" (1957) turned out to be the most audience for him. The other two parts — "The Eighteenth Year" and "Gloomy Morning" did not have such a success with the audience, although they also entered the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films. The fourth film to be included in this thousand leaders of the Soviet distribution, G. Roshal was "Freewill" (1956).

In the "ideologically consistent" fantastic pamphlet by Grigory Roshal "Madmen's Trial", a certain German professor invents powerful rays that the military wants to use for their inhuman

purposes. The scientist flees to America, where many years later he meets with his former student, who appropriated his invention...

Film critic Yakov Butovsky (1927–2012) wrote that the outstanding cameraman Leonid Kosmatov (1901–1977) in the "Madmen's Trial" tried with his skill to "diversify to the fact that in some places the plastic effects become too noticeable, in some places there appears a decoration that is not at all peculiar to Kosmatov. But on the whole, on the line of the camera operator, "Madmen's Trial" can be assessed as a remarkable work, in which many interesting solutions were found that were included in the arsenal of pictorial means of Kosmatov himself and other operators making large-format films" (Butovsky, 1978: 73)

Spectators of the XXI century are rather lenient towards the "Madmen's Trial":

"The film is interesting with interiors, working with color and images, there is even a "surveillance camera" method, which is popular in recent decades ... There are remarkable editing techniques. Of course, attention is paid to the acting works of Vasily Livanov and Victor Khokhryakov. The political and social hopes that conclude the film, as well as the rapid turns within the plot, have not lost interest. Only hopes remained hopes, since, following the example of Irina Skobtseva's character, eccentric humanity constantly makes a toast and succumbs to trade, although it is going to be silent and remain faithful" (With the Wind).

"A very original film with a lot of unusual technical solutions, such as a split-screen with several pictures, playing with color and a kind of camera work! ... The charming Irina Skobtseva remained true to herself here too: she is beautiful — you just can't take your eyes off!" (G. Volanov).

Man from Nowhere. USSR, 1961. Directed by Eldar Ryazanov. Screenwriter Leonid Zorin. Actors: Sergey Yursky, Yuri Yakovlev, Anatoly Papanov, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Ninel Myshkova, Anatoly Adoskin, Vladimir Muravyov, Yuri Belov and others.

Eldar Ryazanov (1927–2015) directed 26 full-length feature films, 15 of which ("Office Romance", "The Incredible Adventures of Italians in Russia", "The Hussar Ballad", "Carnival Night", "The Girl Without an Address", "The Station for Two", "The Old Robbers", "Give a Book of Complaints", "Beware of the Car", "Garage", "Zigzag of Fortune", "Quite Seriously", "Cruel Romance", "Forgotten Melody for the Flute", "Dear Elena Sergeevna") were included in the 1000 highest grossing Soviet films (and this is not counting his TV hits — "The Irony of Fate" and "Say a Word about the Poor Hussars").

According to the plot of the fantastic comedy "Man from Nowhere", a young scientist brings a Bigfoot to the capital, who finds it very difficult to adapt in a socialist environment alien to him...

With this film, Eldar Ryazanov was not very lucky: on May 18, 1961, the picture was released, and on October 24, at the XXII Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, the main Soviet ideologist M.A. Suslov said from a high rostrum the following: "Unfortunately, quite often we still have empty and useless books, unprincipled and of little artistic pictures and films that do not meet the high vocation of Soviet art. And large public funds are spent on their publication. Although some of these works appear under a mysterious title, like "Man from Nowhere" (Animation in the hall). However, ideologically and artistically, this film is clearly not from there, not from there (Animation in the hall, applause). It is also not known where the funds were taken from, how much (a lot) and where the funds went for the production of the film. Isn't it time to stop subsidizing art marriage? (Applause)".

It is clear that after M.A. Suslov's speech "Man from Nowhere" was urgently sent to the shelf (but not for long)...

As for the reaction of the Soviet film press, it was ambiguous.

For example, the director and screenwriter Clementy Mints (1908–1995) on the pages of "Soviet Screen" reacted warmly to this film: "E. Ryazanov made an attempt to master the eccentric comedy film. Honor and praise for your courage! "Man from Nowhere" interprets moral and ethical problems and affirms a positive moral ideal to which a person should strive" (Mints, 1961: 11).

But the theater critic Vadim Frolov (1918–1994) was more strict: "Taking advantage of the fabulous plot, the authors of the comedy wanted to defend a person, and even a person with a capital letter. A very commendable intention! It just so happened that this man was the Odd, a

naive savage from the Tapi tribe. In other words, a person “in general”, not involved, so to speak, in worldly affairs, comes from “nowhere”! First of all, I am saddened by its targeted abstractness in the film. I understand that the authors proceeded from the situation: what will happen if the “Bigfoot” comes to us in the 20th century, what will he see, how he will behave? If you imagine such a situation, seriously understood and seriously played, then it will turn out to be an absurdity. The situation itself contains a comic inconsistency, which always serves as the basis for the funny. But even in a comic misunderstanding, one must find a thought and an idea that would help people see the ugly and beautiful, understand reality as it develops in life. In the film, it turned out that a savage from the Tapi tribe is the person who can sign with a capital letter. ... And yet comedy lacks clarity of thought, when there are no annoying prompts from the director, when comedy itself develops according to the free laws of comedy. Obsessiveness turns into primitivism, into a loss of taste precisely in the interpretation of the film's idea: “Bigfoot” — a savage — turns out to be the cutest, most honest in the “real” world, where the Krokhalevs show their spiritual squalor in different guises. ... I got a strong impression: the film lacks clarity of purpose and clarity of thought, and therefore there is no integral and unified style, Either it is a comedy extravaganza, or a music—hall revue, when, for example, respected academics and professors begin to dance rock and roll at the academic council, and sometimes a surprisingly boring melodrama, when the Porazhaev—Lena—Krokhalev triangle is “played out”. It’s not bad that there are these different styles in the picture. They can be in comedy. It is sad that they do not combine into a single composition and tear the ribbon into colorful shreds, and it is not perceived as a work of great art. There is a bizarre displacement of the real and the fantastic, something unnatural and toy. ... “Man from Nowhere” is an offensive failure of our comedyography. The searches of its creators did not give the results that the viewer expects from the fun genre of comedy films” (Frolov, 1961: 92—94).

Spectators of the XXI century relate to the “Man from Nowhere” if not with delight, or with a good—natured smile:

“Great movie! I have watched it since childhood and always ride with laughter... The actors there are not entirely comedic, but they play comedy like natural—born comedians. A film—fireworks, a joke every thirty seconds, not a second of rest, but minutes that take the viewer's breath away! The end is a little bit sad, but very correct and touching” (Yu. Samoshina).

“Great movie! A wonderful and bold satire on the scoop. It is not surprising that this picture was “shoved” on the shelf, that sycophants—bureaucrats saw themselves in the mirror, and, of course, they were afraid, hearty ones” (S. Semin).

“The film is simply amazing! Excellent combined shooting, naive and dashing fantasy, young beauty Lusya Gurchenko in a huge photo on the wall, acrobatic performances of Jurassic. And what is Papanov's monologue at the beginning of the film at a dinner with cannibals about the Oddball: “I did not eat the weak, did not eat friends, as if he did not know that it was especially pleasant to eat a friend! ... Our innocent custom is to dance on human bones ...” (Moviegoer).

Means Makropulos. USSR, 1978. Directed by Maya Markova, Vladimir Monakhov (based on the play of the same name by Karel Čapek). Actors: Nelly Kornienko, Vladimir Kenigson, Eduard Martsevich, Alexander Ovchinnikov, Evgeny Vesnik, Evgenia Glushenko and others. **Premiere on TV March 11, 1979.**

Maya Markova (1926—2020) has directed two dozen TV films of different genres. On account of the **Vladimir Monakhov (1928—2003)** six TV films.

In this film—play, a fantastic comedy based on the play by Karel Čapek “Means Makropulos”, we are talking about the elixir of longevity... In the 1980s, the film “The Recipe of Her Youth” was shot based on the same play...

Viewers today speak very positively about the “Makropulos Means”:

“Just gorgeous, much deeper and more interesting than the movie “The Recipe for Her Youth”. Nelly Kornienko, of course, sets the tone, but the works of the young Evgenia Glushenko (Kristinka) and the male acting roles are all perfectly played. ... Stylish decorations, combination of dark red and black give the action a cozy mysterious sphere” (Lucy).

“A very interesting TV movie with deep philosophical content. The acting is great, but the most memorable are Nelly Kornienko (Emilia Marty) and Vladimir Kenigson (Yaroslav Prus)” (Svetlana).

Mediator. USSR, 1990. Directed by Vladimir Potapov. Screenwriter Alexander Mirer (based on the first part of his own novel "House of Wanderers".) Actors: Olesya Sudzilovskaya, Andrey Tarasenko, Dasha Sidorina, Denis Chlenov, Inara Slutska, Valery Storozhik, Algis Matulionis and others. **Premiere on TV December 22, 1990.**

Vladimir Potapov directed only two full-length films, including the fantastic TV movie "Mediator".

A mysterious ball is hovering over the Earth, causing trouble...

The TV movie "Mediator" was made under the obvious influence of the fantastic films of Andrei Tarkovsky, but, so to speak, in a light version. However, the director managed to create an atmosphere of danger and suspense on the screen...

The opinions of 21st century viewers about "Mediator" differ significantly:

“This film is one of the best films I've seen in my entire life. In terms of meditateness, plausibility and power of impact, I can compare it with "Stalker". ... The film is one of those that you can watch, even knowing the sequence of scenes by heart. Filmed in such a way that there is a feeling of complete plausibility ... The strongest impression, it is simply impossible to tear yourself away, drags on with irrationality, immerses you in yourself. Later I was looking for a book and was deeply disappointed — the pioneer cheerful little book had, as it turned out, nothing to do with this masterpiece, neither the atmosphere nor the depth. They are just different pieces for different audiences” (Nhfq).

“The film left a very strong impression at that time... It's even surprising that in those terrible, poor, depressive years they were able to make such a film. Strong in psychological perception. I think that in this film Slutska and the Storozhik played their most striking roles. My applause to the director and actors” (E. Misailidi).

"A bright example of "crafts on the topic of the day". Perestroika clichés (party chinushi, evil cops, etc.) were introduced into teenage fiction... for some reason, they completely killed the atmosphere of the work itself” (Yprit).

“Depressive Films. Unfortunately, in our cinematography of those years, in comparison with Hollywood, there was no science fiction at all, and what was filmed on this topic often acquired mocking and humorous forms like the films "This Merry Planet" or "The Island of Dead Ships". In this case, the "mixture of genres" is somewhat different — a kind of perestroika gloom under the sauce of science fiction. The technique, which became popular in the 1980s: to make half of the film in color, half in black and white, which at the end of perestroika reached its "opupea—apotheosis" in cinema only reinforces the negative impression. And a penny budget, constant silence on the screen, "slowness" of the plot, alas, cannot be corrected by vivid action moments such as a helicopter attack” (Dmitry).

Memory Formula. USSR, 1982. Directed by Alexander Krivonos, M. Novitsky. Screenwriter Boris Nikolsky (based on his own novel of the same name). Actors: Ivan Solovyov, Igor Vasiliev, Irina Akulova, Oleg Efremov, Zinaida Sharko and others. **TV.**

Alexander Krivonos shot mostly documentaries. He has only two fiction films, including the “Memory Formula”.

In this "ideologically consistent" fantastic drama, a certain academician Arkhipov conducts research in the field of memory and argues with his American colleague, who suggests using the method of "erasing" painful memories from people who have experienced misfortunes and grief...

Despite the participation of famous actors, "Memory Formula" seems to be an archaic product in the style of pre-thaw 1950s cinema. The play of the leading actor Ivan Solovyov (1910—1982) looks too meaningful and theatrical...

Mirror for the Hero. USSR, 1988. Directed by Vladimir Khotinenko. Screenwriter Nadezhda Kozhushanaya (based on the story of the same name by Svyatoslav Rybas). Actors: Sergei Koltakov, Ivan Bortnik, Boris Galkin, Felix Stepun, Natalya Akimova, Elena Golyanova, Nikolai Stotsky, Alexander Peskov and others. **3.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Vladimir Khotinenko directed 20 full-length feature films and TV series ("Alone and Without a Weapon", "Patriotic Comedy", "Makarov", "Muslim", "72 Meters", "Death of an Empire", "Dostoevsky", "Demons", "The Demon of the Revolution", etc.).

... USSR in the second half of the 1980s. Two men are unexpectedly transported in time and find themselves in the USSR in 1949...

On the one hand, the "Mirror for the Hero" uses the favorite technique of the fantastic genre — travel / lapse in time; on the other hand, it is a brilliant social and psychological sketch of manners and human characters. I would also like to note a wonderful duet of leading actors — Sergei Koltakov (1955—2020) and Ivan Bortnik (1939—2019).

Film critic Vladimir Gordeev writes about the "Mirror for the Hero" as follows: "We should pay tribute to Nadezhda Kozhushannaya and Vladimir Khotinenko: they managed to avoid the simplicity inherent in the film "We are from the Future" in showing people of different eras. If Malyukov puts an end to the entire current generation, then Khotinenko focuses on the difference in characters. ... The situation for the heroes of "The Mirror" is much more serious than that of the heroes of "Groundhog Day" or "We are from the future." In addition to being tested by the past, their will must go through the fire and copper pipes of "looped" time" (Gordeev, 2008).

The opinions of 21st century viewers who evaluate the "Mirror for the Hero" differ significantly, including due to the difference in political views:

"This film just struck me, once and for all, so strangely, I have something in common with Tarkovsky's "Mirror". This is how you watch the film and look at yourself, I saw my childhood, my house, my grandmother, the same details, the same shock that you returned to childhood, to see your mother, a young father" (A. Belousov).

"This is one of my favorite films (there are not many of them). I have admired Sergei Koltakov for many years: from his first roles, and I also consider him very underestimated. This is the rarest actor. Ivan Bortnik is also a unique phenomenon ... In any case, their duet + talent Khotinenko created a unique and unusually deep work" (Marina).

"The grotesquely shown Soviet people in 1949 were unpleasantly slashed. The impression was that they were completely drunk, inadequate, thieves, hunted and tortured by the terrible Stalin. Why is it not shown good about that time? This spoils the impression and puts the film in the category of anti-Sovietism ... Therefore, I did not like it" (L.).

Möbius Leaf. USSR, 1988. Directed by Leonid Partigul. Scriptwriter Vladimir Griбанov (based on the story of the same name by A. J. Deutsch). Actors: Vladimir Salnikov, B. Breslavsky. **Short film.**

Leonid Partigul directed only one full-length feature film ("Mafia is immortal"). "Möbius Leaf" is the only work of the director in the fantasy genre.

"Möbius Leaf" is a short science fiction film about a subway train in the "fourth dimension"...

Monday Starts Saturday. USSR, 1965. Director Alexander Belinsky (based on the novel of the same name by the Strugatsky brothers). Actors: Vladimir Smirnov, Inna Slobodskaya, Leonard Sekirin, Victor Kostetsky, Roman Litvinov, etc. **Premiere on TV December 28, 1965.**

Alexander Belinsky (1928—2014) worked mainly on television.

In the fantastic television movie "Monday Starts Saturday", a programmer discovers that strange events are taking place in a certain northern city...

Everything would be fine, but because of the low budget, weak directing and acting, all the charm of the Strugatsky brothers' fantastic prose, in this film adaptation, in my opinion, disappeared completely...

Hence, it is quite logical that the opinions of current viewers about this film are usually quite negative:

[TV movie] "disgusting in every way. The script is nothing more than an unfair transfer of the Strugatskys' text to film, some important episodes are missed... As a result, the meaning is distorted. The scenery is drawn in an extremely primitive manner, as well as the makeup of Naina Kievna. The acting is below any criticism. It is a pity that we managed to restore this squalor. Some actors later showed themselves, albeit not as great, but from the best side, and here you can see their utter helplessness" (Sibiryak).

"The first thing that catches your eye is the scenery. Maybe because of a lack of funds, maybe because of the desire to make the film fabulous and surreal, the landscape scenery is absolutely unrealistic — paper screens painted in a childish way with primitive sketches of houses, trees, cars and other things. Probably, for the same purpose, the cat-storyteller Vasily and the mermaid look like the heroes of puppet Soviet cartoons. Live actors and a completely realistic Privalov's car look unnatural against this background — ordinary people trapped in a fairy tale. ... But the actors did not enter the characters very thoroughly, so they play mediocre, not really delving into the essence of the experiences of their characters. ... On the whole, despite the closeness to the original sources and the tricks with decorations and special effects, the filmmakers failed to convey the spirit of the book" (Doctor Cat).

Moonlight Rainbow. USSR, 1983. Directed by Andrei Ermash. Screenwriters Valentin Yezhov, Andrei Ermash (based on the novel of the same name by S. Pavlov). Actors: Vladimir Gostyukhin, Igor Starygin, Vasily Livanov, Yuri Solomin, Vladimir Kenigson, Georgy Taratorkin, Grazhina Baikshite, Natalia Sayko, Alexander Porokhovshchikov, Gediminas Girdvainis, Boris Ivanov, Leonid Nevedomsky and others. **10.6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

This is the film of **Andrei Ermash**, the son of Philip Ermash (1923—2002), who held the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, from 1972 to 1986.

The science fiction film "Moonlight Rainbow" tells how a catastrophe occurred on the planetoid Oberon, as a result of which only four of the thirteen Space Marines survived. But the surviving astronauts acquired phenomenal properties...

The premiere of "Moonlight Rainbow" took place in December 1983, when Philip Ermash headed the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography. So it is not surprising that in the same December, all Soviet cinema journals at once responded to it with positive reviews.

The "Soviet screen" took advantage of the "heavy artillery" of the positive — the famous science fiction writer Eremey Parnov (1935—2009) diligently retelling the plot of the "Moonlight Rainbow" came to the conclusion that it attracts attention with the "figurative language of art" (Parnov, 1983: 6)...

The journalist Boris Kokorevich wrote about the "Moonlight Rainbow" in even more enthusiastic tones, emphasizing that "the artists, cameramen and decorators of the film did everything possible and, probably, impossible to reliably recreate the Cosmos on the screen, the world of the future, such unlike ours. Together with the debutant director Andrei Ermash, popular actors "mastered" the space" (Kokorevich, 1983: 3).

The thick magazine "Cinema Art", calling the journalist Alexander Aronov (1934—2001) as a reviewer, was more restrained, but also positively assessed "Moonlight Rainbow": "The film clearly shows moral tension, striving for a certain ethical goal. And the fantastic form does not seem to sit here like a glove: in a sense, it is also a testing ground for approbation and approval of ideas. And in

this tempting, but also difficult to create authenticity genre, the authors break through to serious "pain points" of our attitude. ... I must say that the space security line is outlined here succinctly, but quite expressively, and for this, some "traces" in the audience's memory associated with the actors playing the main roles in the film are mobilized or taken into account. So, a certain Galbright is in charge of the practical investigation of the mysterious phenomenon of Space Marines. If we see in him such a brave and energetic super-detective, usually unraveling the most hopeless tangle, no one, apparently, will object — why else was Vasily Livanov..., invited to this role? Next to him is Nikolsky, silent, dressed with a needle, full of lyrical charm, but invariably attentive and slightly pedantic. Yuri Solomin, instantly referring us to the "adjutant of his excellency", sparingly, but expressively makes it clear that his hero is equally accessible to such spheres as intelligence and counterintelligence. Well, Vladimir Kenigson is clear in the role of a somewhat hectic, grumpy scientist Rogov, with whom it is sometimes tedious to deal with, but necessary — in the role of an expert, he is, alas, irreplaceable. ... I must say that the energetic activity of the "commission of inquiry" is shown somewhat aloof, from the outside.

Of course, after Philip Ermash resigned from the post of chairman of the State Committee for Cinematography in relation to the "Moonlight Rainbow" it became possible to express any criticism.

For example, already in the 21st century, film critic Andrei Vyatkin wrote that instead of a fantastic film, Andrei Ermash produced "something incomprehensible ... Good actors and the best masters of Mosfilm combined filming tried in vain to save the helpless direction — everything was in vain" (Vyatkin, 2003).

Many viewers support Andrey Vyatkin's negative opinion about "Moonlight Rainbow" today:

"The film is rare ... Nothing ... Absolute dummy. With the vast possibilities offered by the novel (here it was possible to make a detective story, a thriller, and a psychological drama, and good action, not to mention the actual fiction), the director managed to create a plastic mess of thoughtful, sentimental, detached from the general video sequence monologues and dialogues and primitive games with light filters (or lighting of the shot film, I don't know for sure). ... Well, it didn't work to catch up with the mystery, so it would be possible to leave the space marines and guys from the special services even on the "steepness" ... In the film, Starygin (not having a very athletic look) walked around the pool with foam, people in spacesuits walked around the darkened pavilion, and then they "finished painting" flashes and radio interference — fantastic beyond reason!" (Yulia).

"Weak picture. And I also remember how in TV broadcasts, apparently luring the audience, they showed only Polling's passage through the obstacle course. We expected it to be there ... But alas! And even Norton's passage across the Mercurian plateau is rather weak" (Glory).

But, of course, there are viewers who are more benevolent to the "Moonlight Rainbow":

"This movie is not for everyone, for an amateur. The authors did not want to make a Hollywood blockbuster, this is science fiction ... The plot is almost psychedelic, one might even say that it is almost completely absent. There is no dynamics, but the film is very colorful, especially for that time. The director has a very good aesthetic taste, all the colors are very harmonious, I just fell in love with this film. Gorgeous music and all sound design. Especially the vocalization in the second half of the film! Even now the film looks modern" (G. Azarov).

"I love this film very much. In my opinion, the most beautiful and harmoniously made of all Soviet science fiction. Very atmospheric and stylish, maybe to some extent arthouse. I watched it many times on TV, starting in the 80s, and now I regularly watch it on the Internet with pleasure, I also bought a DVD for the collection. ... The film creates a magnificent fantastic atmosphere, fascinating and deep. In my opinion, this is how a real sci-fi movie should be. Thoughtful, mysterious, without unnecessary fuss and platitudes. ... Very stylish surroundings, everything is very beautifully done, and nothing more. Each frame, each actor, even episodic, each scene, each costume is full of meaning and attracts the eye. Even today, everything looks very solid. ... The film has a wonderful humanistic message, despite all the serious problems and situations of the narrative, the film ends with a positive and hopeful. The heroes decide to return to work and use their extraordinary abilities for the benefit of people" (Artvolt).

Moscow – Cassiopeia. USSR, 1974. Directed by Richard Victorov. Screenwriters Abner Zak, Isai Kuznetsov. Actors: Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Vasily Merkuriev, Lev Durov, Yuri Medvedev, Pyotr Merkuriev, Misha Ershov, Vladimir Basov (Jr.), Olga Bitjukova and others. **7,2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Richard Victorov (1929–1983) directed 11 full-length feature films, some of which were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

Children and teenagers watched the fantastic film "Moscow–Cassiopeia" with great enthusiasm, plunging into the world of space adventures with pleasure.

The Soviet press reacted to this picture as a whole well, although drawing the attention of readers to the obvious shortcomings.

Here is what, for example, the film critic Natalya Zelenko wrote about "Moscow–Cassiopeia" in the "Soviet Screen": "The film immerses us in the world of realized scientific and technical dreams ... However, in the somewhat paradoxical phrase "science fiction", the second word is perhaps closer to the film. ... Yes, in fact, the authors did not at all aim to convey to the viewer a certain amount of scientific knowledge. Moreover, the "scientific character" of the film is a very relative, controversial and peculiar concept. It contains hypotheses popular in modern science fiction literature related to overcoming space and time and the first contacts with alien civilizations. However, the author's imagination and scientific reliability are not always in tune. This is natural: the solution of scientific problems is the business of scientists, while the authors of the film are interested in something else, a somewhat arbitrary treatment of science – in this case, their right. ... To be fair, I must say that the film did not start well. It was not possible to pick up the right pace right away, and the first third of the picture is upsetting: a long "space" gathering, where overly washed, overly smart and overly prudent guys are discussing a flight to Alpha Cassiopeia, is only slightly enlivened by the pranks of the red-haired Fedka the inventor. All the guys, the performers of the main roles, play moderately reliably, but it should be noted that at first the sluggish dramatic situation does not make it possible to reveal the acting abilities of young performers in full force. Both the staging and the pictorial solution of the first episodes seem to be quite standard" (Zelenko, 1974: 6).

Film critic Romil Sobolev (1926–2011) responded a little warmer about this film: "I. Smoktunovsky, V. Merkuriev and many other good "adult" actors participate in the film, but I must say that they have hopelessly lost to their young colleagues. It is difficult to speak about this film briefly – each of its components is interesting and deserves a detailed analysis, which, however, will still explain nothing to those who have not seen "Moscow – Cassiopeia" – a good film, like music, cannot be rewritten – it must be seen. But if we try to briefly define its main advantage, then it will consist in the seriousness of the conversation that the authors have with children and with the viewer in general. Is this a lot or a little – the seriousness of the conversation? This will be understood by every viewer who has watched "Moscow – Cassiopeia" and remembered a lot of pictures full of nonsense or condescending lisp" (Sobolev, 1974).

Film critic Valery Kichin noted that "Moscow–Cassiopeia" "does not at all intend to raise for public discussion the issue of the participation of young cosmonauts in flights. The movie is playing. Into a dream. The cinema only has an opportunity available to it to realize this game–dream with the maximum degree of perfection. A starship appears on the screen, created by a fantasy such as can only be found in childhood, fully armed with its truly unlimited power. And this proud "I can do everything" will certainly captivate the audience. I saw, specifically watched, how viewers "under 16" were biting into the screen. And how easily and willingly they accepted the conditions of the game" (Kichin, 1974).

The fantastic film "Youths in the Universe" was associated with "Moscow–Cassiopeia" by common characters and themes.

Film critic Natalya Zelenko reacted to this work of Richard Victorov more benevolently, emphasizing that "Youths in the Universe" turned out to be more dynamic: "The film is made in a

good rhythm, cosmic romance is combined in it with a rather famously twisted adventure intrigue. ... Compared to "Moscow — Cassiopeia", the youths have grown very much. At least outwardly. The tasks facing them have also become more complex. In "Youths in the Universe" the main thing happens, for the sake of which, in fact, the cosmic dilogy was conceived — a meeting with an extraterrestrial civilization. ... Even in the first part of the film, one of the heroes stated: humanity went into space, and today space problems have become our real business. As you can see, the authors put quite real problems in the framework of the "cosmic" plot: what does it mean to be happy, is it possible to make a person happy by force, what spiritual qualities form a personality? The problems, albeit mundane, are quite philosophical. ... In general, I must say that the authors invariably achieve success where science fiction takes on a slightly comedic character. ... Well, what about the philosophical problems that the youths tried to solve along the way? No way. These problems only delayed the action. This does not mean that they are, in principle, irrelevant in films of this kind. The trouble is different: the youths are still not ready for serious reflections on a serious topic. The guys in this film are not perceived by themselves, but only together — like the crew of a starship. Probably, it was extremely difficult for young actors to play such generalized, faceless roles. So impersonal that sometimes suspicion creeps in: in fact, where are the living people here? May be, the authors are joking, and all the heroes of the picture are entirely robots!" (Zelenko, 1975).

Already in the 21st century, film critic Andrei Vyatkin drew the attention of the readers of the "World of Fantasy" magazine that "the unity of both films is that space here was a symbol of Maturity. Entering near—earth space is an exit into adulthood and at the same time a departure from everyday reality. The heroes of the films are typical members of young cosmonaut circles and, at the same time, members of an amateur song club. In the era of stagnation, both were a form of flight, internal emigration" (Vyatkin, 2003).

And film critic Denis Gorelov wrote that "with the dilogy "Moscow — Cassiopeia" and "Youths in the Universe", screenwriters Zak and Kuznetsov, together with director Victorov, set the tone for galactic science fiction for a quarter of a century ahead. Having automated production and everyday life, a person was afraid of a riot of machines. It was enough for the self—improving system to slightly adjust the program to come to the conclusion that people are completely unnecessary. The opposition of warm and fluffy cold and smooth, and genius and immortality — feelings and soul will become defining for fiction—cinema of the end of the century (see "The Terminator" and "Return of the Jedi"), but Russia will be ahead of everyone here. Mixed crews with courageous surnames, hostile worlds in a star—speckled world, artificial gardens in orbital stations, models of good—talkative robots and advanced goblins—assassins, the general aesthetics of shiny clothes and light chatter about gravity, telekinesis and protective fields, the phobia of lasers, zombies and mechanical self—government will come to the United States only at the end of the 1970s — in "Black Hole", "Star Wars" and "Star Trek". ... At the end of the 1970s, the period of mass ebb of adults from cinema, which gave birth to all the big—budget children's classics from "Star Wars" to Indiana Jones, millions could be made out of thin air on the script of Zach — Kuznetsov. ... In the 1980s, impoverished Russia yielded all priorities to the world center of profit, both in space and in science fiction. It was a weak consolation that the elephants were still born here — and only years later flew overseas on their ears shouting "THEY never pay!" (Gorelov, 2018).

For a part of the audience, Richard Victorov's science fiction has become a kind of cult, there is even a fan club of these fans on the Internet:

"A wonderful children's film with a wonderful acting of young actors! ... I believe that this film (as well as its second part "Youths in the Universe") is one of the best children's films in world cinematography. Many modern adult actors can envy the level of play of young actors" (E. Kiryanova).

"The film, like the whole dilogy, is simply wonderful ... I just want to say: "Here, study, modern directors, how to make films for children and cinema in general!" (Sasha).

"It seems to me that this is not just a children's film, this is a real adult film. For its time, quite modern, moderately patriotic. On the eve of the flight, the heroes stand on Red Square near the Mausoleum — the film was not filmed pretentiously, but in such a way that it makes you shiver. These wonderful silver costumes, these loving relationships that are being formed are romance!" (Marina).

However, there are, of course, more skeptical viewers' opinions:

"The film of my childhood. Pioneers, space, patriotic songs beyond the solar system. With dubious artistic value and an abundance of Soviet propaganda, I recommend everyone to look" (O. Sadovsky).

"I watched this film in my pioneer childhood and represented the very target audience for which the film was intended, because I raved about the romance of space travel, I reread all the science fiction writers I could find: Belyaev, Efremov, Lem, Garrison, Asimov, Bradbury and many others ... It seemed that he should have taken this film with delight. But, no, it didn't. Immediately, some unpleasant aftertaste remained, some kind of fake. First of all, I was jarred by the pretentiousness of the film. I myself was then 12 years old, but even at this childhood age I understood that work in space is not a "heroic romance of a feat", but above all — very difficult, hard and dangerous work. Like a submariner, test pilot, polar explorer and the like. ... In the film, these teenagers, going on a flight, show with all their appearance, that they are going on a heroic deed, pathos gushes over the edge. ... I did not like this pompous pathos" (Stroybat).

Museum Visitor. USSR—Switzerland, 1990. Director and screenwriter Konstantin Lopushansky. Actors: Victor Mikhailov, Vera Mayorova—Zemskaya, Vadim Lobanov, Irina Rakshina, Alexander Rasinsky, etc.

Konstantin Lopushansky staged seven full-length feature films ("Dead Man's Letters", "Museum Visitor", "Russian Symphony", "Ugly Swans", "Role", etc.), some of which belong to the fantasy genre.

After the "Dead Man's Letters" Konstantin Lopushansky continued his reflections on the ecological theme in the philosophical—fantastic parable "Museum Visitor". In this dystopia, the situation was again considered after the accomplished ecological catastrophe. Humanity has exhausted natural resources. One of the few surviving inhabitants of the Earth is trying to save his desperate fellow in the mind...

In the year when the "Museum Visitor" was released in the all—Union release, the film press wrote a lot about it.

Film critic Valentin Mikhalkovich (1937—2006) noted that "the true theme of the picture is not ecology, but another deficit, the main one created voluntarily: the deficit of spiritual freedom" (Mikhalkovich, 1990: 25).

Andrei Eremin in the magazine "Cinema Art" wrote about the "Museum Visitor" that "despite the aesthetically gloomy setting, the film has nothing to do with the flow of "black" realism that has spilled over today (ie at the turn of the 1990s — A.F.) onto our screens. Cross—cutting themes of Scripture— Fall, Calling, Exodus, Atonement, Salvation, Covenant — around which the picture is built, give it a liturgical meaning. The viewer, who is familiar with the Holy Scriptures firsthand, will take with him the feeling of hope and Eucharistic joy. One cannot help but reflect on the fate of this complex work. Undoubtedly, the new prophetic appeal of Lopushansky is addressed, first of all, to potential "last supplicants". Therefore, the pagans simply will not understand this outstanding picture, but, having disassembled it brick by brick, they will condemn it, and perhaps throw stones at the author. As a consolation, I can only remind him that stones are the best sign of a worthily fulfilled service" (Eremin, 1990: 74).

Many viewers still highly appreciate the "Museum Visitor":

"The film is great ... Actually, like the previous message to humanity — "Dead Man's Letters". I would like to say a huge thank you to the author — after all, no one takes pictures like that. This is probably not even a movie. This is a kind of starting point for the formation of an ethical perception of the world. Such works are not created for the box office and do not pass without leaving a trace ... And it is these films that should be shown to today's schoolchildren, those, in fact, to whom the artist's idea is addressed" (O. Derbin).

"It seems to me that the film was invaluable in its time. I increasingly note the striking visible signs of an ecological catastrophe and human degeneration in the surrounding reality. I remember this film more and more often, although I don't rank it among the indisputable masterpieces" (V. Popov).

Musical Games. USSR, 1989. Directed by Vitaly Aksenov. Screenwriters Vitaly Aksenov, Sergey Kurekhin. Actors: Igor Kornelyuk, Yan Smelyansky, Georgy Traugot, Anatoly Slivnikov, Evgeny Tilicheev, Semyon Furman, Edita Piekha, Boris Shtokolov, Andrei Voznesensky and others.

Vitaly Aksenov (1931—2020) directed eight full-length feature films and serials, however, only his concert film "How to Become a Star" entered the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films.

"Music Games" is a seemingly fantastic film about alien spies, but in reality it is an uncomplicated pop revue with "perestroika" specifics.

However, some current viewers think differently: "This is a prophetic film. The last 30 years of our country's life are concentrated in this film. Here is the Maidan, and the Horde, and Europe with migrants ... And, of course, the eternal Russian question. This film was waiting in the wings. And he struck!" (T. Lutche).

Mysterious Island. USSR, 1941. Directed by Edward Penzlin. Screenwriters Boris Shelontsev, Mikhail Kalinin (based on the science fiction novel of the same name by Jules Verne). Actors: Alexey Krasnopolsky, Pavel Kiyansky, Andrey Andrienko—Zemskov and others. **17 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

This is the story about mysterious Captain Nemo...

Mysterious Wall. USSR, 1968. Directed by Irina Povolotskaya, Mikhail Sadkovich. Screenwriters: Irina Povolotskaya, Alexander Chervinsky, Nikolai Sadkovich. Actors: Lev Krugly, Tatyana Lavrova, Irakli Uchaneishvili, Andrei Mironov, Valentin Nikulin, Irina Povolotskaya, Alexander Kaidanovsky and others. **3,7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Irina Povolotskaya directed only three full-length feature films ("Mysterious Wall", "The Acting", "The Scarlet Flower"), in recent years she is better known as a prose writer. For **Mikhail Sadkovich** "Mysterious Wall" remained the only director's work in feature films.

Scientists are faced with a mysterious phenomenon — an electrostatic spherical wall that appears and disappears. Moreover, it is also capable of causing hallucinations...

The main role in this fantastic film was played by Lev Krugly (1931—2010), who emigrated to the West at the end of the 1970s, which served as a temporary withdrawal of the "Mysterious Wall" from the acting film fund of the USSR. True, for the sake of fairness, I note that when this picture was released in June 1968, it did not enjoy massive success. Still, the audience is used to expecting spectacularity and action—packed fiction, and this is precisely what was not in the film by I. Povolotskaya and M. Sadkovich.

In the year of the release of "Mysterious Wall", film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929—1997) tied it to the theme of ideological confrontation with the West, believing that the film "also carries an ideological and ideological load. Thus, Lomov's belief in the possibility of contact between all rational beings is contrasted with the concept of the disunity of people, the spiritual isolation of man, fashionable in the West" (Revich, 1968: 84).

And already in the 21st century, film critic Vladimir Gordeev came to the conclusion that the events of the "Mysterious Wall" are very reminiscent of "Solaris". Is this wall? And Soviet scientists cannot find the answer. Because each person must find the answer within himself. But for this you need to personally finish with the wall. And what is the contact with the wall if the USSR itself is surrounded by a completely mysterious wall called the "Iron Curtain"? — the filmmakers are silently asking" (Gordeev, 2008).

The opinions of today's viewers about the "Mysterious Wall" are quite benevolent:

"Awesome movie. A masterpiece of Soviet science fiction of the 1960s, rather a philosophical thriller. An interesting, ambiguous non—trivial plot, magnificent actors, dynamic dialogues full of humor, an unforgettable video series, amazing music by Slonimsky" (M. Sun).

“Unusual and atypical is the young Soviet military expert in the interpretation of Andrei Mironov, who is not so much eccentric as eccentric. A poorly educated intellectual, an eccentric, who sensed a taste for the loud discovery of the century. This, of course, is already a satire on the cheap greed of educated people for scientific sensations, and, at the same time, on academic intolerance towards the unorthodox school of alternative knowledge. In general, this old film has its own face, its own zest. It is necessary and even useful to show such a peaceful, calm, subtle, cultural cinema in order to neutralize the thorns, scars and, in general, the frankly anti—scientific and immoral husk of most of today's fantasy” (V. Plotnikov).

“An extremely artlessly filmed and edited film, but full of satire and humor. It turned out something akin to a feuilleton that absorbed the main triggers of that time — from the typical images of scientists and their wives (Tatyana Lavrova laughed at her own incarnation from “9 days of one year”), typical scientific television programs, typical severe military men and “bureaucrats”, typical sergeants (“Maxim Perepelitsa”, “Soldier Ivan Brovkin”, “Keys from the Sky”, etc.), typical, even standard techniques of fantasy and socialist realism. There are many different characters in the film, the authors walked through the political situation in the world and the enormous fascination with science fiction in literature and cinema, which is already becoming obsolete, and therefore suitable for self-parody” (With the Wind).

Mystery of the Eternal Night. USSR, 1956. Directed by Dmitry Vasiliev. Screenwriter Igor Lukovsky (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Ivan Pereverzev, Konstantin Bartashevich, Mikhail Astangov, Apollon Yachnitsky, Danuta Stolyarskaya and others. **18 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Dmitry Vasiliev (1900—1984) during his career, independently and as a co—director, he shot a dozen films, five of which (“Over the Tissa”, “Mystery of the Eternal Night”, “Operation Cobra”, “Alexander Nevsky”, “They went to the East”).

The plot of “Mystery of the Eternal Night” was inspired by the threat of nuclear war, which was in the political air of the planet in the 1950s: under the influence of radiation after the explosion, the underwater flora of the Pacific Ocean grows very rapidly in size, but it turns out that there is a kind of “antidote” — a plant, with which you can resist radiation...

In the year of its distribution and screening on TV, the film was very popular with viewers, but after a few years it was forgotten — both by film critics and by the public...

The opinions of the 21st century viewers about the film “Mystery of the Eternal Night” are far from delight, but shrouded in a haze of nostalgia:

“Denisov is Gusev's predecessor from the movie “Nine Days of One Year”. The country needed such people, fanatically devoted to science, cinema fulfilled this social order as best it could. At the same time, they were taught not to be afraid of neutron (the most dangerous) radiation. There are no such scientists, and those are far away. They were bursting with the film, I remember” (GKS)

“I confess that I can't watch it without laughing, but it's a laugh at very close people and a benevolent laugh. The heroism of the researchers of the radioactive depths is delighted and the words of Pereverzev in the bathyscaphe: “500 roentgens is normal!” Then the radiation did not take us!” (No. 6).

“Average, not the most exciting, but quite a decent film. I don't know if it was worth taking cinemas for his sake with a fight, but on the other hand — bright colors, a rather entertaining plot, beautiful underwater filming, a little love ... Science fiction, science and love” (Lenchen).

Mystery of Two Oceans. USSR, 1957. Directed by Konstantin Pipinashvili. Screenwriters: Vladimir Alekseev, Nikolai Rozhkov, Konstantin Pipinashvili (based on the novel by G. Adamov). Actors: Sergei Stolyarov, Igor Vladimirov, Sergei Golovanov, Pyotr Sobolevsky, Vakhtang Ninua, Sergei Komarov, Antonina Maksimova, Leonid Pirogov, Pavel Luspekaev, Mikhail Gluzsky and others. **31.2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Konstantin Pipinashvili (1912—1969) lived by today's standards not so long life and managed to shoot only eight films, one of which — "Mystery of Two Oceans" — entered the thousand of the most popular films of the USSR.

In the year of the release of the fantastic detective "Mystery of Two Oceans" on the screen, the Soviet press greeted him without enthusiasm. For example, "Teachers' Paper" wrote that "the authors of the picture apparently decided that the talented novel by G. Adamov was not dramatic enough, full of action, and rewrote it in a new way. And from a fascinating sci-fi narration, an ordinary "detective" film story turned out. ... It's a pity! The Soviet viewer is always looking forward to meeting the heroes of his favorite works on the screen. Meetings with real people, and not with conventional figures, pretending to be similar to their namesakes from the books" ("Mystery... ", 1957).

In post—Soviet times, the views of film critics on "Mystery of Two Oceans" has changed significantly.

"It happened so, — writes film critic Nina Tsyrukun, — that I have always seen "Mystery of Two Oceans" in black and white copies, and a classic "film noir" with all the proper attributes stuck in my memory: dark streets at the hour before dawn, curtains fluttering from the wind on the windows, the pavement glistening after the rain, a distorted evil face, shot through the windshield of a car rushing at a breakneck speed; on the soundtrack — scraps of radio signals, squeak of brakes ... All this was presented in the first episodes. An unknown person in a black raincoat calls the apartment of a lonely musician and demands to transmit a message to the Center by radio (the transmitter is camouflaged in the piano; the spy report is encoded with musical phrases. The radio operator's agent is coded with the word "pianist", and it is difficult to say whether it is irony or an accident). The doorbell rings again — this is the state security. The musician lowers the guest out of the window using a steel movie measure, and he himself takes the drug and imitates death. The agents take away the "corpse", which mysteriously disappears along the way ... Over time, it became clear that no "film noir" as a genre took place in our country, and the curiosity with black and white copies should be attributed to the column "On the role of projectionist in the history of cinema, or Once again about the reception" (Tsyrukun, 2001).

Here I will allow myself to disagree with Nina Tsyrukun — color in these episodes in no way prevent "Mystery of Two Oceans" from preserving the atmosphere of "film noir" (but, however, in the future, the action of the film turns into an adventure course more familiar to the Soviet screen). A detailed analysis of "Mystery of Two Oceans" is made by me here (Fedorov, 2007: 17–27).

21st century viewers are still discussing this picture vividly:

"Unlike the book, the filmmakers are overly involved with the spy line. Although Adamov's novel castigated the agents of imperialism and their spy henchmen, it also had a lot of nautical themes: the sailing of a submarine across several seas and oceans, encounters with sea monsters, but in the film there is none of this. There were only spies and NKVD officers all around — in Leningrad, on board a boat. The action is exciting, dynamic, the final duel on the island is good. Now, of course, they won't do it better, despite the possibilities of computer special effects" (E. Logoev).

"All the same, the film is enchanting! Stalinist Empire style! Sergei Stolyarov as the embodiment of a "man of a new era", bad spies, good intelligence officers! Interesting music, a mysterious underwater world ... As I remember now: "password is seventeen!" (Purr).

"The film is really wonderful, even so mysterious, it can be watched in any decades from the moment of its creation with great interest!" (Gozzi).

"If you watch Western spy films of those years, then "Mystery of Two Oceans" will look quite at the level — a solid action film, with good actors — the stars of Soviet cinema. A masterfully made prologue: a thunderstorm, a downpour, an apartment submerged in twilight, a globe, maps, astronomical instruments. Race through the night Leningrad ... Excellent play of actors (primarily villains) — Gluzsky, Golovanov. Medal face (no worse than that of American supermen of that time) and confident play of Sergei Stolyarov, beautiful faces of well—played female characters. The boy (Pavlik) also played his role excellently. Well, the "foreman" Skvoreshnya, the KGB officer Pavel Luspekaev did not disappoint. Everything, as they say, with him — romance, adventure, the

muse of distant wanderings, the fight against enemies, etc. Music (main theme) also appropriately accompanies the development of the plot" (R154).

"No need to laugh or even giggle at this movie! After all, even now there is no such submarine in terms of spaciousness and comfort. Do not forget that the film was created during the Cold War ... Have a conscience to separate the ideological background from the art, fantasy and skills of the film crew. Now we are not laughing at Jules Verne's fantasy, because all his — then fantastic — inventions and predictions have come true, because technology has advanced unheard of in the last 20—30 years. And then there was no use, and there was not, any computer graphics that can create anything. There are only combined shots in the film, and they are truly great" (T. Ivanova).

Napoleon Gas. USSR, 1925. Director and screenwriter Semyon Timoshenko. Actors: Elena Chaika, Evgeny Boronikhin, Roman Rubinstein, Iona Talanov, Pyotr Kuznetsov, Olga Spirova and others.

New Adventures of the Yankees at the Court of King Arthur. USSR, 1989. Directed by Victor Gres. Screenwriters Mikhail Roshchin, Victor Gres (based on the story of Mark Twain). Actors: Sergei Koltakov, Albert Filozov, Elena Finogeeva, Alexander Kaidanovsky, Anastasia Vertinskaya, Evgeny Evstigneev, Evdokia Germanova, Vladimir Soshalsky and others. **4.4 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Victor Gres directed only two full-length feature films, but both of them ("The Black Hen, or Underground People" and "New Adventures of the Yankees at the Court of King Arthur") caused heated controversy in the press and in the audience.

In the science fiction film "New Adventures of a Yankee at the Court of King Arthur", the American pilot finds himself in the era of King Arthur...

The opinions of the Soviet press about this film were purely negative:

Film critic Valery Turovsky counted on the pages of "Soviet Screen" that "Victor Gres staged a highly poetic picture. An oversaturated solution of beauty and beauty. Renaissance film portraits, baroque film still lifes, post—impressionistic film landscapes — all found a place in the film "New Adventures of the Yankees at the Court of King Arthur". Only the place was not found for Markven's humor and sarcasm, irony and parody, satirical and paradoxical. ... If there is at least some sense of humor (there is no question of irony or, it's scary to think, self—irony: the director takes everything he does too seriously) the film "New Adventures of the Yankees at the Court of King Arthur" could become a cascade of attractions, an extravaganza of paradoxes, a collection of wit and eloquence. But titanic self-respect for himself led the talented person through the thickets of branchy cranberries on the wrong path, operatic pathos and historical trash. The film was shot in the genre of a costume ball. ... Sometimes I caught myself on a saving thought, and not whether the director is mocking us, whether he will now, well, right now, some dizzying somersault, — and all this sluggishly flowing opera wonder will rush with a light gait, and the viewer will be breathtaking ... But no, miracles, apparently, still do not happen, and if they happen where, then certainly not in this overcrowded and heavy film" (Turovsky, 1989).

He sternly approached "New Adventures of the Yankees..." and Andrei Shemyakin, who drew the attention of the readers of the magazine "Cinema Art" to the fact that from the film of Victor Gres "plot dynamics have completely disappeared, and any "adventure" (in the archaic sense of the word — an adventure) begins as if to break off immediately : it turns out that the next plot twists and turns are only dreaming of poor Hank ... The dispute is not a calculation with a classic, but a form of dialogue. With the necessary time adjustment. But the trouble is — too straightforward, not in Twain's way, but with the desire to dot all the "i" this "amendment" was made. Hence the complete lack of humor in the film adaptation of the satirical novel. To add something new to this, it was probably necessary, if not to outplay Twain, then at least to play his game. But the authors are not up to any kind of parodic solutions; the film is serious and strict, like a class teacher. ... Gres had the opportunity at least not to lose the argument, if he made the core of the picture a reflection on the whimsical ways of a person who finds himself in the history of mankind. It could have made

a really good movie. And the genre of adventure, a fascinating plot move would not hurt. But why seek adventure if you know how to do it?" (Shemyakin, 1989: 87-91).

Film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929—1997) completely sarcastically defeated "New Adventures of the Yankees..." on the pages of "Soviet Culture": "In many ways, the film by V. Gres belongs to the category of costumed. Exotic robes, quirky knightly armor, colorful columns of troops and pilgrims that look especially good when taken from a helicopter. ... The adventurous beginning is easily deduced from the novel, but in the film it is noticeable how exactly with this beginning the director wages a fierce struggle, in which he wins on points. As soon as a hint of dynamics appears, any retarders are immediately put into play, most often rapid shooting, so that, God forbid, not to bring the critical mass to a plot explosion. ... Somewhere in the pre—final it seemed to me that I was guessing about the intentions of the director. He seemed to want to tell humanity this: go to hell with your progress. ... And your patriotic duty— to put the burning torch into the car that miraculously flew from the XX century as soon as possible, let it go to hell with the pilot. ... But I am not at all convinced that I am interpreting the authors' intention correctly. Because — this is the next remark — my assumption is strongly contradicted by all the previous content of the film, which consists of many episodes, each of which can (and the director believes that he should) be solved autonomously. But in any case, they do not in any way indicate social harmony in the country of King Arthur. If there is no other way out, then personally I still prefer to be shot, rather than burned at the stake. ... You ponder, ponder, but somewhere in the first half of the film, a petty little thought appears and does not disappear: is there anything to solve? Is it not in vain to find a black cat in a dark room if it is not there? And there are only beautiful costumes worn by people in various poses. Kind of like dancing. We watch ballet compositions for more than two hours. Why not be patient in the cinema too?" (Revich, 1989).

Russian film critics of the XXI century reacted to this film warmer.

For example, film critic Evgeny Nefedov writes that "Victor Gres deserves praise for many, many aspects of his film work. Suppose the performers are very interestingly selected, and the outstanding artist Yevgeny Evstigneev is completely amazingly accurate in the image of an all—knowing archbishop, who intelligibly explains to a newcomer from the future the structure of society and, above all, the guiding and leading role of the holy church. The thoroughness of the reconstruction of the atmosphere of an era that has sunk into oblivion (however, if we mean not so much authenticity as a careful, loving attitude to details) could become the envy of a lot of colleagues, including Western ones. ... The disadvantage, and a fundamental disadvantage, lies elsewhere. ... A seditious thought creeps in that Gres tried to squeeze all his own into the narrative at once (note very versatile) ideas about society and a person — and at the same time demonstrate that he is able to master the most refined aesthetics. ... As a result, even those who are not uninteresting, not devoid of depth of observation, the director who, turning to a different era and resorting to a fantastic admission, tried to talk about the problems that worried people today, sharply lose their credibility. I am sincerely sorry!" (Nefedov, 2016).

But film critic Elena Kushnir is absolutely sure that "Gres is a kind of Soviet Terrence Malik, only even less known to a wide audience and with even fewer works. But this is the case when two pieces are worth more than twenty. For at least one of them, Mark Twain's free fantasy, is a rare experiment that goes far beyond conventional cinema. This surrealistic spectacle, filmed on the verge of delirium, sleep and oblivion, argues in philosophical categories not as a film, but as a painting, without disintegrating into separate "living pictures", but preserving the integrity of the narrative, like a chivalrous novel and an avant—garde art house at the same time. This film was born equally by the work of the masters of the Northern Renaissance, the Pre—Raphaelites and the "Andalusian Dog" Luis Buñuel, but does not bow to any of them, existing in its own little big universe, unique visually and rhythmically, if not thematically and staged. ... Like any good parable film, Yankee leaves reasoning at the mercy of the audience, dispensing with blocky explanations: what was it? All. Nothing. Little from the original source. Choose your taste, the film will say nothing more" (Kushnir, 2017).

And if film critics argue about this film by Victor Gres, then the audience is even more disagreeing:

"The mood, form, music, visuals, artists, actors are beyond praise. Ideally. The idea is not expressed clearly enough; the scriptwriters had a strong "internal censor", which thwarted the

clarity of the artistic aim. ... And yet — a masterpiece and a classic. There are very few films of such perfect form. ... Before Victor Gres — down with a hat” (Vlas).

“A unique film. One of the best in Russian cinema and the most interesting visualization of Arthur's story on the screen. Filozov's brilliant acting work and the transcendent alien Kaidanovsky, if you still single out the most powerful images of the film, although the rest are worth different film careers combined. Actually, it is difficult to describe the film in words. It's like describing a dream or a fragment of someone else's fantasy. Thanks to the director for this unique masterpiece — an absolute phantasmagoria, a magical unreality, a non—fairy tale” (L. Fiaba).

“The film is about how America shamelessly invades the life of another country and tries to establish its own order there. But there is a divine will for everything ... Each era has its own Merlin, who points the way to the lost. A very philosophical film. The actors are well chosen, in which you can easily recognize the characters of the British epic” (Dani).

“The film is complete junk. Boredom without Mark Twain, but with abstruse, pseudo—philosophical ideas of Gres himself” (Rabotnichek).

Oh, This Awful, Awful TV. USSR, 1990. Directed by Temur Palavandishvili. Screenwriters: Levan Chelidze, Devi Ivanov—Chikovani, Temur Palavandishvili. Actors: Vakhtang Panchulidze, Abessalom Loria, Baya Dvalishvili, Mamuka Kikaleishvili and others. **TV.**

Temur Palavandishvili directed seven full-length feature films. “Oh, This Awful, Awful TV” is his last film work.

The photographer buys an old TV that shows ... tomorrow's programs...

This is the application of the plot of this fantastic film, where there was a place for both satire and sad Georgian humor...

One Fine Day. USSR, 1976. Directed by July Gusman. Screenwriter Maksud Ibragimbekov. Actors: Cast: Semyon Farada, Sergey Yursky, Inara Guliyeva and others. **Short film.**

July Gusman directed five full—length feature films, of which the film "Don't be afraid, I'm with you!" was the most famous.

In the fantastic comedy “One Fine Day”, the main character (Semyon Farada) comes out onto the balcony and sees an alien ship (by the way, made quite convincingly in the film) ...

Today this film has been forgotten — both by film critics and moviegoers...

One Fine Evening in 2000. USSR, 1973. Directed by Vitaly Aksenov. **Short film.**

Vitaly Aksenov (1931—2020) directed eight full—length feature films and serials, however, only his concert film "How to Become a Star" entered the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films.

Vitaly Aksenov's fantastic short film “One Fine Evening in 2000” is an attempt to predict what the Earth will be like in three decades. Strictly speaking, this is not a fiction, but an editing film in which the director used various audiovisual material...

Almost all of Vitaly Aksenov's main predictions did not come true, because he was sure that in 2000 West Germany would continue to exist as countries of the USSR, Soviet cosmonauts would land on Mars, bubble cars would move around Moscow, etc. But on the other hand, in 2000 there will still be no mobile phones, and TVs will be suspiciously similar to the "advanced" models of 1973...

So today this film by Vitaly Aksenov is a funny incident, testifying to how difficult it is to predict the future even thirty years ahead ...

The responses of the 21st century viewers to this film are mostly ironic: "2020, and we are still not on Mars))))))" (V. Golubev).

"Well, they didn't guess, it didn't work out.... Who does not happen to..." (Musya).

"Well, they could have predicted at least a mobile phone!" (Vitek).

"Oh, it's a pity that the film is so short, I would like to know more about what will happen in 2000..." (Semyon).

Orion's Loop. USSR, 1981. Directed by Vasily Levin. Screenwriters Alexey Leonov, Valentin Selivanov. Actors: Leonid Bakshtayev, Gennady Shkuratov, Vitaly Doroshenko, Anatoly Matashko, Lyudmila Smorodina, Anatoly Azo, Andrey Gradov, Givi Tokhadze, Liya Eliava, Elena Tonunts, Yuri Menshagin, Boris Rudnev, Alexey Leonov, Vitaly Sevastianov and others. **9,4 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Vasily Levin (1923—1998) directed ten full-length feature films, two of which ("The Tale of First Love" and "Stration's Daughter") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films. But the main and most popular work of Vasily Levin was the television movie "Captain Nemo" with Vladislav Dvorzhetsky.

The fantastic film "Orion's Loop" tells about the next space expedition, during which astronauts learn that the Earth is in mortal danger ...

The Soviet film press was very critical of "Orion's Loop".

For example, film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929—1997) asked on the pages of the "Cinema Art" magazine: "What metaphor is hidden behind the unearthly characters in "Orion's Loop"? It looks like nothing, as well as for the robots. They wanted to portray cosmic friends, but they turned out to be fools who cannot figure out that earthlings will beat their foreheads against their energy walls until they unravel the secret. One could see another intention in the film — to show the heroism of earthly astronauts. But, firstly, as I already said, the feat must be meaningful and necessary, and secondly, people behave as absurdly as their fellows in reason. For some reason, one of the crew members is hiding the most important information from his comrades, the other stubbornly and inexplicably decides to declare a personal war on the newcomers — he doesn't want to believe them, doesn't want to, that's all. In addition, the crew of the starship is quite similar to the cyber counterparts; neither one nor the other has any bright, individual traits. But if there are no personalities, then there is no one to worry about — what is the film about then?" (Revich, 1985: 66-67).

And the film critic Andrei Vyatkin, already, in the 21st century, wrote about "Orion's Loop" even more harshly: "You can't erase a word from a song, although I don't really want to recall such, without exaggeration, shameful films like "Star Inspector" and "Orion's Loop". Their appearance can only be explained by the search for easy success on the crest of the wave of the early 1980s, when the Council for Science Fiction and Adventure Film was created under the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR, and the stimulation of the genre became fashionable, giving rise to precocity, as in the late 1950s. False meaningfulness, covering all conceivable, homegrown and borrowed cliches, and the complete absence of logic — they say, science fiction will endure everything" (Vyatkin, 2003).

21st century viewers are also very strict about "Orion's Loop":

"The budget was such that it demanded half of the resources of the Odessa film studio, but the result is depressing. ... Disgustingly bad visuals and no characters of astronauts" (A. Pozdeev).

"The plot is interesting. ... But the main thing is that the characters, the images of the heroes turned out to be too schematic" (A. Grebenkin).

Paradise Apples. USSR, 1974. Director and screenwriter Georgy Shchukin (based on Martti Larni's story "Socrates in Helsinki"). Actors: Vyacheslav Shalevich, Boris Tenin, Lidia Sukharevskaya, Galina Pirnazarova, Yuri Chulyukin, Leonid Satanovsky, Yuri Volyntsev, Zinoviy Gerdt, Rita Gladunko, Eve Kivi, Valery Nosik, Gotlib Roninson, Victor Filippov and others. **7,1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

People and Dolphins. USSR, 1984. Directed by Vladimir Khmelnitsky. Screenwriters: Yuri Alikov, Alexey Leontiev, Vladimir Khmelnitsky. Actors: Igor Ledogorov, Galina Yatskina, Vasily Yatskin, Natalya Fateeva, Vladimir Talashko, Milena Tontegode, Evgeny Leonov—Gladyshev and others. **TV premiere on August 14, 1984.**

Vladimir Khmelnitsky directed six full-length feature films and TV series. “People and Dolphins” is his most famous work.

The science fiction television series “People and Dolphins” tells the story of how scientists, studying dolphins, come to the conclusion that they are endowed with intelligence...

21st century viewers often disagree about this TV movie:

“I love this film ... An extraordinary story. Great actors (and dolphins too). Here we are looking for contact with extraterrestrial intelligence, but we have not found contact with those who are nearby...” (Star).

“The film is great! I love him to tears! The military line of the film was deeply shocked. ... The plot of the film and its deep meaning still excite me” (L. Serenko).

“To be honest, the film is crazy. This is called, there was nowhere to throw the money away. The plan had to be fulfilled ... Well, what is the value of the film as a science fiction work, where they think about how dolphins could move statues with hypnosis. What kind of mushrooms did you have to eat to invent such a thing? In general, the quality of science fiction in the USSR was very low” (Vasya).

Pilot Pirx's Inquiry. USSR – Poland, 1980. Directed by Marek Piestrak. Scriptwriters Vladimir Valutsky, Marek Piestrak (based on Stanislaw Lem's story "Inquiry"). Actors: Sergei Desnitsky, Alexander Kaidanovsky, Vladimir Ivashov, Tynu Saar and others. **15,8 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Polish director Marek Piestrak directed about a dozen full-length feature films and series, but in our country he is known mainly for two fantastic films of the Polish–Soviet production: "Pilot Pirx's Inquiry" and "The Valley of the Serpents". Both of these films were included in one thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films.

The film "Pilot Pirx's Inquiry", based on the novel by Stanislaw Lem, takes us to the era of space exploration ... by humanoid robots. The commander of the ship Pirx is entrusted with a difficult task: to figure out which of the crew members is "non-human"...

The characters of the astronauts are sketched in the picture only, so the main attention is switched to the technical surroundings. The scene of the death of one of the robots is also strikingly filmed: elastic tissue that imitates skin is torn, exposing the arteries and veins of colored wires...

Spectacularity comes to the fore, futurological reflections — to the second. The film did not become a spectacle in its purest form because of the attempt made to consider the moral problem of the cooperation of people with their electronic counterparts, because of tediously long conversations and monologues. A study film, philosophical reflection, in my opinion, did not work either...

For some reason, the leadership of the State Film Agency delayed the release of this fantastic film on the Soviet screen: the Warsaw premiere of "Pilot Pirx's Inquiry" took place in May 1979, and in the USSR the movie was released only in the summer of 1980, just before the July strikes and demonstrations in Poland began...

In my opinion, the film critic Andrei Vyatkin is absolutely right: “the style of the Soviet–Polish film "Pilot Pirx's Inquiry" is the style of a cinematic quotation. The opening shots in the laboratory are clearly inspired by the film versions of "Frankenstein", then a space detective follows — a spectacular run through the dark corridors of a closed spaceship in the style of "Alien", and for dessert — a beautiful flight through a stream of asteroids a la Star Wars" (Vyatkin, 2003).

But in Soviet times, film critics demanded something different from "Pilot Pirx's Inquiry".

So Vsevolod Revich (1929–1997) wrote that “it would be worthwhile to strengthen the ideological content of the film, to make the viewer more clear and deeper why it is so important for

Pirx to succeed in his investigation: not only to stop the conveyor belt of an almighty company, but to protect the human in man, that there are boundaries beyond which a person cannot be replaced by anyone. There is nothing more dangerous than a robot pretending to be a human, because at the most crucial moment it can betray people — not out of conviction, but out of indifference ... This, of course, is about the philosophical aspect of substitution, and not about the senselessly suicidal desire to send a person to certain death by all means when it really can be replaced by mechanisms” (Revich, 1985: 66).

The opinions of today's viewers about this film differ significantly:

“It seems to me that the “feeling of indescribable melancholy” from such films remains precisely because the atmosphere in such films is cold ... That is, perfection in the interiors (usually everything is in white, a lot of chrome—plated metal, you press a button and a robot will do everything for you or the system), coldish, impeccable—looking heroes in spacesuits or overalls ... And human nature protests against such an "ideal" world. But it is precisely such an environment that works for the plot — after all, films were shot about morality, about human relations, about many other things ... (Lina).

“I watched the film twice. For the first time a long time ago (back in the USSR, as a child), the second time — recently. I would not say that he impressed me as a masterpiece. Quite a good movie (especially for the time), but nothing more. ... But if you evaluate the picture from the other side (the depth of the content), then here, too, you somehow do not feel a masterpiece. I involuntarily compare it with Tarkovsky's “Solaris”. That's where the depth is so deep! And let Lem sulk at Tarkovsky as much as he wants, I am entirely on the side of the great director” (I. Godunov).

Planet of Storms. USSR, 1962. Directed by Pavel Klushantsev. Screenwriters Alexander Kazantsev, Pavel Klushantsev (based on the story of the same name by Alexander Kazantsev). Actors: Vladimir Emelyanov, Gennady Vernov, Georgy Zhzhonov, Kyunna Ignatova, Yuri Sarantsev, Georgy Teikh. **20 million viewers in the first year of the show.**

Working mainly in documentary and popular science films, **director Pavel Klushantsev (1910–1999)** shot only one full-length feature film — the fantastic “Planet of Storms”, about the flight of earthlings to Venus.

This fantastic film is staged in the best traditions of Russian science fiction: a heroic Soviet cosmonaut rescues an American astronaut during an expedition to Venus...

In the year of its release in 1962, the film enjoyed great success with the public. Still, after Yuri Gagarin's flight into space, science fiction has become extremely popular, especially among schoolchildren and young people.

Then, about the same thing happened with “Planet of Storms” as with the previous Soviet science fiction film “The Sky is Calling”: American producer and director Roger Corman bought P. Klushantsev's picture and made two remastered versions of it with dossiers — “Voyage to the Prehistoric Planet” (directed by Curtis Harrington, 1965) and “Voyage to the Planet of Prehistoric Women” (directed by Peter Bogdanovich, 1968).

Like most of his fellow film critics, Bogdanovich could not boast of millions in income, so he gladly accepted Corman's offer — to remount “Planet ...” for \$ 6,000.

In a film that was purely male in its cast (there was also a robot in addition to the Russian and the American), the fair half of humanity was clearly lacking. Without thinking twice, Peter Bogdanovich not only reduced the length of the Russian movie, but also filmed several episodes with the participation of some sexually attractive persons. So this picture was released on the screens of the USA under the deservedly enticing title “Voyage to the Planet of Prehistoric Women”...

It was in this, the second remake of “Planet of Storms” that it was clear that the most interesting thing for Americans here is not space and astronauts and not even a robot, but “good girls, cherished friends”: bikinis, “lights of cheerful eyes”...

More details about the American rework of “Planet of Storms” can be found in my article “A Hermeneutic Analysis of Soviet Fiction Film at the Turn of the 1950s – 1960s and Its American Screen Transformation” (Fedorov, 2011: 47-69).

"Planet of Storms" is still remembered by the audience:

"For that time, it was made simply gorgeous! Robot, etc. By the way, the episode with the death of the robot there is the most tragic, it was very sorry for him... Now the film can amaze with its naivety ... Look at it, this is our youth, the era of socialist romanticism" (Zabar).

"Klushantsev is generally a mega—man! The author of the amazing popular science films "The Moon", "Mars" and "Meteorites"... Klushantsev was also the author of the books "To Other Planets!", "The Station" Moon" and "What the Telescope Told About"... With some naivety, the film all the same it is not devoid of charm" (M. Kirillov).

Poltergeist—90. USSR, 1991. Directed by Vladislav Semernin, Boris Zagryazhsky. Screenwriter Vladislav Semernin. Actors: Alexey Batalov, Remigius Sabulis, Inna Pivars, Natalia Florenskaya, Igor Andrianov, Boris Gorbunov and others.

Privy Counselor. USSR, 1989. Director and screenwriter Aghasy Ayvazyan. Actors: Karen Janibekyan, Yuri Aroyan, Igor Kvasha and others.

Aghasy Ayvazyan (1925—2007) directed three full-length feature films, the last of which was "Privy Counselor".

In this fantastic comedy, the secret adviser found in a coffin suddenly comes to life ...

In my opinion, "Privy Counselor" is not the best work of Aghasy Ayvazyan, there are too many perestroika conjuncture and head — on directorial decisions in this film...

Film critic Irina Popova wrote that the uniqueness of the "Privy Counselor" is that the good principle, designed to resist evil, is absent here. Positive heroes, in principle, exist, but they are some colorless, amorphous characters, narrow—minded and incapable of resistance" (Popova, 1990: 9).

Professor Dowell's Testament. USSR, 1984. Director and screenwriter Leonid Menaker (based on the story of A. Belyaev "The Head of Professor Dowell"). Actors: Olgert Kroders, Igor Vasiliev, Alexey Bobrov, Valentina Titova, Natalia Sayko, Nikolai Lavrov, Alexander Porokhovshchikov, Ernst Romanov and others. **18.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Leonid Menaker (1929—2012) directed 14 films of different genres, four of which ("Young Wife", "Lark", "Professor Dowell's Testament", "Don't Forget ... Lugovaya Station") were included in the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films.

"The Head of Professor Dowell" — along with "The Amphibian Man" — is perhaps one of the most famous science fiction stories by Alexander Belyaev.

Alas, her film adaptation did not escape a touch of campy exoticism. It is not entirely clear why it was necessary to transfer the action of the story to the 1980s and, moreover, to Africa.

Would the history of the creation of an artificial race of people become less relevant if it took place in one of the European countries of the 1930s?

On the contrary, I will take the liberty of affirming that immersed in the real atmosphere of Europe in the pre—war years, the events of the picture would have acquired a clearer historical and national basis. And the authors would not need to come up with an intricate form for the police of a certain mythical state, and Natalya Saiko would not have to pretend to be a black woman from a bar.

By the way, the actress is equally uncomfortable both in this role of a singer and in the image of an extravagant movie star. She also failed to create a synthetic image of the artificial woman Eve, created by Professor Korn from the bodies of two dead women. A split personality is conveyed on the screen so much simplified, which causes an involuntary smile in places that seem to be completely inappropriate for this.

Oddly enough, the most vivid figure in the film turned out to be ... the head of Professor Dowell. Actor Olgert Kroders, deprived of movement, body plastics, and in a good part of the

picture— even voices, managed to create a memorable character of an outstanding scientist, whose ingenious invention, falling into the wrong hands, could lead to disastrous consequences for humanity.

Unfortunately, the ending of the picture, where long and in detail explains in words what has long been clear in the course of the action, could not add anything to the controversial image of Dowell.

After its release, "Professor Dowell's Testament" met with an ambiguous reception from the audience and the press.

However, the usually very strict film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929–1997), who specialized in the genres of science fiction and detective, reacted positively to this film adaptation of the fantastic story by Alexander Belyaev (1884–1942), in this case, the standard criticism of losses and losses in aesthetic "transplantation" would be unfair. Here we can rather talk about the enrichment of the original, although the main ideas, albeit modernized, come from the writer...

Kern's image underwent the greatest changes. In the novel, the hero was a poster villain who insidiously killed his teacher and, under torture, forced his head and his brain to work for himself. Screen Kern (I. Vasiliev) is more voluminous. He ceased to be a villain, which immediately removed the raid of boulevardism from the image, and turned into a sober and cold-blooded businessman, talented, intelligent and merciless in achieving his goals. The image retained and strengthened the idea dear to A. Belyaev — you can touch human destinies only with clean, unselfish hands, otherwise these actions acquire a criminal character, no matter how lofty words about "pure" science they hide behind ... But N. Saiko in the role of a singer from the bar, the one to whose head someone else's body was "sewn", did not seem convincing. It can be assumed that a young woman,

Film critic Felix Andreev noted in his article that in "Professor Dowell's Testament", "the collisions of the literary source, carried over to our days, are undergoing a significant rethinking. Patients with transplanted organs now live for many months and even years. The ideas themselves, which more than half a century ago seemed exclusively the lot of science fiction, few people today seem so incredible. Hence, a certain shift in the center of gravity in the new film towards psychologism, the development of moral problems, the adventure side of the plot. At the same time, we note that this restructuring is not always exactly aimed at revealing the human essence of Professor Dowell ... The creators of this movie are concerned about moral issues. They testify by means of their art: the most important discoveries, having become the property of shameless businessmen in the West"...

Already in the 21st century, film critic Vladimir Velminsky wrote that this film by Leonid Menaker "unambiguously follows the tradition of classic films about "mad scientists" of the 1950s – 1960s, such as "The Man without a Body", "Donovan's Brain"... However, it becomes obvious that Menaker intended not only to illustrate, let alone retell the accumulated knowledge on the basis of a "case from practice". "Professor Dowell's Testament" clearly demonstrates that in the case of such an appeal to fictitious scientific concepts, first of all, the formal parameters of visuality are affected".

But the views of the 21st century viewers about "Professor Dowell's Testament" are mostly negative:

"As a fan of Belyaev, this film simply killed me. The most interesting parts of the book were not included in the script, the depth of the characters disappeared, and the central theme of the book — the harm that scientific knowledge in the hands of an immoral person can bring to mankind remained undefined. The film resembles a banal detective story with a central theme of revenge, the meaning of what is happening, even for me, who has read Belyaev's book more than once, was almost impossible to understand in some places. I only like the electronic music in the film and the temperamental acting of Igor Vasiliev, but again, Korn in his performance is a villainous mask" (Ilya).

"Very weak film adaptation! ... Another very unfortunate selection of two actresses for female roles. ... And entrusting a rather mediocre actress Saiko to play three different roles is simply a failure. A sophisticated actress, a vulgar singer and some hybrid of them are played absolutely primitively ... Well, in the film itself there is no intrigue or zest. For me, it would be better not to take it at all than to shoot like that" (Miriam).

"The film is boring and uninteresting. The play of the actors is sluggish, expressionless. I looked once and forgot. It is better to re-read the wonderful book of Belyaev again" (N. Volkov).

But there are, of course, viewers, whose opinion is close to the estimates of V. Revich:

"I think the film is outstanding. ... "Testament...", like Alexander Belyaev's novel itself, is more relevant today than ever. The director managed to convey the idea—warning, which was the basis of the work nearly a hundred years ago" (Alex).

"I watched this picture once, when I was at school age, but the impressions were: from delight to horror ... At that time, in the absence of any graphics and special effects, the film still impressed with its "real" fantasticness and some convincingness. There is a lot of philosophy and difficult life knots in it, the plot is very interesting and quite difficult in the context of a person's craving for gaining immortality" (Arizona).

Puppy from the Constellation Hounds. USSR, 1991. Directed by Eduard Gavrillov. Screenwriters Eduard Gavrillov, Lilia Nemenova (based on the story of the same name by Lilia Nemenova). Actors: Boris Shuvalov, Evgenia Dobrovolskaya, Vera Voronkova, Valentin Smirnitsky, Spartak Mishulin, Lyubov Polishchuk, Valery Nosik, Alexander Lazarev (Jr.), Nikolai Parfyonov and others.

Purple Ball. USSR, 1987. Director and screenwriter Pavel Arsenov (based on the story of the same name by Kir Bulychev). Actors: Natalia Guseva, Alexander Gusev, Vyacheslav Nevinsky, Boris Shcherbakov, Vyacheslav Baranov, Svetlana Kharitonova, Igor Yasulovich, Victor Pavlov, Sergey Nikonenko, Vladimir Nosik, Marina Levtova and others.

Pavel Arsenov (1936—1999) directed ten full-length feature films, but his most famous work was the fantastic series for children "Guest from the Future".

"Purple Ball" is a kind of sequel to "Guest from the Future", where Alice, using a time machine, travels to another era to neutralize the Purple Ball of Hostility ...

Contrary to the calculations of the authors, "Purple Ball" enjoyed much less audience success than "Guest from the Future", perhaps due to the fact that the leading role in "Guest from the Future" has matured and lost her childish charm...

Even today, "Purple Ball" has much more negative audience reviews than positive ones: "It's a very weak work, in my opinion. ... gives off some kind of "amateur performance". It seems that the director, filming the next episode, ended it with the words "... well, it'll do!" I do not compare the quality of the film with modern technologies, but try to compare it with the old Soviet films in the genre of fairy tales and science fiction, and I come to the conclusion that "Purple Ball" is a first-rate hack" (Capital of Culture).

Rainbow Formula. USSR, 1966. Directed by Georgy Yungvald—Khilkevich. Screenwriter Yuri Chernyavsky. Actors: Nikolai Fedortsov, Raisa Nedashkovskaya, Savely Kramarov, Ivan Ryzhov, Frunzik Mkrtchyan, Georgy Vitsin, Lev Stepanov, Roman Tkachuk, Natalya Varley, Nikolai Grinko, Evgeny Shutov, Zoya Fedorova, etc. **The film was not released on a wide screen (although some reports went in limited rental on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR).**

Georgy Yungvald—Khilkevich (1934—2015) known to the audience, first of all, for his "musketeer" films. During his long film career, Georgy Yungvald—Khilkevich directed 22 films, five of which were included in the thousand highest-grossing Soviet films.

In the fantastic comedy "Rainbow Formula", a scientist creates a robot that looks absolutely similar to himself. Everything would be fine, but the robot is trying to be too independent...

Filming for "Rainbow Formula" was completed in 1966, but the film was never released to the wide screen. The reasons for this are still unclear. There are several versions. The first of them is based on the fact that the filmmakers did not like the satirical sharpness of the film. The second assumption (which was expressed, for example, by G. Jungwald—Khilkevich himself) reminds that the "Rainbow Formula" had a strong competitor with a similar plot — the fantastic comedy "His

Name Was Robert", which was released in 1967. The third version of the "shelf" fate of the "Rainbow Formula" (the version, in my opinion, a joke, since the cinematography in the film, in my opinion, is quite consistent with professional standards) was proposed by film critic Denis Gorelov: in his opinion, this film was "banned for professional marriage: three operators have not learned to point the camera exactly at the face together" (Gorelov, 2009).

Today, of course, in the "Rainbow Formula" the flaws of the debut direction are clearly visible. And the composer Alexander Zatsepin, in my opinion, is clearly disappointing here. After the brilliant music in "Operation "Y", one could expect much brighter and more modern melodies from him.

But on the whole, the "Rainbow Formula" does not look without interest, and, I think, taking into account a good acting ensemble, it would have every chance to attract Soviet audiences in 1966 or 1967 to cinemas...

Viewers of the XXI century about the "Rainbow Formula" differ significantly.

"For": "In my opinion, the film is much more interesting and funnier than "His name was Robert". Very bright, colorful. Wonderful cast!" (Hellas). "Great eccentric comedy! ... In some satirical moments "Rainbow Formula" surpasses "His name was Robert", but the St. Petersburg film takes its "stars": after all, Oleg Strizhenov and Marianna Vertinskaya are super!" (G. Volanov).

"Against": "Initially, it is clear that this film will not have a future, because by its cleverness it caused some associations among the leadership of our country at that time. Despite the good selection of actors, the film is still very weak" (Barygin—Amursky).

Recipe for Her Youth. USSR, 1984. Directed by Evgeny Ginzburg. Screenwriter Alexander Adabashyan (based on the play by Karel Čapek "Makropulos Means"). Actors: Lyudmila Gurchenko, Oleg Borisov, Alexander Abdulov, Anatoly Romashin, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Elena Stepanova, Sergey Shakurov and others. **14.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Evgeny Ginzburg (1945—2012) during his career, he has directed 25 films, performances and musicals. He mainly worked on television, over and over again chaining millions of viewers to their home screens ("Magic Lantern", a series of television "Benefits", "Island of Lost Ships", "Merry Chronicle of a Dangerous Journey", etc.).

So, the famous master of TV musicals Evgeny Ginzburg this time filmed a fantastic play by Karel Čapek "Makropulos Means". The very first shot — catchy, frankly decorative, tunes in to the wave of a fun attraction. But then very unexpected things happen. Strange even.

First of all, there is no further witty—parody play with form. But it was in "Benefits" — and combined shooting, musical effects of electronic equipment!

But something else is worse. A musical is unthinkable without hits — bright, well-remembered melodies. The melodies of "Recipe...", although they are not devoid of a certain pleasantness, cannot be called smash hits. They are forgotten immediately after the end of the viewing. Therefore, perhaps even such a plastic and musical actress as Lyudmila Gurchenko, not feeling solid melodic ground under her feet, could not play in full force of her talent. But her role is truly a benefit — a variety show actress who received a mysterious potion of eternal youth!

As for the other roles in the film, they are openly supportive (this is not a reproach, but a benefit performance principle). True, the minimum of drama, allotted to the lot of Sergei Shakurov and Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, allowed them only to sparkle with their eyes and to indicate their presence on the screen with intricate movements.

The Soviet film press reacted to the "Recipe for Her Youth" in a very differentiated way.

Film critic Valentin Mikhalkovich (1937—2006) wrote about this film as follows: "In the play, Čapek tried to prove that eternal youth is absurd. Let us suggest — as the writer would say — that a means has been found that allows a person to remain as he was, say, at twenty or twenty—five years old. The body does not change, it remains as young, but the main thing is that the soul grows old — it gets fed up, it becomes apathetic. A man for centuries of life manages to know everything, to taste everything, to enjoy everything, and no joys of life will be able to excite him. Therefore, in the finale of the play, an ordinary girl — young Christina — burns the recipe: she does not want

satiety. The authors of the film do not agree with the sad conclusions of the play. They are not at all dramatic about the "Makropulos Means", and therefore "rewrite" the play, introduce new motives there, turn it into a perky one" (Miklakovich, 1984).

But critic Valery Semenovskiy did not like the film at all, since in it "the characters are schematic, pale, finally, just boring. ... Despite a certain ingenuity of the director Yevgeny Ginzburg" (Semenovskiy, 1984: 8).

And film critic Irina Shilova (1937—2011) noted that "the director brought Čapek's plot to the thick of the parable, but it became clear that the dramatic structure of the play itself does not always withstand this concentration. A tangled tangle of dramatic twists and turns — the story of the testament, the clarification of the positions of many heroes embroiled in intrigue, the mysterious biography of the heroine, the disclosure of the secret of the recipe, etc. — needed extensive verbal explanations, which, alas, very often prevented the organic arrangement of the musical material. The director turned out to be insufficiently consistent in observing the law of the rhythmically measured distribution of speech and music in dramatic development. ... Perhaps all this led to the contradictions of the picture, which, with all its staged finds, does not always have the severity of taste and sense of proportion" (Shilova, 1984: 44).

Viewers' opinions about the "Recipe for Her Youth" today, as often happens, are polar:

"It's amazing that few people know such a great film. The combination of intrigue, humor, beauty of actors, wonderful music, luxurious decorations and a serious theme in a "frivolous" package is a piece product (although in fact it is not a product, but a work of art). This is one of the best roles (or the best) of Lyudmila Gurchenko, who at one time — when the film passed on the screens of cinemas — was paid a tribute of respect and admiration even by those who are not enthusiastic about her other roles. And all the other actors shone — as if they were a match!" (Eugene).

"I've been watching, or rather, reviewing this wonderful film for three days. It ends, I turn it on again. And I will continue tomorrow. You can watch it from anywhere and endlessly. Strange, but I don't see it as a musical. For me, this is the most serious philosophical treatise. The film reveals what is inherent in human nature: a person especially values what he can lose. What we have, we do not store, having lost we cry. Why are we made this way? How often, looking back, you suddenly discover that you were very happy, but did not appreciate and did not notice it. How wonderful the film shows the moment when the heroine realizes that immortality is over, how she passionately falls in love with this wonderful world. For me, Gurchenko is Elina Makropoulos. I look at the great beloved actress and laugh and cry with her" (M. Dzhiganskaya).

"I don't like the film at all. Not catchy music, banal lyrics. Disappointment" (Betty).

"I really don't like this film. Karel Čapek's beautiful play was turned into a stupid musical, leaving little of the content. At the same time, the music in the musical is completely unmemorable! ... Gurchenko, as always, is vulgar. Abdulov is not impressive here either, a cute ladies' man, nothing more. Dzhigarkhanyan seemed to come straight from the set "Hello, I am your aunt", almost the same techniques" (B. Nezhdanov).

Return from the Stars. USSR, 1989. Directed by Vladimir Latyshev, O. Larionov (based on Stanislaw Lem's novel "Return from the Stars"). Actors: Valery Solovyov, Sergey Vlasov, A. Oleinikov, Olga Onishchenko, Marina Solopchenko, Svetlana Slizhikova and others. **TV.**

Vladimir Latyshev (1934—1990) directed two dozen films. He has two fantastic television performances — "The Last Alternative" and "Return from the Stars".

In the "Return from the Stars" astronauts return to Earth after a long—term space expedition, and discover that during their absence the planet has changed, people live on it without wars and violence ...

Some viewers still remember this picture with good feelings:

"A very interesting, careful attempt to transfer the most complex fantastic prose of Stanislaw Lem to the screen. All the actors are pleased with the performance, the good work of the production designer, cameraman and composer" (A. Grebenkin).

“Of course, to film this difficult (including technically) novel on “Lentelefilm” during perestroika times — the idea is more than bold. But, perhaps, the Soviet people felt exactly as confused and lonely as Bregg on the eve of the collapse of the Union, and the director Vladimir Latyshev, as a creative person, felt it subtly” (M. Palukh).

Return of the Doctor. USSR, 1980. Directed by Andrey Ermash. Screenwriters Valentin Yezhov, Andrey Ermash (based on the stories by J. Seidel “There and Back” and R. Dahl “Sound Machine”). Actors: Georgy Taratorkin, Vyacheslav Ezevov, Boris Ivanov, Yuris Strenga and others.
Short film.

This film **directed by Andrei Ermash**, the son of Philip Ermash (1923–2002), who held the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, from 1972 to 1986. After the debut short film “Return of the Doctor”, Andrei Ermash directed two full-length science fiction films – “Moonlight Rainbow” and “End of Eternity”. But on December 26, 1986, Philip Ermash left his high post, having managed before that to start the filming process of “End of Eternity”, which was released in April 1988. Alexander Kamshalov (1932–2019), who replaced Philip Ermash as chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, was not so favorably disposed towards his son, and as a result, “End of Eternity” became the end of the cinematic path of Andrei Ermash, who at that time was only thirty years old ...

The film “Return of the Doctor” was ideologically verified, as it told a story about how in a bourgeois society people who were acutely aware of social problems ended up in a special clinic and there they became indifferent to everything...

Road to the Stars. USSR, 1957. Directed by Pavel Klushantsev. Screenwriters Boris Lyapunov, Vasily Soloviev. Actors: Georgy Solovyov, Georgy Kulbush, Dmitry Shatrov and others.

Working mainly in documentary and popular science films, director Pavel Klushantsev (1910–1999) shot only one full-length feature film — the fantastic “Planet of Storms”, about the flight of earthlings to Venus, which was included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

“Road to the Stars” — the mid-length fantasy film (about 50 minutes long) combines elements of popular science and fiction films, telling about the first manned flight into space and to the moon.

During the years when “Road to the Stars” was released, Yan Koltunov wrote in the “Technics for Youth” magazine that this film “came out on the screens in an unusually timely manner — exactly when he was most needed. And this was the first reason for his great success. ... And the main thing, perhaps, is the successful combination of a high scientific level of the script with an expressive artistic performance. ... The film turned out to be encyclopedic, wide in scope. He revives the most important stages in the history of Soviet rocket technology, recreates the image of K.E. Tsiolkovsky..., talks about satellites, looks into the future, takes us to an inhabited satellite, to the moon conquered by man. Brilliant combined footage makes the viewer feel the speed of the rockets, the depth and distance of interplanetary space” (Koltunov, 1958: 24).

However, after this praise, Yan Koltunov noted that “the desire to cover all questions of astronautics also gave rise to the film’s drawback — the unwanted conciseness of the film story. The first half of the picture, where the arsenal of ideas and means of flight into space is often shown with fluent techniques of a newsreel, turned out to be more artistic than the second half, where this entire arsenal is put into action. The monotony of techniques, the slowness of the scenario in the description of inhabited satellites and the flight to the moon do not give the viewer food for thought and weaken his interest in this part of the film. The authors of the film got carried away in this part of the “conflict-free” screening, the general demonstration of the technique, and seemed to have forgotten about the viewer, who would be interested to see the same technique in the plot clashes. For example, say, an accident could reveal both the dangers of interplanetary space and the means of dealing with them,

It turns out that “The Road to the Stars” is interesting to the audience of the XXI century. I will give only one viewer review: “The film looks a little boring and seems too long... But it was only until the 30th minute... when the footage of the flight into space began to be shown on the

screen, I thought: "Didn't you mix up the release date of the film? There could not be such special effects in 1957!". I was so amazed by this fact that I examined the picture with bulging eyes and a feeling of complete delight. Special effects, static survey of space stations, mastery of combined filming make it clear that in the Soviet Union, really high—quality science fiction films were shot, which look at the level, and maybe even better, than similar Western films" (M. Iron).

Sandwich. USSR, 1989. Directed by Peter Stein (based on Stanislaw Lem's story "Do You Exist, Mr. Jones?"). Actors: Victor Rakov, Vladimir Belousov, Tatiana Ryleeva, Marina Troshina and others. **TV.**

Peter Stein (1947—2007) directed 17 full—length feature films, mostly TV shows.

In the fantastic comedy "Sandwich", a race car driver (Victor Rakov), who has suffered an accident and a complex surgical operation, turns out to be a very unusual type...

Satellite of the Planet Uranus. USSR, 1991. Director and screenwriter Haji Akhmar (based on the story of A. Belyaev "Ariel"). Actors: Iskander Akhmar, Yuri Volkov, Pavel Makhotin, Alexey Alekseev and others.

Haji Ahmar (1929—1993) directed seven feature-length films, none of which were successful with a mass audience. The screen version of Alexander Belyaev's fantastic story "Ariel" called "Satellite of the Planet Uranus" was no exception — the Soviet film press chose not to notice it, which is not surprising, since the film is far from true professionalism, and the actor for the main role was chosen extremely poorly.

Spectator reviews about "Satellite of the Planet Uranus" are entirely negative: "It was done so clumsily that there are no words! There is no direction, the cameraman does not know how to shoot a movie. The second roles are played by famous actors who have nothing to play, and the main character is just playing the fool. It is better not to evaluate works of this level at all" (Checkmark).

Seven Elements. USSR, 1985. Directed by Gennady Ivanov. Screenwriters Gennady Ivanov, Vladimir Shcherbakov (based on the science fiction novel of the same name by V. Shcherbakov). Actors: Igor Starygin, Irina Alferova, Hanna Dunovskaya, Uldis Norenbergs, Alexander Filippenko, Boris Khimichev, Lyubov Virolainen, etc. **7.2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Gennady Ivanov (1936—2014) directed nine full-length feature films, of which only one was shot in the fantastic genre — "Seven Elements".

In this film, the alien "flower" turns into a woman...

Famous actors were involved in "Seven Elements", however, alas, they did not manage to create interesting images, although, of course, they look good in elegant suits and interiors...

Film critic Vladimir Gordeev believes that "the peculiarity of the film "Seven Elements" is that one stroke of the pen could turn the film from "humane and positive" into "dark and depressing". Moreover, it would even be logical! But that did not happen. As a result, the plot turns into something stupid, far—fetched, rather ridiculous" (Gordeev, 2011).

And it seems that today's viewers treat the "Seven Elements" as a film failure:

"The film looks heavy. ... The action takes place in the distant future, but hints of a futuristic technique are very weak, I would even say they are not at all. ... Everything is very primitive, imbued with the spirit of a scoop in the worst sense of the word. ... Boring, and this for all my love for Russian science fiction" (G. Azarov).

"Quite a mediocre film, nothing about anything. I do not recommend it to anyone. Is it only for enthusiastic young ladies who want to look at the "handsome actor—darling". A beautiful video sequence clearly prevails over the plot and meaning. "Seven Elements" is a typical representative of the "aesthetic" trend in Soviet science fiction, along with "Star Inspector". Courageous handsome

actors, beautiful actresses' romantic robes fluttering in the wind, their beautiful hair fluttering in the wind, everything is so romantic, ah! The plot, the meaning in the background, if any. There is so much sweet syrup and oil that it even makes me sick" (Stroybat).

Shining World. USSR, 1984. Director and screenwriter Bulat Mansurov (based on the works of Alexander Green). Actors: Tiit Härm, Ilze Liepa, Pavel Kadochnikov, Lev Prygunov, Alexander Vokach, Gleb Strizhenov, Yuri Katin—Yartsev and others. **14.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Bulat Mansurov (1937—2011) directed 16 full—length feature films and serials ("The Competition", "Quenching Thirst", "Trizna", etc.). "Shining World" turned out to be his highest—grossing film.

I confess that I went to Bulat Mansurov's film "Shining World" with the hope that finally the magically unstable atmosphere of Alexander Green's works would appear on the screen simply and strictly, poetically and unsaid, without exotic excesses and corny "romanticism".

I was gladdened by the words of the director, who, in one of his interviews, enthusiastically told how he was looking for a special, like flying plastic of movements for the picture, not by chance inviting ballet dancers to the main roles. How close and dear to him is Green's thought about the freedom of the human spirit, about the inevitability of the victory of Good over Evil.

Alas, the very first shots of the film with the screaming colors of the costumes of the characters noticeably diminished my joyful mood, and then neither, in fact, the excellent plastic abilities of the actors, nor the very professional combined shooting could raise it. If the director wanted to create only a vivid melodramatic show about a flying man, who, to his misfortune, fell in love with a vengeful princess, then success is beyond doubt. But what does Green have to do with it? What has the fabulous props of interiors, evil operetta villain—ministers hissing with nasty thin voices?

Of course, the heroes of the "Shining World" are divided into good and evil, righteous and sinful quite unambiguously, which in itself does not contradict the laws of the romantic—fantastic genre. But the excessive exaggeration of characters against the background of oleographic landscapes makes one recall the molasses of the film adaptation of "Scarlet Sails", where one of the most subtle and brightest works of the writer appeared, I remember, as a glossy set of advertising and tourist postcards.

The Soviet film press reacted to the "Shining World" quite sympathetically.

Film critic Yuri Bogomolov wrote in "Satellite of the cinema—goer" that "The Shining World" — "it is not just a magical amazing country in which extraordinary people live, there is a person who has the happy gift of flying in reality, but the world that exists inside a person. It is huge and rich, like the universe. He is as generous as the Sun. And one must have the courage to discover this shining solar world within oneself" (Bogomolov, 1984: 7).

The opinions of today's viewers about "Shining World" are usually divided into "pro" and "contra":

"A piercing film. I liked it very much. ... The music and the song at the end of the film are very beautiful, but they cause sadness. Wonderful Artists participated in the film. ... This is the best adaptation of A. Green's work" (Alfiya).

"Great film! In contrast to the complex, difficult to perceive and, in my opinion, not in everything successful, the first major novel by Green, the film turned out to be dynamic and adventurous, but at the same time thought—provoking, with a powerful socio—philosophical overtones. The deviations from the author's plot were only beneficial" (Afrosiab).

"I watched this film when I was a teenager. Then he just shook. Now, probably, she would have taken it more calmly. I still remember the feeling of light depth and lightness. Ballet dancers in the lead roles, in my opinion, are undoubtedly the right decision for the adaptation of such a book" (Thea).

"A very serious flaw: who advised the director to distort the plot of the novel in such a way?" (Sfaera).

Silence of Dr. Evens. USSR, 1974. Director and screenwriter Budimir Metalnikov. Actors: Sergei Bondarchuk, Janna Bolotova, Irina Skobtseva, Leonid Obolensky, Igor Kuznetsov, Boris Romanov and others. **16 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Budimir Metalnikov (1925—2001) directed only three films, of which only a fantastic picture about earthlings and aliens — "Silence of Dr. Ivens", was included in the thousand of the highest—grossing Soviet films.

In the year the film was released, "Soviet Screen" responded to it with an article claiming that a number of reproaches can be presented to the film. Nevertheless, for those who understand the importance of the problems posed by B. Metalnikov, who are interested in the philosophy of space exploration, the film is useful and interesting. It provides rich food for thought. Dr. Ivens in the image of Bondarchuk is a courageous and wise man ... The play of the actress Janna Bolotova also attracts attention, although her role is very difficult in its own way: try to portray the love of an unearthly creature! Here it is so easy to fall into abstract sugaryness or slide into vulgar "earthly" sex. The actress and director managed to avoid this. You believe them ... But the power of a work of art lies in the fact that it activates all the baggage of emotions and knowledge accumulated by a person. "Silence of Dr. Evens" raises layers, as if directly with him and not connected.

The jury of the International Fantastic Film Festival also liked the acting work of Janna Bolotova — she received a special prize there for the best female role...

Curiously, today's viewers perceive "The Silence of Dr. Ivens" in general positively:

"The Silence of Dr. Evens is a very good film, about the fact that on Earth the power of arms is many times greater than the power of morality. Unfortunately, these problems on Earth are topical even now" (A. Markov).

"This film shocked me as a child and made an equally strong impression now, in adulthood. I reviewed it and once again realized that these are already unattainable heights of that cosmic humanity and sincerity, as well as that height of flight of thought characteristic of that time and real art, then not yet corrupt and brutalized from lust and violence" (Sergei N.)...

"This is one of my favorite films. I first watched it in the early 1970s, when I was still a child, but I was so impressed by the role of the beautiful Janna Bolotova that I began to imagine myself as an alien, played "flights to airless space and to other planets", invented the continuation of the story of the main characters of the film. I was very sorry that they were tragically dying. This film... every time I watch it like the first time, holding my breath" (Irena).

"An ingenious foresight film, not only has not lost its relevance for 40 years, but has become even more topical. The film shows spiritual bankruptcy and insanity, the danger to the existence of all mankind ... the capitalist system. ... The finale is sad and, alas, natural, — in the world of capital it could not be otherwise; space is of interest to those in power only in connection with the invention of a new, more advanced weapon of mass destruction. ... I get real pleasure from the work of great actors — Bondarchuk, Bolotova, Obolensky" (Rousse).

"Not a masterpiece, but a very good thought—provoking film. About what? About who we are — people and humanity. We climb into space, build from ourselves masters. Are we worthy of it? Do we have the "First Law of the Earth"? An enemy who is not like us is an enemy, you have to hit him with a rocket, into him — from a pistol ... The film is about this" (M. Kirillov).

Sky is Calling. USSR, 1959. Directed by Alexander Kozyr, Mikhail Karyukov. Screenwriters: Evgeny Pomeschchikov, Alexey Sazonov, Mikhail Karyukov. Actors: Ivan Pereverzev, Alexander Shvorin, Konstantin Bartashevich, Gurgun Tonunts and others. **20 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Alexander Kozyr (1903—1961) directed only three films, the last of which — a fantastic film about space flights "Sky is Calling" — entered the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films.

Former cameraman **Mikhail Karyukov (1905–1992)** directed only two films as a director — "Sky is Calling" and "Dream to Meet". Unfortunately, shortly after the premiere of the film "Dream to Meet" (1963) M. Karyukov retired and, alas, did not shoot any more films.

After the successful premiere of the film "Sky is Calling" it was bought by the famous American producer and director Roger Corman and commissioned Francis Ford Coppola to remount and re-sound this movie.

F.F. Coppola not only rewired and cut out the "communist propaganda", but also added an episode with Martian monsters. In 1962, this picture was released in American cinemas under the title "Battle Beyond the Sun".

Fragments of the film "Sky is Calling" were inserted into another "American" film edited by Peter Bogdanovich — "*Voyage to the Planet of Prehistoric Women*" (1968), which was based on another Soviet science fiction film — "The Planet of Storms" (1962).

It is believed that the famous film by Stanley Kubrick "2001: A Space Odyssey" (1968) used technical solutions from the movie "Sky is Calling."

The audience is still discussing the film "Sky is Calling" with fervor:

"An amazing, one might say — a unique film for its time, the time of cosmic romance and political thaw, when it seemed that everything was already close — both communism and the first Martian flights!" (Ilyas).

"The entire episode from this film with a flight from Earth to an orbital station with minimal changes was included in S. Kubrick's film "2001: A Space Odyssey". Kubrick's film also includes an episode of a video telephone session with the Earth. The orbital station itself in Kubrick's film is copied from the movie "Sky is Calling" practically one to one" (Freshman).

"The film is technically flawless. For comparison — American science fiction before "2001: A Space Odyssey" never dreamed of such a thing. Otherwise, Roger Corman and Peter Bogdanovich would not have been tying whole chunks of "Sky is Calling" and "Planet of Storms" and blurt out their own films from them. The plot, unfortunately, is absolutely oak. And Gurgun Tonunts and Ivan Pereverzev ... do not save" (M. Kirillov).

Solaris. USSR, 1968. Directed by Boris Nirenburg, Lidiya Ishimbaeva. Screenwriter Nikolai Kemarsky (based on the novel of the same name by Stanislaw Lem). Actors: Vasily Lanovoy, Antonina Pilyus, Vladimir Etush, Victor Zozulin and others. **TV premiere — 1968.**

Boris Nirenburg (1911–1986) directed 16 full-length feature films, mostly on TV. **Lydia Ishimbaeva (1924–1998)** has put more than five dozen films for television.

If it had not been for the film adaptation of Stanislaw Lem's novel by Andrei Tarkovsky, released on the cinema screens in 1973, the modest 1968 TV "Solaris" would probably have been forgotten. But the "palm" in terms of film adaptation went to "Solaris" directed by Boris Nirenburg and Lidia Ishimbaeva.

Film critic Svetlana Matyushina writes that "the 1968 two—part television show Solaris, in which Vladimir Etush (Dr. Snout) and Vasily Lanovoy (Chris Kelvin) played, was distinguished by scientific pedantry. ... The audience saw a dry letter—by—letter interpretation of the book — as the writer wanted. The film focuses on reflections on the cognizability of the world. The ex-wife of Chris was interested in Lem only as an unknowable object of reality. ... Maybe the hero of Lanovoy does not manage to solve the riddle of Solaris, but he remains on the planet, confident that "the time of terrible miracles has not yet passed." The same mysterious Ocean, the superintelligence, the description of which takes almost a third in the novel, cannot be seen in the film. All the action takes place in the sealed space of the station, which looks more like a closed laboratory on Earth, and not in space. The audience greeted the two—part television show coldly. There was nothing new in it about the already written text of the novel: the mechanical transfer of dramatic twists and turns to the screen, completely monotonous dialogues and Chris's voiceover — the movie clearly lacked artistry" (Matyushina, 2019).

The opinions of the modern audience about the television "Solaris" are generally quite restrained in terms of assessing the artistic qualities of the film adaptation:

"I liked the film "Solaris" by B. Nirenburg is an example of the creation of a cinematic product, which is not easy to perceive, from S. Lem's work. So, in fact, the picture is beautiful. ... This "Solaris", taking into account its primitive (according to modern cinematic estimates of this genre) scenery, looks like a high—quality theatrical performance. And her huge plus is the cast. Where will you see another V. Etush ... But V. Lanovoy in the role of Chris is usual, not surprising. ... The conclusion is obvious. Fans of the novel by S. Lem and the film by A. Tarkovsky will probably not like the picture, since it is significantly inferior to them in its artistic parameters. But real connoisseurs of good Soviet cinema with its high—quality acting and unique atmosphere will like it" (M. Mitskevich).

Solaris. USSR, 1973. Directed by Andrei Tarkovsky. Screenwriters Andrei Tarkovsky, Friedrich Gorenstein (based on the novel of the same name by Stanislaw Lem). Actors: Donatas Banionis, Natalia Bondarchuk, Yuri Yarvet, Vladislav Dvorzhetsky, Nikolai Grinko, Anatoly Solonitsyn and others. **10.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Andrei Tarkovsky (1932—1986) directed seven full-length feature films ("Ivan's Childhood", "Andrei Rublev", "Solaris", "Mirror", "Stalker", "Nostalgia", "Sacrifice"), but only his full-length debut was included in the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films — "Ivan's Childhood".

... On a space station orbiting the distant planet Solaris, strange and mysterious events take place. Astronaut Chris arrives at the station, tasked with sorting out all this and, as they say, making an adequate decision ...

Using the canvas of the famous science fiction novel by Stanislaw Lem, Andrei Tarkovsky, it seems to me, created one of his philosophical film masterpieces. His film was not only a reflection on the consequences of possible contacts with extraterrestrial civilizations. The great master managed to create on the screen a capacious and attractive images of the planet Earth, where warm rains are pouring, and sad horses are pensively wandering over the transparent river...

"Human needs human". This phrase becomes key to understanding the author's concept of the film, which raises the eternal problems of Conscience, Guilt, Compassion, Mutual understanding and, of course, Love...

In "Solaris" there is an ensemble of first class actors. Donatas Banionis, Anatoly Solonitsyn, Nikolay Grinko, Yuri Yarvet, Vladislav Dvorzhetsky. Natalia Bondarchuk played the first and, probably, the best role in her acting biography in Solaris.

In a word, you can talk and write about Solaris for a very long time. But it's better to watch this film. Moreover, with each new viewing, its depth is revealed with new facets...

The famous Polish science fiction writer Stanislaw Lem (1921—2006) was very jealous of his literary brainchild and constantly argued with Andrei Tarkovsky — both during the writing of the script and during the filming of the film.

Years later, Stanislaw Lev explained his position as follows: "I have very fundamental complaints about this adaptation. Firstly, I would like to see the planet Solaris, but, unfortunately, the director deprived me of this opportunity, as he shot a chamber film. And secondly (and I said this to Tarkovsky during one of the quarrels), he did not shoot "Solaris" at all, but "Crime and Punishment". After all, it follows from the film only that this foul Kelvin drove poor Hari to suicide, and then for this reason he was tormented by remorse, which was intensified by her appearance, and the appearance in strange and incomprehensible circumstances. I used this phenomenon of the next appearance of Hari to implement a certain concept that goes back almost to Kant. After all, there is Ding an sich, the unknowable, the Thing in itself, the Second side, to which it is impossible to break through. And this in my prose was completely differently embodied and arranged ... And it was absolutely terrible that Tarkovsky introduced Kelvin's parents into the film, and even some of his aunt. But first of all — the mother, and the "mother" is "Russia", "Motherland", "Earth". This has already made me quite angry. At that moment we were like two horses pulling one cart in different directions ... In my book, the sphere of reasoning and questions of cognitive and epistemological was extremely important, which is closely connected with solarist literature and the very essence of solarism, but, unfortunately, the film was thoroughly cleared of it. The fate of the people at the station, about which we learn only in small episodes during the next arrivals of

the camera, are also not some kind of existential anecdote, but a big question concerning the place of man in the Universe, and so on. With me, Kelvin decides to stay on the planet without any hope, and Tarkovsky created a picture in which an island appears, and on it a house. And when I hear about the house and the island, I almost lose my temper with indignation. The emotional sauce into which Tarkovsky immersed my heroes, not to mention the fact that he completely amputated the "Scientist landscape" and introduced a lot of oddities, is absolutely unbearable for me" (Lem, 1987: 133–135).

The metropolitan cinematic world of the late 1960s — early 1970s, of course, was aware of the conflict between the writer and the director, therefore (although not only for this reason), immediately after the release of "Solaris" in Soviet theaters, there were many defenders of the novel from the "unjustified motion picture distortion".

Film critic July Smelkov (1934–1996) believed that "the space and ocean of Solaris turned into an entourage in the film. They are artistically non-functional, you can do without them. ... Lem's theme and thought Tarkovsky replaced with his own theme and his own thought. ... It is in this opposition that the theme of the film is revealed — an earthly man in a cosmic abyss. Tarkovsky's characters talk a lot about conscience, but what it has to do with what is happening remains unclear: after all, the situation of the novel, quite accurately transferred into the film, outside of human morality, the ocean cannot have human motives for behavior. The relationship between Kelvin and Hari is full of drama, but, torn out of the structure of the novel, not connected with the relationship of Sartorius, Snaut, Gibaryan with their "guests", seem to hang in the air. Simply put, Kelvin, played by D. Banionis, there is no overarching task, there is no end-to-end motive for the action — of course, not because the actor could not find it, but because he was not supposed to be the script. (This, it seems to me, is the reason that the role did not become Banionis's luck; the same can be said about Y. Yarvet and A. Solonitsyn. Many people like N. Bondarchuk in the role of Hari, but ... re-read the novel — in my look, there Hari is much more interesting. The heroes of Lem have a super task — Contact. Contact with an incomprehensible, inhuman (in the literal sense of the word), but highly developed mind, with an alien, but unusually interesting civilization. The framework of good science fiction, the film does not. There is a human drama — there is no drama of knowledge. There is love for the Earth — there is no desire for contact. Adding to the novel what he wanted, Tarkovsky took less from it than could have been taken. As a result, the "free translation" of the novel into the language of cinema has independent (independent of the "original") merits, but what "Solaris" was written for did not fit into the frames of "Solaris". ... Someone might argue that Tarkovsky's film is poetic. Yes, but this is the poetry of Tarkovsky himself, his directorial manner, his vision of the world. And the poetry of cognizing thought, the poetry of man's courage in his struggle with the Unknown, which sounded so powerfully and dramatically in Lem's novel, remained outside the film" (Smelkov, 1973).

The writer and critic Ariadna Gromova (1916–1981) wrote in the same spirit about the film "Solaris": "As for the sensation of the beautiful Earth, which is so necessary for the director, it is not in the film. And the Earth, in fact, does not exist. There is a suburban suburban area — a river, a mound, a house on it. True, for a minute or a half, impetuous, completely differently filmed footage: highways, long tunnels, a stream of cars ... And for Chris Kelvin, the whole "beautiful Earth" seems to fit in a summer cottage. After all, when at the end of the film he mentally returns to Earth, all his ideas about his home planet come down to the same: a mound emerges from the fog, and a house on the mound, and dad in the house; Chris on the porch of the dacha falls on his knees in front of his father, and it turns out exactly like in the painting by Rembrandt — only the cosmic prodigal son is shod, and instead of bare heels, we see solid soles. Then: can the viewer appreciate what Chris Kelvin is sacrificing — the one in the film? Indeed, at 53 years old (he is twenty years older than Kelvin from the novel), he only has for his soul that dad, aunt, hous and even, it is not known why, a horse in the garage. He has no love, no friends. There are apparently no plans, plans, unfinished works. It is not even clear what he is doing at all, where he works, whether he has ever been in space. What does he lose on Earth? Why on his part, such a sacrifice — to stay to work on Solaris. ... And the final of the film, made in the spirit of the most primitive sentimental anthropocentrism, is absolutely depressing. ... in the film it suddenly turns out that Ocean's non—contact is a fiction, that he understood everything perfectly, and he even got the best feeling for Kelvin and, in order to compensate for the troubles caused, he offered something like a mental

excursion wherever his heart desires (as already mentioned, Kelvin, of course, went to dad's house). That is, it is clear: a person, especially if he is good, anyone will understand, even if plasma, everything is one. ... So what happens? The moral and philosophical problems, which the director was so interested in, are actually not developed in the film — neither those on which Lem's novel is based, nor those stated in the interview. And what is the film about then? ... He's talented, of course. Well filmed. But rather stretched and boring. Especially in "earthly" scenes, where it is difficult to understand what the characters are talking about and why the characters are quarreling. Only one thing is really clear there: the hero really does not want to leave the Earth. So he doesn't look at his native place. Actually, Tarkovsky made his film about this man, passionately loving the Earth and completely indifferent to everything else in the Universe. And everything else — the tragic events at the station, the disputes of scientists — was introduced mainly "for the plot" (Gromova, 1973).

The philosopher Gleb Pondopulo (1926—2020) generally adhered to a similar opinion, arguing that in A. Tarkovsky's "Solaris", much "raises doubts, criticisms and even a feeling of dissatisfaction. It seems to us that this is determined, first of all, by the contradictory position of the author, the inaccuracy of the ideological concept of the film "Solaris". The essence of this inaccuracy lies in the fact that the idea of a moral duty, of a person's personal responsibility is interpreted rather abstractly and inconsistently. It has not been brought to a clear figurative embodiment of the most important idea that the basis for the formation of a person's personal responsibility, his awareness of his moral duty are, first of all, the collective forms of his activity, and not only introspection, self-esteem, memory, a feeling of love for his neighbor, etc. ... Tired and lonely, the heroes of the film "Solaris" look confused and suffering. Only a myth, an illusion in the form of Hari appears before us forever young and beautiful. But the more "humanized" Hari from communication with Kelvin, the more suffering she looks. ... The desire to emphasize the motive of suffering, in the end, in the episode of the "resurrection" of Hari, leads to the fact that the authors change their taste. This fragment of the film suffers from naturalism, bears a touch of mysticism. The transformation of the humanistic idea in the film is surprising and hopelessly contradictory. The defense of a person, a call to respect for the human personality, the inner world of a person turns out not to believe in the power of his mind, his will, his feelings, but to pity and a rather banal maxim that only shame can save the world. In the film, there is a man tormented by doubts, preoccupied with moral problems. There is the result of human civilization and culture — amazing technology, visions of cities of the future, treasures of science and art. But in the film there is no or almost none of the main thing — the human collective, without which it is impossible to fully and deeply penetrate into the "secret" of a person. ... The feeling of loneliness, isolation in the world of narrowly personal relationships and experiences does not leave the heroes of the film on earth. It comes through in the patriarchal life of the Kelvin family, the episode of Burton's trip with his son through the city of the future, in the episode of Kelvin's return. This artificial isolation from the social sphere of life determines the speculative characteristics of the posing of moral problems in the film "Solaris". ... the superficiality in the artistic development of many important, urgent and acute problems posed in the film leads to the fact that that the heroes of the film "Solaris" look authentically and artistically convincing when it comes to penetrating the inner, personal, individual world of a person, and unconvincing when they have to solve common human problems. In these cases, the filmmakers are forced to resort to banal symbolism and rhetoric, which, unfortunately, is not lacking in this original work of a talented director" (Pondopulo, 1973).

Culturologists and film critics N.M. Zorkaya (1924—2006) and M.I. Turovskaya (1924—2019) also wrote about "Solaris".

"Is Tarkovsky leaving Lem? — wrote M.I. Turovskaya — But how many "honest" film adaptations we have seen and racked our brains to catch that trifling deviation through which the soul flew away from the film, turned it into a "visual aid". Tarkovsky honestly departed from the novel, having accomplished the only thing that if he does not make art, then, at the very least, makes it possible. He submitted to someone else's fiction and became free in it. The film is different, this does not mean bad, although, of course, you may not like it. He may like it, and then the rustle of paper strips, reminding the astronauts of the rustle of leaves, as a transcript reminds of living speech, and the strange detail of a winter morning, scattered over the bulge of the earth's surface in Bruegel's painting, and the sweetness of rain will cease to seem like an "earthly

makeweight" as my esteemed opponent speaks with sci-fi arrogance, and become part of the whole, which is the film. ... In Tarkovsky, the Ocean seems to respond to that very special dash, to the memory of the heart, to the bitterness of Chris Kelvin's nostalgia, in which the Earth, its rustles, smells and the sound of rain falling on the wooden terrace are forever encoded ... Only rain is falling in the house, and Chris stands outside in the garden and looks through the glass at his father, who does not notice the tight streams whipping him on the shoulders. A metaphor of the unknown, a familiar and strangely mirrored world, called out of nothing by the living and incomprehensible Ocean of Solaris ... Expected contact? A sentimental happy ending? I don't think so. Rather, the inner law of the artist, always striving for harmony" (Turovskaya, 1973).

And N.M. Zorkaya emphasized that "the true heroes of the picture are not Space, not the thinking cosmic "substance" of the planet Solaris, this happy invention of a science fiction writer, and not aliens from Space, cold-blooded "doubles". Other heroes: Man and his homeland. About them, about people and the Earth, put in the face of the Cosmos and the test by the Cosmos, Tarkovsky tells with sincerity, as much as possible such in the chosen genre and plot, which is not conducive to lyrics. ... And after Kelvin, having overcome his doubts, indifference, egoism, could not betray the cosmic Hari, as he once missed and overlooked, all in his scientific and technocratic dreams, in his proud omniscience earthly Hari, the Solaris ocean did not send him terrible monsters, not destructive "come to life fetishes", but home, but the happiest images, washed by enlightened rain tears. And in infinite space, in the plasma of the universe, in the Universe, that small piece of the Earth, that old house near Zvenigorod, is the soul of Chris Kelvin. This is how the notorious problem of contact was solved, and the Earth conquered the Cosmos with love. Of course, we can say that this is not quite the same as with Stanislaw Lem. But is two worse than one? And would, say, Euripides be offended that about Medea, about whom he told people for the first time, more and more new details have been told to mankind for more than two thousand years, and Medea has a long life?" (Zorkaya, 1973).

Film critic Yuri Khanyutin (1929—1978) was generally in solidarity with their point of view, believing that "it would be wrong to understand the film in such a way that the director urges you to lie on the grass at home and not to meddle in uncomfortable space. But he asks the question: with what we will go on a journey to the stars — you can overcome gravity, but you cannot get rid of your earthly feelings, prejudices, thoughts. What will a person carry into outer space — cruelty, cold pragmatism or reason and humanity? In other words, the film poses not a so far fantastic problem of contact with other civilizations, but a very real problem burning for all philosophical and social thought of the 20th century — man and technological progress, science and morality. ... Tarkovsky is against the excessive claims of science to guide human behavior. There are situations, the film says, where the scientist must be, first of all, a man. Scientific reasoning should not be opposed to moral principles. At the same time, the director does not question the necessity of progress itself, the necessity and power of science" (Khanyutin, 1975).

Film critic Sergei Kudryavtsev drew the readers' attention that the film "Solaris" is "a metaphor for the need to remain human in any conditions. But, besides this, a declaration of love for the Earth, for all of humanity. ... After all, if we ignore the external content of "Solaris", and also compare it with "Stalker" and "Nostalgia", then these three works, no matter how strange and paradoxical it may seem, are arranged in a kind of trilogy about both the "salutary bitterness of nostalgia" and going back to basics, and finding a home. ... A person still has to listen to the secrets and try with all his might to unravel them. And the cinema of Andrei Tarkovsky requires maximum concentration, and most importantly — the desire to hear, see, feel and understand. Just like that, without the intense work of the senses and the human brain, neither the world around us reveals its secrets,

The high appraisal of "Solaris" prevails in the opinions of philosophers, film experts and film critics in the 21st century as well.

For example, the philosopher and culturologist Grigory Pomerants (1918—2013) recalled that "art allows one to anticipate what a person is already partly disposed to. Rublev's icons capture those who, in the American experience, would fall into the first 5 percent. They amazed Tarkovsky too, but from the inside he knows how to see and show only people of the second group. People of this group, watching "Solaris" or "Mirror", experience Aristotelian purification through suffering, see their problems naked and through their pain — glimpses of inner light. People of the third

group are able to appreciate Tarkovsky only by chance, under the influence of some kind of shock. Usually they get bored and do not understand what snobs find “in this burden” (Pomerants, 2000).

Film critic Yegor Belikov is convinced that the film “Solaris” “for all its slowness, restraint, emotionlessness, manages to drag the viewer along into the opaque waters of the endless ocean of thought and does not allow them to emerge for too long. ... In every truly brilliant film there must be something that cannot be explained. Tarkovsky made a snag film that pretends to be science fiction, but turns out to be a riddle without a solution. The painting “Solaris” itself has the same properties as the intelligent ocean shown in it: while watching it, it generates vague reflections about the nature of human existence. But it does not allow itself to be fully realized, it remains a smooth surface, impenetrable for an outside observer” (Belikov, 2019).

An unsurpassed connoisseur of Andrei Tarkovsky's work, film critic Dmitry Salynsky, in his monograph (Salynsky, 2009) and articles, writes that “the world that opens with the help of the cinema outside this window, for Tarkovsky had a greater ontological value than the ordinary world surrounding the viewer in the cinema. Through the eyes of the hero, Tarkovsky brought his reflection on the nature of cinema into the film. In *Solaris* we are dealing with two such windows, consistently reinforcing the value status of the world visible behind them. The first is a screen on which the film “Solaris” is shown in front of the audience. Inside it, the second window is the memory screen, or memory gaze. The world seen in the first window breaks through with the second window into the new space visible behind it. Tarkovsky in *Solaris* often uses this *mise en abyme* technique, making the film space multi-layered” (Salynsky, 2002).

Indeed, “the plot created by Lem acquired a different sound after the release of Tarkovsky's film. If the first film adaptation, the closest to the literary principle, passed almost unnoticed, then Tarkovsky's appeal to the novel changed the attitude of the entire reading public towards it. This is evidenced at least by the fact that while working on his own film, Soderbergh, willingly or unwillingly, played along with the images of the literary source, and the images of Tarkovsky's film. Whatever the faithful admirers of Stanislaw Lem may say, who do not accept, following the Polish writer, Tarkovsky's film, the novel *Solaris* is now doomed to exist “in tandem” with the classic film of a Russian director” (Anokhina, 2011).

Analyzing Steven Soderbergh's film “Solaris” (2002), film critic Vasily Stepanov believes that, recalling the film adaptation of Tarkovsky, the American director “wants, if not supplant his film, then at least enter into a dialogue with him, compare himself with Tarkovsky. Ocean *Solaris* slipped images to scientists from Earth in which they unmistakably recognized a fake, which did not prevent them from enjoying their own nostalgia. Soderbergh plays the same game with an informed viewer. He takes out of the audience's memory the shadow of Tarkovsky's film, and kills it, forcing him to return again and again to the classic film in the space of his own picture. In Soderbergh's “Solaris” there are scenes that literally repeat what we saw in Tarkovsky's film. But without listing them, I would like to focus on how the American director presents them. ... Tarkovsky's ruined research station acquires from Soderbergh a functional asceticism that would go to a kitchen or an operating room. The station is finished in shiny metal. We know from experience that stainless steel does not absorb odors, it is sanitary. That is, the Soderbergh textures are not only cleaned of Tarkovsky's legacy, but they also cannot absorb anything, acquire at least some properties. It is bare steel, stripped of history and unable to find it. Despite the ambitiousness of the venture, “Solaris” 2002 is full of specific humor. For example, Soderbergh replays the ending of a 1972 film: where Tarkovsky quoted Rembrandt's “The Return of the Prodigal Son”, he uses a different visual rhyme — “The Creation of Adam” in the Sistine Chapel. Kelvin's hero lies, and a child stretches out his hand to him. Soderbergh's Calvin is the new Adam created by the God of *Solaris*, who appeared in the form of a child. Calvin's fake wife, whom Soderbergh calls Rhea, becomes the Eve of a new Eden. Thus, the ambiguity and complexity of Tarkovsky's finale is removed from Soderbergh. His “Solaris” is a film about love, the story of the new Adam and Eve, who are being created by an alien planet. And this story ends with a completely American happy ending. ... One way or another, with his laboratory experience Soderbergh helped to transfer poetics, problematics and profundity of Tarkovsky's view into a modern context and to introduce it into American science fiction cinema of the 21st century. Thus, perhaps, the death of the genre, which was much talked about at the beginning of the 2000s, was delayed” (Stepanov, 2016).

It is curious that the opinions of today's viewers in polarity are very reminiscent of the polemics of film critics in 1973:

“Well, I looked at “Solaris”. Well, it's a drag. Banionis, like a restless person, wanders the entire film both on Earth and on a rocket. In general, to put it mildly, he is out of place in the film ... Why did the hero of Banionis go to Solaris in general? Yes, and there he met his wife, it seems, so what? Tell me what idea to look for in the film. Misunderstandings torment” (Zinochka).

“The strongest cast, especially Donatas Banionis, the ingenious direction of Tarkovsky himself, amazing camera work and an interesting script. It was these components that made the film a masterpiece of world cinema. This painting by Andrei Tarkovsky wants to be rethought with every new viewing” (Spruce).

Sold Appetite. USSR, 1928. Directed by Nikolai Okhlopkov, Iosif Rona. Screenwriters Anatoly Mariengof, Nikolai Erdman (based on the pamphlet of the same name by Paul Lafargue). Actors: Ambrose Buchma, Mark Tsibulsky, Anisim Suslov (Reznikov) and others. **The film has not survived.**

Nikolay Okhlopkov (1900—1967) directed four films. **Joseph Rona (1878—?)** directed five films, all during the silent period.

According to the plot of the film, a certain professor Fuchs helps the gluttonous millionaire solve his problem with the absorption of food...

Solo. USSR, 1979. Director and screenwriter Raul Tammet (based on the story "Death of a Ferryman" by Peeter Vallack). Actors: Viyu Kirvits, Mikk Mikiver, Gunnar Graps, Utah Lehiste, Peet Raig and others. **Short film.**

Raul Tammet directed only three feature films, two of which ("Solo", "And Then He Looked Back...") — in a fantasy genre.

The contact of the ordinary and mysterious unearthly worlds, and the vapor between these worlds ... The fantastic philosophical parable of Raul Tammet was very promising...

Something with the Phone. USSR, 1979. Directed by Konstantin Osin. Screenwriter Anatoly Grebnev (adaptation of K. Bulychev's story "May I ask Nina?"). Actors: Anatoly Grachev, Iya Arepina, Lyudmila Marchenko and others.

The protagonist of a fantastic picture in a charming performance by Anatoly Grachev (1937—2005) on New Year's Eve 1979 calls on the phone and talks to a girl who lives in the war times in 1942... In 1987, this story by Kir Bulychev (1934—2003) was once again filmed on TV.

Konstantin Osin directed only one feature-length feature film (“Thirst over the Stream”). The short drama "Something with the Phone" was his one work in a sci-fi film.

Today's audiences are very warm to this film:

“Of course, in comparison with the story, the accents are shifted, but this did not scare me, because I (as a true admirer of Bulychev's early science fiction novels) passionately wanted to see the film adaptation of this particular story. It was felt when reading that everything written by the author is real (he is a child of war), and I imagined this girl who had thrown a bridge from the past into the future very vividly, just with my own eyes. And suddenly I stumble upon this adaptation, and there is no limit to my joy” (A. Pozdeev).

“Well this is necessary, a short film, without any special effects at all, with a fantastic slant, but it looks in one breath, so touching and so interesting! The end was left incomprehensible, really Vadim Nikolaevich will never meet with the adult Nina? I really like the idea of a phone and a temporary incident. Using as a basic idea, with an inventive and dashing twisted plot, it would be

possible to shoot a full—length piercing fantasy melodrama, a wonderful lyrical movie fairy tale, even more abruptly than "Titanic" and "Back to the Future", and even "Irony of Fate" (Andros).

Space Flight. USSR, 1936. Directed by Vasily Zhuravlev. Screenwriter Alexander Filimonov. Actors: Sergei Komarov, Vasily Kovrigin, Nikolai Feoktistov, V. Gaponenko, Ksenia Moskalenko, Sergei Stolyarov and others. **20.0 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Vasily Zhuravlev (1904—1987) directed 15 full—length feature films, five of which ("Space Flight", "Border Locked", "Fifteen—Year—Old Captain", "Black Business", "The Man in Civilian Clothes") were included in the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films. Unfortunately, after the film "Space Flight" (he was advised by K. Tsiolkovsky himself), Vasily Zhuravlev no longer returned to the fantastic genre, preferring adventure and detective films.

As film critic Sergei Kapterev wrote, "although the script... was built on an adventure intrigue, unlike other successful films by Zhuravlev, it receded into the background: it was the accumulation of impressive details of the future earthly life (mainly conveyed by futuristic architectural models), interplanetary travel and landing on the moon that became the main feature and the main success of the "Space Flight" (Kapterev, 2010: 182).

Film critic Andrei Vyatkin also emphasized the importance of the technical side of "Space Flight": "The scientific side of the film was almost flawless. In addition to outdated parts (overpass start, overload tanks), everything else is impressive today. ... Well, and the artistic level was deliberately lowered ("so as not to supplant science"). The stamp was piled up on the stamp: a conflict between an innovator and a conservative, an indispensable space passenger — a "hare", and so on. But the main thing is that the spirit of the era, the naive faith in fabulous communism was preserved. The rocket plane took off over the Moscow of the future, modeled according to the then advanced sketches — with the Palace of Soviets on the site of the Cathedral of Christ the Savior and other skyscrapers" (Vyatkin, 2003).

In any case, the importance of the "Space Flight" for the development of Soviet science fiction can hardly be overestimated. After Yakov Protazanov's "Aelita", which was more simplified in its presentation, it was a significant technological leap forward...

Viewers are surprised to discover this fantastic film today:

"The best masterpiece of the fantastic films shot in the USSR" (Mikhail).

"An excellent film, in terms of technique it is similar to "The New Gulliver" and "The Adventures of Buratino", films of the 1930s with a combination of live actors and puppets in the frame. After that, nothing like that was filmed! Of course, naive about flight techniques, etc., but how it looks!" (S. Semin).

"It is striking how technically well space is made; in some later Soviet science fiction films, instead of space, you still see a stretched canvas with light bulbs. The passage of astronauts on the moon is magnificent, although in other places it is very noticeable that animation, especially when jumping, the interiors of the astrolet and lunar landscapes, are very noticeable. I would put this film on a par with the magnificent "Planet of Storms" (Alexander P.).

Spiral. USSR, 1990. Directed by Giuli Chokhnelidze. Screenwriter Vazha Gigashvili (based on the novel of the same name by Guram Panjikidze). Actors: Levan Uchaneishvili, Otar Megvinetukhutsesi, Edisher Magalashvili, Liya Eliava, Iya Parulava and others. **TV.**

Giuli Chokhnelidze (1929—2008) directed four full-length feature films. Of these, only "Spiral" was filmed in the fantasy genre.

The brain of an old physics professor is transplanted into the body of a young guy who died in a car accident...

This TV movie was filmed at the end of the existence of the USSR, and very few viewers, in general, know about its existence...

Stalker. USSR, 1979. Directed by Andrei Tarkovsky. Screenwriters Arkady Strugatsky, Boris Strugatsky, Andrei Tarkovsky (based on the "Roadside Picnic" by the Strugatsky brothers). Actors: Alexander Kaidanovsky, Anatoly Solonitsyn, Nikolai Grinko, Alisa Freindlikh and others. **4.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Andrei Tarkovsky (1932—1986) directed seven full-length feature films ("Ivan's Childhood", "Andrei Rublev", "Solaris", "Mirror", "Stalker", "Nostalgia", "Sacrifice"), but only his full-length debut was included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films — "Ivan's Childhood".

The intellectual parable "Stalker" is based on the fantastic prose of the Strugatsky brothers. However, in the interpretation of Andrei Tarkovsky, science fiction gave way to the artist's philosophical reflections on the problems of Conscience, Faith, Human responsibility for their deeds, environmental and moral catastrophe...

Led by the Stalker — the guide to the dangerous and mysterious Zone — the heroes of the film want to get into a certain magical room with a well, where, as it were, all cherished desires are fulfilled... And this path becomes the main spiritual and moral test in their lives...

The "Stalker" has a truly fatal fate. It all started on the set, when Tarkovsky, having changed several cameramen, decided to practically re-shoot the whole picture. Then the finished film, like "The Mirror", turned out to be "semi-forbidden". Then, one by one, the director and the leading male actors — Anatoly Solonitsyn, Nikolai Grinko, Alexander Kaidanovsky and the cameraman Alexander Knyazhinsky — passed away... They left. The mystery of the "Stalker" remains...

Andrei Tarkovsky began filming the first version of Stalker on February 15, 1977. The cameraman of the film was then the brilliant Georgy Rerberg (1937—1999), the episode was filmed in Stalker's house...

In May 1977, a film crew filmed nature in Estonia. By August 1977, the first draft of "Stalker" was almost complete.

There is a persistent legend that all the material filmed by Rerberg was ruined during the development of the film at Mosfilm, and as a result, no one saw it. However, the actress and director Gemma Firsova (1935—2012) recalled that in August 1977 she watched in one of the studio halls the first version of "Stalker", sustained by the director and cameraman in a specific color scheme, but Tarkovsky himself did not like this version for artistic reasons...

Georgy Rerberg recalled it this way: "Now a lot of things have been written... I don't read all these things, but I was told that one of the Strugatsky brothers said somewhere that I had escaped from the picture. It's not good to say that. I haven't escaped anywhere. I wanted to continue working. In this sense, my conscience is clear. ... In general ... I have not escaped anywhere. I was simply removed from the picture ..." (Focus on infinity. "Stalker". *Cinema Art*. 2006. № 4).

Then Georgy Rerberg spoke about the problems with the film: "We worked in the graphic manner, which we came to with Andrey at the "Mirror". Very complex objects were asked. Difficult in terms of camera movement, tricks, lighting solutions. Difficult in terms of light and shadow changes. We started to work confidently, accurately, dashingly. We did not invent anything new: we did everything as before. But they could not achieve the result that was obtained on the "Mirror" under the same conditions. Everything was done in exactly the same way, but the film that was given to us did not stretch" (Focus on infinity. "Stalker". *Cinema Art*. 2006. № 4).

As a result, Andrei Tarkovsky, dissatisfied with the first version of "Stalker", obtained additional funding from the state film industry and re-shot the film practically anew, but that was a completely different story...

Unfortunately, for some unknown reason, the first version of "Stalker" was not transferred to the Gosfilmofond for storage ... In the early 1990s, the editor of the film "Stalker" Lyudmila Feiginova, who kept the working materials of the first version of the film, died in a fire. In this fire, they burned out...

And if the film distribution of "Solaris" was developing quite successfully, then "Stalker" as a result was let on, as they say, "the third screen", and instead of stormy polemics in the press there was mostly silence.

One of the few articles in the film press of 1980 was published about "Stalker" in the magazine "Soviet Film". Film critic Irina Shilova (1937–2011) wrote that "the art of Andrei Tarkovsky is marked by a rare individual coloration, loyalty to such plastic motives as water, fire, grasses in the wind, sudden rain. In "Stalker" he creates a strange, paradoxical, constantly changing world of the film, without resorting to the tricks of combined and stunt shooting: he simply does not need them, because the fantastic permeates the very air of the picture. The incomprehensible is hidden under the surface of the most ordinary objects, it is hidden in the most ordinary landscape. ... We are given to understand that the properties of the magic room have not been proven. The stalker himself says that he never met those who visited this door again. Maybe this room doesn't exist at all, — but there is a threshold before which a person must and can know himself. Today, now, in our ordinary life, where there are no aliens or the Zone, but there is a reality of our daily existence, in which selfishness, thoughtlessness, the inert force of habits so often take over us. A person must remember this threshold, must know the whole truth about himself, no matter how bitter it may be, in order to become better, to defeat himself..." (Shilova, 1980).

Maya Turovskaya (1924–2019) also highly appreciated "Stalker": "The icon painter Andrei Rublev, who seeks the city (the first name of the script "Passion for Andrei"), a prisoner of his own conscience, Chris Kelvin, was succeeded by a wretched, almost foolish Stalker performed by a new for Tarkovsky, but very "his" actor Alexander Kaidanovsky (the director's thought about staging Dostoevsky's "Idiot" was not accidental. As a butterfly crawls out of a chrysalis, this "final" of his protagonist Perhaps it is in the figure of the protagonist that the turning point of "Stalker" is most obvious) (Turovskaya, 1991).

Film critic Valentin Mikhalkovich (1937–2006) was sure that "Tarkovsky considered the silence of the heroes in the room a positive result of their journey. Both characters felt their moral imperfection and realized that it did not give them the right to contact the energy of the cosmos. It is significant that while working on "Stalker" the director already understands the image in a new way. If earlier it seemed to Tarkovsky a natural inevitability that each reader or viewer retains in his memory not a work of an artist, but a product of his own, individual creativity, now these particular creations appear to Tarkovsky as truncated, incomplete, for in an infinite image everyone "selects, finds his own. ... begins to interpret the work in accordance with its "advantage". The stream of time that constitutes the image moves beyond the frame of the frame and the entire film, he is able to tear the viewer out of everyday life, to elevate to higher truths, to truth. That is why the viewer cannot become like the Professor and the Writer, who did not dare to creep into the source of energy. In the infinity of the image, one should dissolve ... as in nature, plunge into it, get lost in its depths, drown, as in space, where there is no bottom or top" (Mikhalkovich, 1989).

Already in the 21st century, film critic Dmitry Salynsky wrote that "Stalker" is "one of the most famous films by Andrei Tarkovsky, which has become cult for world cinema. The movie is prophetic, philosophical, all-embracing, eternal. ... I form my vision of the film more on a philosophical plane, since this approach seems to me the most harmonious and comprehensive in relation to Stalker. But I will not deny that other options for interpreting the meaning of this film are also very intriguing. For example, the psychological interpretation is the simplest and most accessible to almost any viewer, therefore it is the most popular. So, the Zone is called a symbol of the subconscious, the Room is a kind of container of the innermost — a special part of the Id, desire — a manifestation of the Super Ego, and really fulfilled innermost desires — the result of the work of the Id, which, within the framework of the concept of the Room and the film as a whole, always prevails over the Ego. The conclusion of the picture is that Id dominates both the Ego and the Super Ego, since in the finale, according to Stalker himself, the heroes did not gain faith and did not achieve enlightenment. The mythological interpretation is already much more interesting. Many interpreters see in "Stalker" not so much the possibility of a Christian interpretation as mythological or even esoteric. The film is perceived as an ancient parable, and its visual symbolism and semantic message, as the embodiment of some ancient myth or myths. From this point of view, it is customary to perceive the Zone either as the Great Mother (by nature itself), or as the embodiment of some ancient goddess (relying on the legend of Tannhäuser or Celtic myths about the Fairy Queen). It is difficult to assess how correct such interpretations can be, But personally, I am inclined to believe that the mythological course of thinking in the framework of the work on this film could have occupied Tarkovsky least of all, if only because the roadside picnic was taken as

a basis — a fantastic work, not a fantasy one. In addition, the film quotes the Bible many times, draws parallels between the heroes of the picture and the biblical characters. In "Stalker" we hear lines from the Apocalypse. The theme of the Apocalypse, which had a cult significance in the works of many great geniuses (for example, Dostoevsky and Blake), is of great importance in the works of Tarkovsky. Almost every of his films, from "Ivan's Childhood" to "Sacrifice", in one way or another, touches on the theme of the end of the world. Each picture contains landscapes, dialogues and lines of meaning about the Apocalypse. In fact, in his work, Tarkovsky talks about the world already during or even after the Apocalypse. And "Stalker" is a particularly significant picture in this regard. The entire visual of the film shows the viewer one huge apocalyptic landscape; parallels are drawn between the meteorite that created the Zone and the beginning of the Apocalypse (those same seals). And "Nostalgia", and "Solaris", and "Sacrifice" — all bear visual or semantic markers of the Apocalypse theme. We also note that during the sounding of lines from the Apocalypse in Stalker, the director shows a moving visual row, when under water the viewer sees, as it were, the remnants of a former civilization (for example, what was left of the presence of people in this area after the emergence of the Zone). These items are medical instruments, coins, icons, weapons, calendar sheet, part of a cannon, and more. The long visual series is a chronicle of the life and death of mankind, a truly apocalyptic visual very much in the spirit of both the Strugatsky and Tarkovsky. In addition, the film contains quotations from the New Testament in both verbal and visual form. All this forms a certain vector of understanding of "Stalker" for the viewer. The picture very quickly ceases to be perceived as fantasy and goes into the spiritual plane" (Salynsky, 2009).

Viewers continue to argue about "Stalker" today. At the very first approximation, their opinions can be divided into those who, apparently, simply did not understand (or could not understand) the philosophical depth and artistic skill of this picture. And those where there is an attempt to at least to some extent come closer to understanding the film world of Andrei Tarkovsky:

"I think that this film, like some others, was not a success for Tarkovsky. First of all, no matter how banal and even trivial it sounds, because of the weak technical level — there are few special effects, as they would say today (and they would really come in handy there — it's fantastic!), And also because of the film's overload with tirade speeches ... A film is not a book or a play (also trite, but it is so). Excessive reasoning out loud is a disaster for Tarkovsky's films. ... Take a book and read it aloud while sitting in a dark room — is that really a movie?! Another weakness of Tarkovsky is his inability to create coherent and dynamic stories. Which manifested itself both in the "Mirror" and in the "Stalker" (Taras).

"A masterpiece, to be sure. I can watch this film an infinite number of times, and the sensations do not fade. Fascinating music by Artemiev, surreal landscapes, excellent work of the cameraman, brilliant actors ... And most importantly, the film is deep, each dialogue is masterfully built, all words must be listened to very carefully" (Oleg).

Star Inspector. USSR, 1980. Directed by Mark Kovalev, Vladimir Polin. Screenwriters: V. Smirnov, Mark Kovalev, Boris Travkin. Actors: Vladimir Ivashov, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Yuri Gusev, Timofey Spivak, Valentina Titova and others. **5.6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Mark Kovalev directed only four full-length feature films. The "Star Inspector" is his only work in the fantasy genre.

On account of the artist and director Vladimir Polin only one full-length feature film — "Star Inspector".

The fantastic film "Star Inspector", not sparkling with special professionalism, tells about space flights and the revolt of an artificial brain...

The Soviet film press reacted very negatively to the "Star Inspector".

Film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929—1997), for example, wrote that in the "Star Inspector", the space crew amazes "first of all, by their impersonality and lack of at least primitive psychological motivations their action" (Revich, 1985: 67).

The opinions of today's viewers about the "Star Inspector" range from "pro" to "contra":

"Maybe with the technical means the film was a little disappointing, but the idea is excellent — the electronic brain Tubos, which subordinates everything and everyone... Plus the brilliant actors, the film is very good, I liked it" (I. Magnitsky).

"Alas, "Star Inspector" and "Orion's Loop" are the worst science fiction films about space made in the USSR. Even the film "I was a satellite of the Sun" filmed in time immemorial at the studio of popular science films was made much more professionally than these two articles" (Freshman).

"To say the film sucks is to say nothing. ... If we do not delve into the plot, but talk about the visual means of the film, then it is a vivid embodiment of glamor and aestheticism. The interiors, the actors' make-up are sheer glamor, and their costumes are not the work clothes of astronauts (engineers, technicians, hard workers) but some kind of high fashion design delights. A characteristic detail: none of the costumes of the heroes of the film have pockets! Where to put tools, keys, spare parts, documents, etc.? To carry everything in your hands? But the actors do not portray astronauts (hard workers, engineers and so on), they demonstrate the aesthetic predilections of the filmmakers, their glamorous tastes" (Stroibat).

"And I'll say simply — not a film, but green boredom, and not at all because it is inferior in budget to "Star Wars" (The Connoisseur).

Star Trip. USSR, 1982. Directed by Boris Ivchenko. Screenwriter Evgeny Shatko (based on his own story "Alien—73"). Actors: Vladimir Nosik, Elena Melnikova, Grazhina Baikshite, Les Serdyuk, Borislav Brondukov, Vsevolod Gavrilov, Bogdan Brondukov and others. **6.7 million spectators in the first year of the demonstration.**

Boris Ivchenko (1941—1990) directed 11 films, but only two of his first works — "Annychka" and "Olesya" had real audience success. It was these melodramas that were included in the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films.

The famous actor and director Leonid Bykov (1928—1979) began filming this fantastic comedy in 1978 (under the working title "The Alien"). He reserved the main role in this picture for himself. But, alas, on April 11, 1979, Leonid Bykov died. And three years later the film was directed by Boris Ivchenko based on the same script, written by Yevgeny Shatko, but under the title "Star Trip".

In "Star trip" the situation of similarity between a rural mechanic and an alien was played up ... But, alas, director Boris Ivchenko was deprived of Leonid Bykov's comedic talent, therefore, despite the participation of good actors, "Star trip" collected at the box office funny for those times 6.7 million viewers ...

True, many of today's viewers are quite friendly to the "Star Trip":

"If you don't get attached to personas and details, then you have to admit that the film is interesting in many ways. This, of course, is not only a satire on socialist reality. Now any film of that time can be perceived like that. It is rather a philosophical parable on the theme "we do not value what we have, but when we lose it we cry". ... The production of the film is on top... Adding more realistic details to the script is absolutely useless, it would only "kill" all the charm and immediacy of the plot ... I will say even more — this film is a very talented work" (Flom).

"This is certainly not a film of the level of "Kin—dza—dza", the director, for unknown reasons, still lacked cinematic acumen, directorial instinct, and taste as such. That made the film "rural", medium, so-so" (Doctor).

Step from the Roof. USSR, 1971. Director: Radomir Vasilevsky. Screenwriter Rادیy Pogodin. Actors: Dmitry Nikolaev, Neta Boyarskaya, Georgy Millyar, Nikolai Kornoukhov, Anatoly Yabbarov, Alexander Potapov, Lev Prygunov, Anatoly Obukhov, Vladimir Balon, Roman Tkachuk, Georgy Vitsin, Elizaveta Nikishchikina, Borislav Brondukov, Antonina Shuranova and others.

Radomir Vasilevsky (1930—1998) has directed 19 full-length feature films, mainly intended for a children's audience.

The science fiction film "Step from the Roof" is a typical product of the 1970s "children's sci-fi", with the "correct" ideological filling, mediocre performance of underage performers and curious secondary roles of adult actors (I would especially like to highlight the colorful characters of Georgy Milyar and Borislav Brondukov). According to the plot of the film, fifth-grader Vitka travels in time, finding himself in the Stone Age, then in Musketeer France, then during the civil war with "bad whites" and "good reds"...

The opinions of today's viewers about "Step from the Roof" differ significantly:

"The film is good. The style of storytelling and acting is consistent, ... the acting is very decent. ... When assessing the merits and apparent demerits, I think one must remember that the film is intended for children. For those who are about the same age as the main characters" (Luke).

"The idea is funny, the actors are good, and the film is weak. But, as a child, this was not noticed, he just enjoyed the adventures of the protagonist. There is no integrity in the film, a real universal human idea, because there is a set of scenes and Soviet propaganda now seemingly inappropriate" (Alexander).

Story of an Experienced Pilot. USSR, 1984. Directed by Omar Gvasalia. Screenwriters: Omar Gvasalia, Goderdzi Chokheli. Actors: Gia Badridze, Guram Pirtskhalava, Georgy Mataradze, Sofiko Chiaureli and others. **TV.**

Omar Gvasalia (1942–1992) directed five full-length feature films. "Story of an Experienced Pilot" is his only fantasy genre movie. His next and, alas, his last picture ("The Siege") O. Gvasalia shot in 1989, and three years later he died in a car accident.

In the fantastic comedy "Story of an Experienced Pilot", the alien decided to spoil the earthly passengers flying on a regular flight...

It is rather difficult to watch this picture today, since there is clearly no sparkling humor there, and somehow it is not perceived as a real science fiction film either...

Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. USSR, 1986. Directed by Alexander Orlov. Screenwriters Georgy Kapralov, Alexander Orlov (based on the novel of the same name by R.L. Stevenson). Actors: Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Alexander Feklistov, Anatoly Adoskin, Alexander Lazarev (senior), Bruno Freundlich, Alla Budnitskaya, Eduard Martsevich, Leonid Satanovsky, Alexander Vokach, Alexander Kirillov, Tatiana Okunevskaya and others. **14.0 million viewers in the first year demonstrations.**

Alexander Orlov directed 18 films and TV series. Among them were such notable works as "The Mystery of Edwin Drood" and "Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde". However, only his musical "The Woman Who Sings" (1979) managed to enter the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films.

Of course, you can understand the motives that guided the authors of the film "The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde". They wanted to create a work on the topical topic of the scientist's responsibility for his discoveries, condemnation of the permissibility of any means to achieve the goal. Perhaps they were interested in the nature of the duality of the human psyche.

However, such a concept is barely visible in the film. Screen adaptation of the novel by R.L. Stevenson resembles a weak tracing paper from foreign paintings of a similar genre of horror films. To the harsh, soullessly mechanical music, the hideous monster, Mr. Hyde, rages on the streets. Here A. Feklistov skillfully repeats the external drawing of the role of Death, brilliantly played by A. Filippenko in the musical "The Star and Death of Joaquin Murietta". Poor Jekyll suffers in front of the mirror, feeling the inevitability of becoming Hyde's monster...

Having built the film adaptation not on cinematic, but on theatrical laws, the authors are carried away by the external surroundings. They do not allow Innokenty Smoktunovsky to deploy a psychological portrait of your character. The audience's attention switches to stunts related to Hyde's revelry. But, alas, the technical level of tricks and special effects, as they say, is set aside ... During the session, the feeling of conventionality, mock-up, and mannequity of what is happening on the screen does not leave all the time. "Horror" is not scary...

The Soviet film press met the adaptation of the novel by R.L. Stevenson is kind.

For example, in the year the film was released "Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" on screen film critic Yuri Bogomolov wrote that "the authors of the movie managed to create an atmosphere of intense mystery. Literally all episodes are permeated with mystery. ... For us, the audience, the mysterious life of the human spirit, full of vicissitudes and trials, its mysterious and, one might say, fantastic metamorphoses, should open up. The terrible story of the transformation of angelic innocence into cold calculating intellectualism, and then into a dull, heartless and uncontrollable force, ends as a cautionary tale. As a parable about a man in whom good and evil coexist, warring not for life, but for death" (Bogomolov, 1986: 9).

True, film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929–1997) noted that "Hyde performed by Alexander Feklistov, of course, is simpler, this is only part of Jekyll. The actor managed to convey his abomination and disgustingly well, but, perhaps, Hyde should have been made a little more complex". But he immediately paid tribute to Innokentiy Smoktunovsky in the role of Jekyll: "About big actors you often think that they are as if created for the role in which we see them" (Revich, 1986: 14).

Spectators of the XXI century for the most part share the positive opinions of Y. Bogomolov and V. Revich:

"The film is great, and those who see it as a horror movie just need to re-read Stevenson, if they can read at all. ... Music, in my opinion, simply amazingly emphasizes the essence of what is happening, not only illustrates the picture, but complements it. Feklistov's game shocked. Smoktunovsky looked paler, but maybe that was the way it should have been, because there was more "Haida" in the hero from the very beginning" (Kharkovchanka).

"This is the best adaptation of a novel by Robert Stevenson. While Western filmmakers are trying to shoot a traditional "horror", one more spectacular than the other, the director Alexander Orlov is making an attempt to penetrate the nature of the human psyche, focusing on the eternal problem of the duality of the human soul. What can we say, Hyde lives in many people. At first, he just peeks out stealthily and winks, and then crushes the person under him, leading him to irreversible changes and inevitable collapse" (A. Grebenkin).

Summer Impressions of the Planet Z. USSR, 1986. Directed by Evgeny Markovsky. Screenwriter Yuri Tomin (based on his own book "Carousels over the city"). Actors: Arnas Katinas, Giedrius Puskunigis, Sergey Shakurov and others. **TV premiere on January 5, 1987.**

Evgeny Markovsky (1947–2019) directed four full-length feature films, of which only "Summer Impressions of the Planet Z" is a fantasy genre.

In this TV movie for a children's audience, an alien boy gets into a children's sports camp...

Viewers' opinions about this film today differ significantly:

"I was really hooked by this film as a child. And this sudden appearance of the child impressed, and the children seemed recognizable, and I followed the intrigue with bated breath. I did not have this at all with "Guest from the Future." And even "Adventures of Electronics", although they are designed for a wider circle, I just really liked it, nothing more. And then I was ready to accept the whole film, as it is, for one sympathy for Felix. This is how the similar themes are found" (Sveta).

"Summer Impressions of the Planet Z" gives us a brilliant acting job. Absolutely all actors, both adults and children, play with great dedication. I would especially like to note Sergei Shakurov in the role of Palych and, of course, the young alien Felix, performed by the charming Arnas Katinas. There is a lot of humor in the film, having reviewed it already as an adult, I realized that the whole film was smiling. The film looks very easy, filmed in the best traditions of good old children's films, leaves only positive and bright emotions" (Yulia S.).

"I didn't like this movie at all. I didn't like it, first of all, because of the poor performance of the leading actors. Their inability to play is especially evident in the conversation scene after the rehearsal. Learned awkward gestures of both Boris and Felix as in bad school performances. ... Tomin's books with film adaptations are unlucky. Such a film could be made!" (Klausse).

Talking Machine. USSR, 1970. Director and screenwriter Gleb Selyanin (based on the story by J. Kruss). Actors: Nikolai Boyarsky, Natalya Markova, Elizaveta Uvarova, Alexey Savostyanov, Irina Zarubina, Natalya Brodskaya, Elena Efimova, Tatyana Bedova, etc. **TV.**

Gleb Selyanin (1926—1984) has directed three dozen TV films, including the fantasy genre.

"Talking Machine" — fantastic TV show about a professor who invented an apparatus capable of translating the language of animals into human and vice versa...

Temptation B. USSR, 1991. Directed by Arkady Sirenko. Screenwriters Arkady Strugatsky, Boris Strugatsky (based on his own work "Five Spoons of Elixir"). Actors: Lembit Ulfsak, Oleg Borisov, Natalya Gundareva, Vladimir Zeldin, Stanislaw Sadalsky, Alexander Pashutin and others.

Arkady Sirenko directed 11 full—length films and serials ("Twice Born", "Fathers", "Sophia Petrovna", etc.). The film "Temptation B." — his only work in the fantasy genre.

In the fantastic film "Temptation B." a certain writer discovers the secret of the immortal sect...

The movie in the end, in my opinion, turned out to be rather monotonous, as they say, "not for everyone," although Arkady Sirenko was persuaded to appear in "Temptation B." many top— notch actors...

True, the film critic Pyotr Chernyaev praised the scriptwriters and director for the philosophical fiction denouncing the System, although he drew the readers' attention that Arkady Sirenko had no experience of working with the fantastic genre (Chernyaev, 1991: 1).

The opinions of today's viewers about "Temptation B.", as is often the case, differ:

"The film is wonderful! Each of the actors who participated in the picture— star in the sky... Most of all I liked the work of Oleg Borisov! In such technically scarce conditions, such a wonderful and deep image has been created! However, each of the characters deserves the highest praise!" (O. Derbin).

"The weakness of drama is extremely difficult to overcome with great acting. Especially— if the game is not cool. I suspect that L. Ulfsak's fans will ardently disagree with me again, but he did not convince me in any way" (Elenitsa).

The Last Crook. USSR, 1966. Directed by Vadim Mass, Jan Ebner. Screenwriters Alexey Sazonov, Zinovy Paperny. Actors: Nikolai Gubenko, Sergey Filippov, Anastasia Georgievskaya, Svetlana Savyolova, Oleg Popov, Boris Sichkin and others. **3.6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

This fantastic comedy about Communist times, when the last criminal is coming out of prison...

Third Planet. USSR, 1991. Director and screenwriter Alexander Rogozhkin. Actors: Anna Matyukhina, Boris Sokolov, Svetlana Mikhalchenko, Konstantin Polyansky, etc.

Alexander Rogozhkin directed two dozen full-length feature films and TV series, among which the most famous comedy "Peculiarities of National Hunting" and "Peculiarities of National Fishing".

The striking scenes of many Soviet science fiction films of the perestroika era were the heroes' contacts with the mysterious Zone, where, with a respectful glance at the classic "Stalker" by Tarkovsky, extremely supernatural things happen to them. There is uncertainty at every step: evil and cruel mutants, werewolves created by the hellish genius of a maniac professor or a nuclear explosion, man—eating dogs, etc. etc.

Sometimes, however, as in the film by Alexander Rogozhkin "Third Planet", mutants can be kind, but this does not change the essence...

Of course, one can understand the motives that inspire the authors of the "stalker-epic". They want to create works on the topical topic of human responsibility for their actions on the planet, to condemn the permissibility of any means to achieve the goal, to reflect on the problems of ecology and the nature of the human psyche...

However, as a rule, philosophical concepts are barely visible in the stream of rented movie stamps, which is called the whole world...

As for "Third Planet", I personally regret that after the completely professionally staged "Guard" the director rushed into the general stream of secondary, epigone and, in addition, absolutely non-cash film production.

The story of how an imposing bearded man, having made his way into the Zone, tries to heal his daughter with the help of mutants, alas, does not even carry a hint of the author's individuality...

The opinions of XXI viewers about the "Third Planet" are clearly divided into pros and cons:

"A wonderful film, a masterpiece of psychological drama, despite the periodic horror and depression, not bearable for everyone. In addition, the director (or his consultants) were well versed in the issues of bioenergy and mysticism (when compared with other films of those years on a similar subject). Leaves a deep and lasting impression, reusable, looks even better now than at the time of its creation" (V. Possokh).

"I liked the film! Various topics were touched upon, in particular — ecology and human behavior!" (Potap).

"There is no film. The post-Stalkerism reveals the sterility of everyone — both the director and the composer. Tarkovsky has exhausted the topic" (L. Sazontieva).

Thirteenth Apostle. USSR, 1988. Directed by Suren Babayan. Screenwriters Suren Babayan, Georgy Nikolaev (based on Ray Bradbury's "The Martian Chronicles"). Actors: Juozas Budraitis, Andrey Boltnev, Vladas Bagdonas, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Donatas Banionis, Algis Matulionis, Valentinas Masalskis, Juris Riinieks, Mikk Mikiver, Vladimir Kocharyan, Ingeborga Dapkunaite, Elle Kull and others.

Suren Babayan directed seven full-length feature films, mainly in the genre of a philosophical parable.

In the fantastic parable "Thirteenth Apostle" Suren Babayan, clearly under the strong influence of Andrei Tarkovsky's films, builds a difficult-to-understand plot connected with the investigation of the reasons for the death of the space crew...

The Soviet film press reacted coldly to the "Thirteenth Apostle":

Film critic Valery Turovsky noted that in the "Thirteenth Apostle" prevails "a slow, rational and judicious rhythm of the movie, and its ideological and philosophical load (and in some places even congestion!), And restrained humanistic passion for reasoning about the moral limit, beyond which science does not dare to go, and if it does, it will be the last step, followed by the death of civilization" (Turovsky, 1989: 7).

And the film critic Alla Gerber reasonably wrote in "Soviet Screen" that "the meaningfulness with which every movement of the heroes is presented leads to physical fatigue and a gradual dullness of perception, because every thought is an image, and every image is fixed with flowing monotony, although it is beautiful and aesthetically verified and painterly flawless" (Gerber, 1989: 11).

Being a typical picture of a parable arthouse, which is really very difficult for an ordinary viewer to watch, the film the "Thirteenth Apostle" failed at the box office, and today is practically unknown to the mass audience...

This Fantastic World. USSR, 1979–1990. Directors: Tamara Pavlyuchenko, Victor Spiridonov, Antonina Zinovieva. Cast: Yuri Bogatyrev, Eduard Martsevich, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky,

Victor Sergachev, Evgeny Evstigneev, Juozas Budraitis, Leonid Kayurov, Yuri Yakovlev, Sergei Yursky and others. TV. 16 series.

Tamara Pavlyuchenko directed two dozen feature TV films, among which there were several films of the fantastic genre. **Victor Spiridonov** directed ten full-length TV films, many of which were included in the cycle "This Fantastic world". **Antonina Zinovieva (1928—2018)** directed two dozen TV films, including for the television cycle "This Fantastic World".

The television cycle "This Fantastic World" includes screen adaptations of the works of many famous science fiction writers: J. Verne, G. Wells, R. Bradbury, I. Aisimov, R. Sheckley, S. Lem, A. Belyaev, I. Efremov, K. Bulychev, Strugatsky brothers, etc.

This Fun Planet. USSR, 1973. Directed by Yuri Saakov, Yuri Tsvetkov. Screenwriters: Dmitry Ivanov, Yuri Saakov, Vladimir Trifonov. Actors: Victor Sergachev, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Leonid Kuravlyov, Alexander Vokach, Larisa Barabanova, Savely Kramarov, Natalia Krachkovskaya, Vladimir Nosik and others. **The premiere on TV on December 31, 1973.**

Yuri Saakov (1974—2004) directed 14 full-length feature films, some of which were concert films. **Yuri Tsvetkov (1940—2011)** directed seven full-length feature films, of which "This Fun Planet" received the greatest fame.

The views of the 21st century viewers about this comedy—fantasy musical, in which aliens come to Earth during the New Year's holiday, differ significantly:

"I watch the picture with pleasure in our time. Light, fun movie for relaxation. Lots of jokes. Dancing. Puppet numbers. ... Wonderful songs of David Tukhmanov sound: "Our beloved", "White dance", "Song of eternal movement", "Heart must love" and others. Landing of aliens (E. Vasilieva, L. Kuravlev, V. Sergachev) at the masquerade ball, I think it will be shown on television during the New Year holidays. I recommend watching the film to those who have not seen it" (Andrey).

"The filmmaker is weak. And the artists are wonderful, and the songs seem to be quite good, and the trump theme is New Year's. ... But somehow it did not become New Year's. Didn't fire. Weak, though funny in places" (V. Ivanov).

Through Hardship to the Stars. USSR, 1981. Directed by Richard Victorov. Screenwriters Kir Bulychev, Richard Victorov. Actors: Elena Metelkina, Vadim Ledogorov, Nadezhda Sementsova, Alexander Lazarev, Alexander Mikhailov, Boris Shcherbakov, Igor Ledogorov, Igor Yasulovich, Vladimir Fedorov, Gleb Strizhenov, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, Yevgeny Karelskikh, Uldis Liieldidzh, Lyudmila Filyadiy Nilskaya and other. **20.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Director Richard Victorov (1929—1983) directed 11 full-length feature films, some of which were included in the 1000 highest—grossing Soviet films.

At the same time, it is curious to see that in the first year of demonstration in cinemas, the largest number of viewers received from R. Victorov not his spectacular fantastic films, but stories based on modern material "Cross the Threshold" (school theme), "A Sharp Turn Ahead" (criminal theme). However, over time, the everyday pictures of Richard Victorov in the audience's consciousness faded into the background, and interest in his "space" films remains to this day (which, in particular, is evidenced by the digitized and revised version of the film "Through Hardship to the Stars").

The Soviet film press reacted very favorably to the film "Through Hardship to the Stars".

In the year of the premiere, literary critic Svetlana Istratova wrote in the "Cinema Art" magazine: "Showing life on Earth and Dessa, Victorov puts in his picture the dilemma of reason and ignorance, prudence and frivolity in relation to the most important thing — human life. If the humanoids on Dess were responsible for their future, they would not have become like a living mass ..., would not have lost the ability to think and fight. In essence, the models of the highly

civilized Cassiopeia, whose inhabitants have been turned into self—righteous robots, and the degraded, devastated Dessa are similar. The dumb crowd is just as easy to control as the obedient robots. The human mind, without reliance on a living feeling and high morality, can lead the world to no less terrible catastrophe than its opposite — the absence of reason, thoughtlessness, which engenders irresponsibility. ... The master's reflections on the relationship between man and the environment, the inhabitants of different planets are directly related to the main idea of his science fiction films — the idea of international humanism, which asserts the primacy of goodness and justice in any communication and contacts between reasonable beings" (Istratova, 1983: 51-52).

Film critic Andrei Plakhov, in his review in the magazine "Soviet Screen", also praised this film, noting, however, that "attempts to somehow ground the "odyssey of the XXIII century", to liven up the appearance of space Argonauts, to revive their dialogue with modern jargon, are met, especially during the second part of the film, a tangible "resistance of the material" (Plakhov, 1981: 4).

In this, the film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929–1997) agreed with A. Plakhov: "In the first part we feel a philosophical swing, ... and the second ... part is more utilitarian" (Revich, 1981: 15).

Already in the 21st century, film critic Yevgeny Nefedov considered that the "adult" ... sci—fi production of Richard Victorov ... was noticeably inferior to his children's and teenage films: "Moscow—Cassiopeia" (1974) and "Youths in the Universe" (1975). ... Nevertheless, it would be unfair to talk about a creative failure and hint at the opportunism in awarding the USSR State Prize. ... Victorov and his associates can be reproached about not very successful decisions (for example, Glasha's robot looks excessively comical), but the pathos of the work as a whole seems to be even more relevant today" (Nefedov, 2017).

Film critic Stanislav Rostotsky considered that "Through Hardship to the Stars" is a double feature, more familiar in a grindhouse cinema somewhere in the American backwoods. ... Now this film looks like an almost exhaustive digest of the then ideas, techniques and images of world cinema science fiction (except, perhaps, just, oddly enough, "Star Wars" — you remember about them last). It is difficult to say what exactly the authors respectfully borrowed, and what they reached on their own, having caught the general spirit of the era, but in any case, Gleb Strizhenov as Glan is incredibly similar to Jor—El, played by Marlon Brando in Richard Donner's "Superman" (1978), hairstyles the indigenous inhabitants of the planet Dessa are identical to the hairdressing preferences of the Klingons from "Star Trek" (1979) by Robert Wise. and the black cat Vasily is as much a member of the Astra crew as his red—haired brother Jonesy aboard the Nostromo in Ridley Scott's "Alien" (1979). The scenes in the Lebedevs' house, where Niya finds his first earthly refuge, seem to be an outlandish hybrid of the first series of "Solaris" (1972) by Andrei Tarkovsky and the upcoming "Wizards" (1982) by Konstantin Bromberg. There are moments that are completely mysterious: analysts are still at a loss to guess what made the make—up artists create such unimaginable eyebrows for the character of Boris Shcherbakov, space explorer Eduard Kolotun — whether this is a refined reference to "Flash Gordon" (1980) by Mike Hodges, or a hint of no less elegant Secretary General. On the other hand, one cannot help but give credit to the absolutely innovative ideas that had a significant impact on the genre: one cannot dismiss the idea that Paul Verhoeven reviewed the second series of "Through Hardship to the Stars" very carefully before taking on "Total Recall" (1990)" (Rostotsky, 2018: 20).

Among the audience of fans of the film "Through Hardship to the Stars" there are many in the XXI century:

"I love "Through Hardship to the Stars" very much. I've been watching for many years. It was especially interesting at that time to watch science fiction — films about space, about other planets outside our galaxy. Such, it is impossible to convey, delightful music, the starry sky is shown. ... The ending of the film is very touching... I am very glad that Turanchoks and all his servants who conquered the planet were finished. ... Life has reappeared on the planet" (Valera).

"A wonderful film, which, at one time, "blew off my head", at my seven years old. Later, I was surprised at how many labors and heart attacks it was necessary to shoot this film — either the pool was not allowed for filming weightlessness, or the bald Niya was not allowed to be filmed: they say, we are fighting in Afghanistan, and you are filming a bald girl (though I don't see the connection between these two events)" (Mac).

And as usual — among the audience there are fans of catching the authors of the film on all sorts of everyday "errors":

"The film is very entertaining, it looks with interest, but, unfortunately, there are very obvious mistakes in it. For example, Professor Ivanova is killed by a bullet fired from an ordinary pistol. But she's wearing a closed—helmet suit! Apparently, the civilization of Dessa lags behind the Earth (and even an ecological catastrophe), so are Earth suits so poorly protected even from a simple bullet? An obvious puncture" (Miriam).

Throw, or It All Started on Saturday. USSR, 1976. Directed by Serik Raibayev. Screenwriters Felix Frantsuzov, Alexander Shlepyanov (based on the fantastic story "The Ability to Throw a Ball" by Kir Bulychev). Actors: Esbolgan Zhaisanbaev, Asanali Ashimov, Galina Shetenova, Lev Tyomkin and others. **TV.**

Serik Raibayev directed four full—length feature films, among which only "The Throw..." belongs to the fantastic genre.

In the film "Throw, or It All Started on Saturday" the main character, having acquired a fantastic ability to accurately throw objects, wants to become a famous basketball player ... In the USSR, a film was shot with a similar plot — "The ability to throw a ball" (from the TV series "This fantastic world").

The views of the 21st century viewers about "Throw..." differ significantly:

"Such a light summer movie, with a little fantastic component. Great music by Alexander Zatsepin (I especially liked the song "The Voice of Parting" and the guitar themes). The actors are very nice, they played well ... Nice movie" (Kira L.).

"In my opinion, the TV movie turned out to be average. The situation depicted in the film is extraordinary, and the movie is ordinary, sterile. I don't feel life, sports, energy, human relations in him in the end. In it, I only like the music and songs of Alexander Zatsepin" (Alexander).

"Unfortunately, the film is very nifty. And, apart from the landscapes..., there is nothing interesting. It's a pity ... Alexander Zatsepin quite rightly did not write anything for the film, except for a hack. ... In general, if you do not want to waste more than an hour of time, and if you are not a film expert who compiles classification lists of films, you should not watch a film" (V. Shuplyak).

To Aldebaran! USSR, 1989. Directed by Boris Nikolaevsky. Screenwriter Sergei Bondarenko (based on the play by A. Sudarev). Actors: Vyacheslav Baranov, Alexey Zolotnitsky and others. **TV. Short film.**

The fantastic comedy directed by Boris Nikolaevsky, filmed on the verge of reality and dream, tells how suddenly a messenger from a distant galaxy comes to the apartment of an ordinary earthly person and invites him to become the Ruler of the planet Aldebaran ...

In my opinion, one of the best roles of the wonderful actor Vyacheslav Baranov (1958—2012), who managed to convey in his character all the shades of mistrust and temptation that his hero faces, who is one step away from alien life...

Trial 1968, USSR. Directed by Evgeny Ostashenko. Screenwriters: Victor Arkhangelsky, Evgeny Ostashenko (based on the story of the same name by Stanislaw Lem). Actors: Victor Pavlov, Mikhail Kolkunov, Nikolay Kryukov and others. **Short film.**

Evgeny Ostashenko (1939—1991) directed only two full—length feature films ("The Adventures of Nuki", "The Elephant Lost"). He worked mainly in documentary cinema.

The science fiction film "Trial" tells the story of an outsider from the school of astronauts, who will test himself as a pilot of a spaceship...

Director Yevgeny Ostashenko maintains the first half of the film almost in a comedic spirit, and Victor Pavlov partially copies his student character from "Operation "Y". But the second part of the film was solved in the more traditional spirit of Soviet science fiction films of the 1950s —

1960s. Here V. Pavlov's character acquires professionalism and deserves the praise of the head of the school ...

Today the film "Trial" is practically forgotten by both film critics and viewers...

Under the Constellation of Tweens. USSR, 1979. Directed by Boris Ivchenko. Screenwriters Igor Rosokhovatsky, Ivan Mykolaichuk (based on the story "The Guest" by Igor Rosokhovatsky). Actors: Vsevolod Gavrillov, Gennady Shkuratov, Boris Belov and others. **3.8 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Boris Ivchenko (1941—1990) directed 11 films, but only two of his first works — "Annychka" and "Olesya" had real audience success. It was these melodramas that were included in the thousand of the highest—grossing Soviet films.

The fantastic drama "Under the Constellation of the Twins" tells the story of how an artificial brain created there disappeared in a research institute...

The picture was filmed in the late 1970s, one was sustained in the style of the previous decade, the element of entertainment in it was extremely small, hence it is not surprising that this movie did not have massive success at the box office...

Viewers of the XXI century for the most part have a positive attitude to this movie:

"An interesting attempt to create a science fiction film ... Some of the officials saw in (this) history ... a hint of a Soviet person who cannot be brought up in a communist society and who sooner or later will "break free", so the film was released as a "third screen" ... The critics were also harsh on the film. The authors were accused of an ill-conceived plot (for example, why does the robot release dangerous animals from the zoo, not understanding the simple truth that they can harm a person, and also that the robot does not find a better use, how to investigate thefts from the food base)" (A Grebenkin).

"The beginning seemed boring, but then it went off, and the meaning of the film came to me. ... Awesomely I liked two actors in their roles: Vsevolod Gavrillov as professor and whitefish as Gennady Shkuratov" (L. Eskina).

Unicum. USSR, 1984. Directed by Vitaly Melnikov. Screenwriters: Alexander Zhitinsky, Vitaly Melnikov (based on Alexander Zhitinsky's story "Dreams"). Actors: Vasily Bochkarev, Evgenia Glushenko, Olga Starostina, Tatyana Plotnikova, Stanislaw Sadalsky, Galina Volchek, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Mikhail Kozakov, Evgeny Leonov, Yuri Bogatyrev, Nina Ruslanova, Baadur Bronlaviduerjakova, Borislauschina Sharnova Ekaterina Durova and others. **6.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Vitaly Melnikov ("The Chief of Chukotka", "Seven Brides of Corporal Zbruev", "Hello and Goodbye", "The Eldest Son" and others) during his long film career has directed two dozen full-length feature films, three of which were included in the thousand highest—grossing Soviet films.

In Vitaly Melnikov's fantastic comedy "Unicum", events flicker at an almost dizzying pace. The story of a humble software engineer, who suddenly discovers in himself an unusual gift of broadcasting his dreams to people around him, is told with fiction, cheerfully, witty, Actors Stanislaw Sadalsky, Yuri Bogatyrev, Galina Volchek, Evgeny Leonov, Mikhail Kozakov, Innokenty Smoktunovsky and others truly swim in the satirical colors of their heroes. There is a bureaucrat boss, a bribe—taker, an adventurer—hypnotist ... All this is interspersed with nightmarish visions of the protagonist, with an aptly peeped working atmosphere of a certain research institute. It's a pity, closer to the finale, the satirical colors of the picture fade away,

And then you begin to retroactively lament that the main character was so easily and quickly released from the electronic computing department to the "free bread" of a pop artist, thereby depriving the film of a solid satirical ground underfoot. One gets the impression that, carried away by the eccentrically grotesque, Vitaly Melnikov parted too quickly in Unicum with the tragicomic intonation of his previous works.

Viewers' opinions about "Unicum" today differ significantly:

"The film was ahead of its time and looked into the future. This happens when talented people get down to business. An ensemble of actors in the prime of their creative powers" (V. Shishkin).

"I consider the film to be unsuccessful for this reason: the first part of it is quite interesting for myself (when events take place at work), everything is dynamic, wonderful Sadalsky. But then the dynamics drops sharply, the plot starts to mark time and becomes terribly boring. Neither the director nor the screenwriter could come up with anything interesting, but only repeated the same thing. The ending is also completely blurry" (Art).

Valley of the Serpents. USSR – Poland – Vietnam, 1988. Directed by Marek Piestrak. Screenwriters: Vladimir Valutsky, Marek Piestrak, Wojciech Nijjiński (based on the science fiction novel by Robert Stratton (pseudonym of Wieslaw Gurnicki) "Dr. Traven's Hobby"). Actors: Krzysztof Kohlberger, Eva Salacka, Roman Wilhelmi, Sergei Desnitsky and others. **32.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Marek Piestrak directed about a dozen full-length feature films and series, but in Russia he is known mainly for two fantastic films of the Polish–Soviet production: "Pilot Pirx's Inquiry" and "Valley of the Serpents". Both of these films were included in one thousand of the highest–grossing Soviet films.

Curiously, "Valley of the Serpents" became the third most popular Soviet (though staged jointly by Poland and Vietnam) science fiction film (second place in the science fiction section is occupied by Leonid Gaidai's fantastic comedy "Ivan Vasilyevich Changes His Profession"). True, "Valley of the Serpents" was released 26 (!!!) years after the undisputed leader of Russian science fiction – "Amphibian Man" (65.5 million viewers) – and has already gathered half the audience.

The success in the USSR of "Valley of the Serpents", which openly used the key motifs of Steven Spielberg's adventure fantasy about Indiana Jones, was quite natural, since the Soviet film distribution in 1988 was not yet saturated with Hollywood products, and video recorders had not yet become an obligatory part of every family.

Film critic Evgeny Zharkov is right: "Valley of the Serpents" is "a typical low-budget" answer to Hollywood" ... Those who saw this "masterpiece" of joint Soviet–Polish creativity directly in the late eighties, the film evokes a lasting sense of nostalgia. To the modern generation of viewers, the picture will seem incredibly boring and terribly amateurish. ... It is even difficult to call special effects with this word, because they rather cause a healthy laugh than admiration. ... This is my reasoning from the point of view of time and place, because as a boy, sitting in the cinema, I perceived "The Valley of the Serpents" as an extremely interesting and fascinating sight. Now that I have something to compare with, and I do not mean the current high–tech opuses, but the pictures of the same years, only produced by the USA, England and France, the absurdity of "Valley of the Serpents" is obvious. The proverb says that in the absence of fish and cancer – a fish" (Zharkov, 2010).

Film critic Alexei Griбанov fully agrees with this opinion about "Valley of the Serpents", who reasonably believes that "special effects are the main problem and the main feature of the film. Janusz Krol, who took part in the work on the film, "the first Polish specialist in special effects," complained that, due to the modest budget, not all ideas were realized. So, the funny cardboard kite was supposed to be a flying dragon. Marek Piestrak reproached Soviet specialists in his interviews for the poor decoration of the cave, which was completely inconsistent with the original plan" (Griбанov, 2014).

The same Aleksey Griбанov told the readers that "perhaps, in fact, some kind of spell was imposed on "Valley of the Serpents", but now no one of the leading actors was left alive. Roman Wilhelmi died at fifty-five from liver cancer, Krzysztof Kohlberger, after a long illness, died at the age of sixty. But the life of Eva Salatskaya ended most terribly and tragically: the woman-dream of Soviet middle school students died at the age of forty-nine from anaphylactic shock caused by a wasp sting" (Griбанov, 2014).

Viewers of the XXI century regard this film as a product of the pre-computer era, designed for Soviet film-goers who are almost unfamiliar with Western science fiction products:

"People of the eighties were not at all spoiled by such plots, every such film was played with a bang, with crowded halls. There were still two years left before the era of video salons, about any "Star Wars", especially about "Indiana Jones", we did not know, and did not know. On which, of course, the authors of this, albeit sometimes controversial, but I think, a very worthy film played ... There is not a single free seat in the hall! To say what impression the film made on me then is to say nothing. At times, when I was thirteen, I hid behind a chair, it was so scary, so exciting! And these scenes are in the dungeon! The snake seemed so natural, what kind of cardboard is there! The mutation scene generally led to a state of animal horror! Later, as an adult, I watched it, of course, with a smile, but this film is still one of my favorites" (A. Pozdeev).

"Well, even though a lot was done unprofessionally and now it seems funny, but the film was interesting to watch! After all, at that time the province was not spoiled by box—office movies, they just watched, empathized!" (Vika).

"I remember watching when I was eight years old ... I remember. Not a bad adventure horror game with fantasy elements. Of course, now it does not look the same, but the oppressive atmosphere of the jungle and the basements of the underground temple still looks somehow frightening, and the musical accompaniment is very well chosen. Of course, the crude combination shots and the ridiculous stuffed papier—mâché monster is a real flaw. But this is taking into account that the film was still filmed not in Hollywood, but by us and the Poles" (Ener).

Veld. USSR, 1988. Director and screenwriter Nazim Tulyakhodzhaev (based on stories by Ray Bradbury). Actors: Yuri Belyaev, Nelly Pshennaya, Georgy Gegechkori, Tamara Skhirtladze and others. **7.2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Nazim Tulyakhodzhaev directed only three full—length feature films, the most famous of which was "Veld".

Of course, "Veld" originally claimed to be something more than ordinary film science fiction or "horror film". But, in my opinion, the film turned out to be not only imitative and secondary, but also technically helpless. The low budget of the production, the primitiveness of the combined filming protrude literally from all the cracks of the episodes of the movie that are very unreliably fitted to each other. First of all, the antediluvian solution of the central scenes of the picture is depressing — in the "video room", where the African steppe "Veld" with wildly and viciously roaring lions appears at the behest of hardened children. A carelessly executed technique of a "wandering mask", superimposing a color image of heroes on a black—and—white background with an animal, immediately violates any credibility of the action.

A similar impression arises from the scene where medieval knights at full gallop crash into a battered domestic—made locomotive designed to portray the foreign transport of the future. On the other hand, many episodes of the film with long passages of cars along deserted streets, with neglected and cracked houses, etc. filmed clearly under the impression of "Stalker" or "Letters of a Dead Man", only in a rough, adapted, version...

As a result, the philosophical intention: to prevent the separation of generations, the loss of moral values by a person, to stop the all—consuming penetration of the mass culture — remains only declared.

Of course, much here can be attributed to the director's inexperience, to his desire to demonstrate his "observation", the desire to amaze. But the main disadvantage of "Veld" is technical.

In the era of perestroika, "Veld" was evaluated ambiguously in the "Soviet screen". Science fiction writer Mikhail Yemtsev (1930—2003) wrote about him like this: "The first impression after watching, when the magic of color and sound is still active, is quite favorable: a diligent professional film made with great love for science fiction. The findings of the operator and the artist were good, and the acting workshop did not disappoint, and the director treated the renowned science fiction writer with courtesy, presented his work in a variety of ways. But this plurality soon begins to torment the viewer with its internal inconsistency, a random combination of plots of different stories, deliberate ineffability. ... In the film there is an abyss of meaningful silences and undeciphered symbols. Working on the motives of several works by the same author at

the same time, the director becomes a free interpreter of his work. One gets the impression that the talented director set himself the goal of presenting the viewer with the maximum completeness of the multifaceted poetic world of Ray Bradbury, because everything shown by the film is scattered in one way or another in the writer's various works. ... Leaving the director the right to interpret the writer's work, we cannot fully agree with him. The world of Ray Bradbury's prose is understandable and open to man, it is bright, clear and accessible, like a fairy tale, like a parable" (Yemtsev, 1988: 3).

The opinions of the modern audience about "Veld" are also ambiguous:

"With a minimum of funds, the director was able to create a reliable and frightening picture of the near future ... And is it the future? Rather, the real one. ... "Veld" is not one of those films that one wants to revise — it is very eerie and hopeless. But it was filmed very professionally and wisely, and this is important" (M. Kirillov).

"This is a very competent film. This is exactly the case when low—budget becomes a plus. The absence of obviously futuristic interiors creates its eerie, "reality" (Punkst).

"The film is depressing. Everything is hopeless, everyone is doomed ... Of the minuses: uninteresting combined shooting, no merging with the atmosphere is visible, it is clear that these are just moving pictures, and the control panel in the form of a calculator on the door is completely puzzling" (Hellas).

"The film successfully conveys the unique atmosphere of Ray Bradbury's fantasy, in which naturalism coexists with the coldish reticence of the action and the mystical expanse of the landscape, and where even the very real, everyday affairs of the characters bear the stamp of unreality. ... the film got to the point: it contains both reticence, and naturalism, and the cold infinity of the landscape, and blood" (Eugenia).

"Unsuccessful adaptation of Bradbury's works. The meaning of the story "Veld" is generally turned inside out, it immediately caught my eye" (SanZhorich).

Voice of Memory. USSR, 1983. Directed by Victor Zhilko. Screenwriter Georgy Nikolaev (based on the stories of Ray Bradbury "The Martian Chronicles"). Actors: Yuris Strenga, Nikolay Grinko, Sasha Zhilko, Tambet Yurno and others. **Short Film.**

Victor Zhilko directed only four feature films, two of them are short films.

... After the atomic war, only a robot—servant remained in the house "alive", which remembers those who lived in it ...

Following the traditions of Russian philosophical film science fiction, laid down by Andrei Tarkovsky, Victor Zhilko invited Nikolai Grinko ("Solaris", "Stalker") and an ensemble of Baltic actors with a "western" appearance to play the main roles ... Unfortunately, today "Voice of Memory" is forgotten and practically not available to viewers...

Wake up Mukhin. USSR, 1968. Directed by Yakov Segel. Screenwriters Anatoly Grebnev, Yakov Segel. Actors: Sergey Shakurov, Liliana Aleshnikova, Alexander Palees, Valery Kozinets, Nikolai Rybnikov, Nikolai Sergeev, Ivan Ryzhov and others.

Yakov Segel (1923—1995) directed 14 films, two of which ("The House I Live In", "Farewell Doves!") were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

In the fantastic comedy "Wake up Mukhin" an ordinary Soviet student (Sergei Shakurov) is transported by the power of his dream to various historical epochs...

Perhaps, frightened by satirical injections, the then filmmakers gave the movie a minimum circulation, so the picture did not have a wide audience success.

As for the Soviet film press, she reacted coolly to this film.

For example, the literary critic Zinoviy Paperny (1919—1996) wrote in "Soviet Screen" that "trying to push off from the school—well—known, the authors begin to "force" science fiction, and then it is already likened to a kite with a fragile, torn thread. It is fair to say: in the best scenes (it is a pity that there are not so many of them), the film ceases to disintegrate and delaminate. When,

for example, Mukhin comes to Benckendorff, and he assures him with feigned pathos: "We will not give Pushkin offense," and then he thanks "for the signal", or the scene at Pushkin when he writes poetry, and Mukhin "helps" him, — this is both funny and unexpected. But when at an ancient Roman stadium, the audience decides to "figure out an amphora for three" — this, perhaps, is also funny, but vulgar. We have before us a rather difficult case — almost a comedy, which is not that it did not work out" (Paperny, 1968).

Today's viewers write about the film "Wake up Mukhin" much warmer:

"The film is a miracle. Unexpectedly and unscheduled, one of the top films of world cinema. ... By style, I recall Bunuel, Pasolini, Roger Vadim. Only Segel is better. And Fellini and Tarkovsky were not even close. And you don't need helicopters, napalms, Mekong jungles, bulging eyes, twisted faces, pyramids and self—mutilation, tons of pathos, meaninglessness from scratch and multimillion—dollar budgets. And Elizabeth Taylor and Meryl Streep oh how far to Aleshnikova. Even Jane Fonda and Brigitte Bardot nervously smoke on the sidelines. And one more miracle — Alexander Palees created the best image of Pushkin in cinema today... Rybnikov is magnificent. Such films should be given Oscars—lions—palm branches or higher awards" (Rubin).

"The film is bold for its time. Satire is very caustic in places. Especially memorable are the characters performed by the wonderful actors Ryzhov and Rybnikov — these types are the same at all times — swindlers and opportunists who are hooked on power" (Vladimir).

"A film with elements of humor, but very difficult. This is a "quasi-comedy". For it raises problems that are by no means comic. ... Successful and subtle jokes scattered throughout the film are remembered" (Skalustr).

Weapon of Zeus. USSR, 1991. Directed by Nikolai Zaseev—Rudenko. Screenwriters Evgeny Veltistov, Boris Chirkov (based on the novel "Nocturne of Emptiness" by Evgeny Veltistov). Actors: Igor Vasiliev, Juozas Kiselyus, Nele Savichenko—Klimene, Svetlana Kopylova, Peteris Gaudins, Alla Larionova, Milena Tontegode, Andrejs agars, Valery Storozhik, Vladimir Korenev and others. **TV.**

Nikolay Zaseev—Rudenko directed 15 full-length films and TV series, including the TV movie "Weapon of Zeus".

Writer Evgeny Veltistov (1934—1989) published his science fiction novel "Nocturne of of Emptiness" at the height of the Cold War, in 1982. In the novel, cunning politicians are preparing a "climate war" to take over the world...

Director Nikolai Zaseev—Rudenko took up the adaptation of this novel at the turn of the 1990s, when counter—propaganda themes in cinema had already gone out of fashion, and perestroika passions were raging in the USSR with might and main. As a result, the "late" TV movie called "Weapon of Zeus" was completed in 1991 and after the first screening faded into the background...

Many viewers still remember this picture:

"Great film! ... In the USSR, films with detailed plots were rare, and I loved them very much" (Alex).

"I was very surprised that the film on the theme of the inhuman military—industrial complex of our "partners" was released in perestroika 1991, when everything western became the best for us ... The film is full of criminal and spy clichés" (Sibiryak).

Who is Behind the Wall? USSR, 1977. Director and screenwriter Semyon Reitburt. Actors: Anatoly Grachev, Irina Kalinovskaya, Evgeny Lazarev, Felix Ivanov and others. **Short Film.**

Semyon Reitburt (1921—2012) made two dozen documentaries. "Who's Behind the Wall?" — one of the few of his appeals to feature films.

Action of the fantastic film "Who's Behind the Wall?" takes place in 2000, and we are talking about the possibilities of artificial intelligence.

A certain scientist (Anatoly Grachev) offers his interlocutors an experiment: to ask two interlocutors, whose images appear on monitors, questions to try to determine who is a real person and who is not...

This short film still looks with interest today, since the problem inherent in it is still relevant...

Wise Measure. USSR, 1988. Directed by Valery Ponomarev. Screenwriter Nikolai Matukovsky (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Borislav Brondukov, Victor Tarasov, Tatyana Vasilyeva, Victor Gogolev, Tatyana Rogozina, Vladimir Konkin, Stefania Stanyuta, Raisa Ryazanova and others.

Valery Ponomarev (1943–2017) directed seven full-length feature films, of which only the fantastic comedy "Wise Measure" belongs to the fantastic genre.

Filmed in the "perestroika" key of social criticism "Wise Mere", the inventor Nikolai (his role was colorfully played by Borislav Brondukov) created an apparatus that determines the degree of the human mind. Everything would be fine, but those around him treat Nikolai like a madman...

Viewers today argue with enthusiasm about this film:

"The film is interesting and thought—provoking, wonderful acting" (Fedot).

"The film shows the work of officials well, so to speak. We immediately tried on the possible results for ourselves, immediately imagined how they could fly out of their seats, based on the results of the check. And, of course, at once with hostility" (SanZhorich)

"The film is weak ... The theme with the durometer—wise measure is already boring from the very beginning of the film, and even more so when the inventor begins rhetoric about disorder and stupidity" on a national scale" (The Rooks Have Arrived).

"The film is based only on Borislav Brondukov, the rest is weak..." (Mel).

Wizards. USSR, 1982. Directed by Konstantin Bromberg. Screenwriters Arkady Strugatsky, Boris Strugatsky (based on his own story "Monday starts on Saturday"). Actors: Alexandra Yakovleva, Alexander Abdulov, Valentin Gaft, Ekaterina Vasilieva, Valery Zolotukhin, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Mikhail Svetin, Roman Filippov, Semyon Farada, Leonid Kharitonov, Nikolai Parfyonov and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1982.**

Konstantin Bromberg (1939–2020) directed only four full-length feature films, two of which — "The Adventures of Electronics" and "The Wizards" — immediately fell in love with the multimillion TV audience.

Film critic Konstantin Ognev is convinced that the "Wizards" can be safely attributed to a vivid example of mass culture, although our art criticism deliberately bypassed this term in the Soviet period of history, considering it a product of Western society, carefully applying the concepts of "elite" and "spectator" cinema to cinema" (Ognev, 2018: 42).

The "Wizards" still have a lot of fans today:

"This film is on the New Year's gold list. It is fabulous and funny and still relevant, because films about love that overcomes evil and envy are always relevant" (Alla).

"An incomparable film. Gentle, kind, nagging and cheerful. Such a constellation of masters that takes your breath away ... For all times!" (Victoria).

"Probably, everyone in this life has something that is associated with childhood. So for me the film "Wizards" is that very association, the best, kind, bright fairy tale that brings at least a short while to my soul a feeling of complete happiness! While watching, my thoughts are transported to the most joyful moments of my life, and my mood rises by 100%! Excellent music... Actors are incomparable" (Lialechka).

"I really love the movie "Wizards". I always love especially for the New Year. ... Like many others, I associate the film with childhood" (V. Anchugov).

"To my shame, I saw this film for the first time just the other day. Here is a picture! What a game! Well done, well done all! We knew how, we knew how to shoot before so subtly, mentally,

talented! This is not a modern fantasy "don't get what". And what is the subtext: just a film within a film. Either satire, but soft, or humor, but tough. The scenes with a self-assembled tablecloth, Gaft on a "horse", a cat who does not want to speak are just masterpieces, she laughed to tears" (O. Khramova).

But there are, of course, other points of view:

"I actively dislike the film. I love the Strugatskys very much and especially "Monday Starts on Saturday", and since the film was positioned "based on" this book, I naively expected even remote motives. Since there are so few of them that they are invisible, the film was immediately disliked. If I had expected it simply as a film "Wizards", then perhaps I would have treated it differently. But — alas! What is, it is" (Ines).

Wonderful Boy. USSR, 1970. Directed by Alexander Orlov, Leonid Pekur. Screenwriters: Oscar Volin, Igor Vinogradsky, Alexander Orlov. Actors: Nikita Golubentsev, Zane Lieldija, Valentin Nikulin, Valentin Gaft, Yuri Sarantsev, Leonid Kanevsky, Alla Budnitskaya and others. **TV premiere on January 1, 1971.**

Alexander Orlov directed 18 films and TV series. Among them were such notable works as "The Mystery of Edwin Drood" and "The Strange Story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde". However, only his musical "The Woman Who Sings" (1979) managed to enter the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films. **Leonid Pekur** made only two full-length feature films. His last film "Melody. Songs of Alexandra Pakhmutova" was released on television in 1976.

The fantastic musical "Wonderful Boy" was filmed for television and is intended for a children's audience. His action took place in a certain unnamed and very conditional western country, and the adult roles were played by talented actors Valentin Nikulin (1932–2005), Valentin Gaft (1935–2020), Yuri Sarantsev (1928–2005) and others. According to the plot, the villains want to use for their own purposes a charming robot boy, designed by an eccentric professor. Today this film is interesting, in particular, because almost all the songs (composer — Eduard Artemiev) in it are sung by Alla Pugacheva, then unknown to the general public.

The opinions of 21st century viewers about this film are pretty cool:

"I didn't like the film, it will be boring even for modern spoiled children" (A. Monastyrsky).

"Of course, the film is rather weak, but what actors! ... Yes, and there is something elusive in this film that makes us treat it with sympathy" (A. Khakimov).

Youths in the Universe. USSR, 1975. Directed by Richard Victorov. Screenwriters Abner Zak, Isai Kuznetsov. Actors: Misha Ershov, Sasha Grigoriev, Volodya Savin, Vladimir Basov (Jr.), Olga Bitjukova, Nadezhda Ovcharova, Irina Savina, Vadim Ledogorov, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Igor Ledogorov, Lev Durov and others. **10,6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Please, see: **Moscow – Cassiopeia. USSR, 1974. Through Hardship to the Stars. USSR, 1981.**

Zombie Variant. USSR, 1985. Directed by Evgeny Egorov. Screenwriters Vyacheslav Naumov, Evgeny Egorov. Actors: Aristarkh Livanov, Yuri Gusev, Valery Ivchenko, Irena Dubrovskaya, Romualdas Ramanauskas and others. **11.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Evgeny Egorov known only for one film — the detective-fiction film "Zombie Variant".

This counter-propaganda movie tells about a group of neo-fascists who settled in Africa and dreams of enslaving the whole world with the help of psychotropic weapons ...

The interest of Soviet viewers in this, in my opinion, ordinary film can be explained, probably, first of all, by the fact that in 1985, video recorders in the USSR were still far from every family, and, therefore, the audience was far from being oversaturated with Western products. zombies of all kinds and colors ...

"Zombie Variant" managed to appear on the screen at the very beginning of the "perestroika" times, so the Soviet film press, which had not yet had time to "unravel", greeted it rather approvingly (see, for example: Chernenko, 1985: 8—9).

But in the 21st century, viewers do not rate the "Zombie Variant" very highly:

"The direction is clearly lame — the film breaks up into a bunch of episodes. There is no wholeness and dynamism" (Crete).

"There are interesting moments, but in general — trash" (Whirlwind).

2. "Mystery of Two Oceans": a novel and its adaptation

Let me take two popular Soviet media texts, the novel *Mystery of Two Oceans* (1939) and its screen version (1956) as an example of ideological and structural analysis. This will allow us to identify differences in social and historical context of the creation time and in the structure of these media texts.

Following the methods developed by U. Eco, let's single out the three "rows" or "systems", which are important in a work. They are: author's ideology; the market conditions which determined the idea, the process of writing and success of the book (or at least which contributed to all three of them); the methods of the narration (Eco 2005, 209). These methods sort quite well with C. Bazalgette's methods of the analysis of media texts (Bazalgette 1995) – with the resting upon such key words of media education as "media agencies", "media/media text categories", "media technologies", "media languages", "media representations" and "media audiences", since all these concepts are directly related to ideological, market, structural and contents aspects of the analysis of media texts.

Ideology of the authors in social and cultural context (dominating concepts: "media agencies", "media representations", "media audiences")

I must make a reservation here that by the authors I understand the writer G. Adamov (1886-1945) and the creators of the screen version – the script-writers V. Alekseev, N. Rozhkov and the director K. Pipinashvili (1912-1969). Despite the initial pathos of the communist ideology expressed on the novel (which was written in 1938 and published in 1939), its screen interpretation acquired somewhat subdued features. This is caused by gradual changes in Soviet society (the film was shot in 1955, a year before Khrushchev's famous anti-Stalin speech).

Ideological priorities are marked in G. Adamov's novel rather sharply:

"Pavlik grew up far away from his homeland, from its happy life, from its exciting struggle with the menacing forces of nature and the remnants of the past, slave years, away from its victories and achievements. For six years which are important for the formation of man, he had lived in capitalist America, in an atmosphere of enmity between man and man, the workers and the capitalists, the poor and the rich. Pavlik lived a lonesome life without his mother who had died the first year they moved to the quiet, patriarchal Quebec, without brothers and sisters, without friends and comrades. Suddenly after having passed through mortal danger, Pavlik got to a Soviet submarine, to a company of courageous people, to a close-knit circle of friends accustomed to danger and able to fight with it. They conquered his heart with their cheerfulness, their unity, their friendship and their simple but cast-iron discipline. Motherland – strong, affectionate and brave, accepted Pavlik in the tight space of the "Pioneer". It breathed new feelings into him, aroused an ardent desire to be worthy of it, to take after the best of her sons" (Adamov, 1939).

There is no such straightforward ideological vocabulary in the film. However, the main attributes of the kind are carefully preserved. We shouldn't forget that the first half of the 1950s in the Soviet Union was marked by the so-called "Cold war". That's why the ideological constituent of espionage themes is strengthened in the film compared with the novel. Admittedly, in the film espionage has lost clear orientation to a particular country. In 1938-1939 Japan was one of the most likely military opponents of the Soviet communist regime, and in G. Adamov's novel engineer Gorelov appeared as insidious and cruel Japanese spy. As is known after the defeat in World War II, Japan has been devoid of military power. That is why in K. Pipinashvili's film the spy of 1955 acquired a cosmopolitan coloration. Ideologically it became even more favorable. On the one hand, Gorelov could be not only an American spy but also a spy sent by any bourgeois and imperialist country. On the other hand, a kind of "political correctness" was observed – the public enemy was not specifically named, the spy has lost his distinct national coloring.

But that ideological constituent is not solely a communist model's product. For example, during the Cold War American films were also shot in the same ideologically straightforward manner, where friendly and democratic Americans fought the evil Kremlin agents or their stooges...

The soviet ideological specificity showed in something different: in author's aspiration for the bright communistic future, where the best and the most powerful submarines travel through the world's oceans, and the country of all sorts of Soviets becomes a tremendous accomplishment of a

utopian dream of a classless society with equal needs and opportunities; the society with limitless natural resources, technical and technological, with the most advanced workers, farmers, scientists, , sailors, pioneers, etc.

The market conditions which contributed to the conception, the process of creation and to success of the media text (dominating concepts: “media agencies”, “media/media text categories”, “media technologies”, “media audiences”).

The Soviet media market of the 1930s can probably be divided into two periods. In the first half of the 1930s there still existed if not private than co-operative property in the print and film publishing. In the second half of the 1930s Stalin’s censorship drew up nearly all the remaining artists under the banner of social realism. As for G. Adamov, there was no need to draw him up, because his ideas and thoughts were always in unison with “the Party’s general line”. The totalitarian regime of the second half of the 1930s demanded that the “masters of culture” fought public enemies and spies against the background of the construction of communism and the conquest of nature. And G. Adamov earnestly responded to this calling with his book *Mystery of Two Oceans*.

At the same time the writer oriented himself to the children and the youth, that’s why he described the underwater world and technical equipment of the submarine in great detail.

The novel sold well, but as G. Adamov expected, it was read mostly by schoolchildren. That’s why the authors of the screen version significantly changed the plot of *Mystery...* to make it more entertaining and expand the audience’s age range.

As is known the only owner of the Soviet media market in the 1950s was the state. The planning of film production went from the top, without taking into account the tastes and need of the audience. However guided by pragmatic intuition and common sense the governing body of cinema didn’t reduce screen production to some kind of Party Reports. After all, cinema as well as the alcohol beverage was a significant source of government revenue. Thus there existed a relative variety of film genres even during the reign of Stalin (when only 9-18 Soviet films were made each year) in the end of the 1940s and the beginning of the 1950s. “If a viewer had a choice he “voted” against the historical and biographical films which constituted the main part of film production in the early 50s. And vice versa, comedies, adventures, detectives, film on contemporary topics were the most popular” (Goldin, 2000).

Screen version of G. Adamov’s novel was created during the expansion of filmmaking: 144 full-length films were produced in 1957. Therefore the state could afford a relative variety of genres. In many cases it wanted to make competitive productions. Under these conditions the authors produced a synthesis of fiction and detective story, and the result fully justified their hopes. *Mystery of Two Oceans* became one of the most successful films of 1957 and took the honorable 6th place.

Of course, the film adaptation of the novel by G. Adamov didn’t have many real rivals competing with dozens of boring “party” and “industrial” films. Only few of Western entertainment films were demonstrated in Soviet movie theatres (and when they were, as a rule they had a great success). However, even in comparison with the “top ten” of Soviet cinema of the 1950s (Table 1) the results of *Mystery of Two Oceans* (31.2 million viewers in the first year of demonstration) are rather good.

Table 1. The leaders of Soviet film distribution of the 1950s

1. *Quiet Flows the Don* (1957) by Sergey Gerasimov. 46.9 million viewers.
2. *Spring Love* (1953) by Yan Frid. 46.4 million viewers.
3. *Over the Tisza* (1958) by Dmitry Vasilyev. 45.7 million viewers.
4. *Carnival Night* (1956) by Eldar Ryazanov. 45.6 million viewers.
5. *Wedding Dowry* (1953) by Tatyana Lukashevich, Boris Ravenskih. 45.3 million viewers.
6. *Outpost in the Mountains* (1953) by Konstantin Yudin. 44.8 million viewers.
7. *Ivan Brovkin in Virgin Lands* (1959) by Ivan Lukinsky. 44.6 million viewers.
8. *Brave People* (1950) by Konstantin Yudin. 41.2 million viewers.
9. *Kuban Cossacks* (1950) by Ivan Pyryev. 40.6 million viewers.
10. *Soldat Ivan Brovkin* (1955) by Ivan Lukinsky. 40.3 million viewers.

I must note that not only to dramas are among the leaders of the box-office of the 1950s. The “lighter” genres prevail – comedies (5 films) и action (3 films). Thus the authors of the screen version reached their main goal – to make the film successful with the audience. This success was caused not only because of the synthesis of detective and science fiction genres, but also the high technical level of special effects and scenery.

The structure and methods of narration in the media text (dominating concepts: “media/media text categories”, “media technologies”, “media languages”, “media representations”)

I believe that both the novel and the screen version of *Mystery of Two Oceans* are based on simple dichotomies:

- 1) the aggressive bourgeois world and the peaceful and friendly world of the builders of the bright communist society;
- 2) positive and ideologically correct (i.e. faithful to communist ideas) characters and villains/spies;
- 3) heroism/self-sacrifice and betrayal;
- 4) honesty/sincerity and fraud/deceit;
- 5) the plan and the result.

Since one of the characters in the novel and in the film is a child, I can add one more dichotomy “naivety/innocence and experience/sophistication”.

All the characters in G. Adamov’s novel were male, but a female doctor appears in K. Pipinashvili’s film. This creates one more dichotomy: the woman and the villain, the culmination of which is a spectacular scene where the spy Gorelov tries to drown the woman in the diving gateway of the submarine.

Besides the main spy (S. Golovanov played his role) one more traitor appears though only in the beginning of the film (played by M. Gluzsky). The script writers had to create a new plot line connected with the appearance of Gorelov on board of the submarine “*Pioneer*”.

“A professional engineer who works on a classified submarine of course is trusting as a child and absolutely carefree, whereas his twin brother, a circus gymnast, is the embodiment of slyness and deceit. He lures his own brother, the innocent engineer, to the very dome of the circus and throws him down to the arena without any regret. Then he changes into his brother’s jacket and then he has fun launching boosters in an underwater bunker” (Sorvina 2007).

Thus there is no coincidence that “the entourage of the circus, a place traditionally popular among horror films directors” is used here (Tsyrkun. http://mega.km.ru/cinema/Encyclop.asp?Topic=lvn_flm_4976). And the dramatic story of the circus murder was thought out by the script writers instead of G. Adamov’s vaguely written storyline about Gorelov’s Japanese relatives (his uncle and his bride). Together with the storyline of the second spy (M. Gluzsky) – the car chase, portable radio transmitter and poison – there scenario novelties replace G. Adamov’s meticulous and detailed descriptions of underwater plants, animals and technical equipment.

At the same time there are no special detective plot novelties either in the novel or in the film, because for detective plots whether it’s an investigation or “tough action” the variation of elements is not typical. The typical thing is namely the repetition of the usual scheme in which the reader can recognize something he had already seen before which is pleasurable. Pretending to be an information generating machine, a detective story is by contrast a redundancy generating machine. Allegedly arousing the reader detective stories actually reinforce the sort of indolence of imagination, because the story is not about the unknown, it’s about the already known (Eco, 2005: 263). In the U. Eco opinion, thus there is a paradox: the very “detectives” which seem to be made to satisfy the interest in something unexpected and sensational, are actually “consumed” for quite the opposite reasons. They are like invitations to the peaceful world where everything is familiar, calculated and foreseen. Ignorance of who the real criminal is becomes a minor point, almost a pretext. Moreover, “in “action detectives” (in which the iterative schemes triumph as well as in “detective investigations”) the suspense connected with the searches for the criminal often is totally absent. We do not follow the way the criminal is searched for; we follow the “topos” actions of “topos” characters whose patterns of behavior we love (Eco, 2005: 199).

However what seems to be the professional orientation of the authors of the film to a genre appeal can be interpreted quite differently. For example, in 1957 Soviet *Teacher's Newspaper* defended Adamov's plot construction: "Apparently the authors of the film decided that G. Adamov's ably written novel lacks action and drama and rewrote it anew. Thus the fascinating science fiction was changed into the ordinary detective story. It's a pity! Soviet viewers always look forward to meeting the characters they love on the screen, the meeting with human beings, not with some conventional figures claiming to have similarities with their namesakes from the books" (*Teacher's Newspaper*, 1957).

As regards the human beings in the review of "Teacher's Newspaper" this is too much: the characters in the novel as well as in the film are stereotyped genre figures. Take the description of the villains: "Two men leaned over the map. Their faces were indistinguishable, only their eyes were gleaming in the dim light: ones were narrow, dull and indifferent; others were big, fiery and sunken into the blackness of the eye sockets. The silhouettes of these people were vaguely outlined. ... He was waxy pale. Long thin lips were gray; they curled in a strained, lifeless smile. Fear was in his deep sunken black eyes. His high forehead was covered with tiny beads of perspiration...» (Adamov, 1939).

In this connection M. Sorvina justly notices that "here we can observe a paradoxical peculiarity which confirms the tendency: Gorelov doesn't look neither magical nor charismatic; the authors of the film build up his charisma solely with the help of dramatic art and details. They literally impose him as a strong, bright, attractive and of course deceptive personality... It's not by chance that at the very beginning of the film Gorelov always wins. He is the strongest – in the first fight with a Soviet secret agent (Igor Vladimirov), the most intelligent – in his advices to a rather stupid captain (Sergey Stolyarov) and in logic games with the boy. That's him who the child likes the most, and a child's trust is a criterion for the audience's confidence. This character is a knight without fear and reproach as though he has no drawbacks. Thus the audience doesn't wonder why he is the strongest in the crew and knows the exercises in concentration. At that time the audience has not been versed in cinematic clichés yet. Nobody ever suspects Gorelov in treachery and this suggests that this man knows how to put on a mask because of his profession" (Sorvina, 2007).

Eventually it turned out that *Mystery of Two Oceans* can be interpreted even in terms of Freudism: for psychoanalysis, Adamov's novel is an ideal object. Firstly, this book isn't tainted with the slightest literary gift. Secondly, and more importantly, the very nature of the genre, a fantasy, a dream, avidly demands psychoanalysis. Not only the German word "traum", or the English word "dream", but also the Russian word "gryzoza" has the second meaning – "a reverie". Therefore the analysis of literary fiction is a particular case of the interpretation of dreams... If Adamov was a little more attentive (or sophisticated) he would have realized that the atmosphere of cheerful homosexuality reigned aboard (Bar-Sella, 1996).

In our opinion the last passage is too radical and ironic, but it confirms U. Eco's correctness once again: the texts oriented to the particular reactions of a certain circle of readers (be it children, or soap opera lovers, doctors, law-abiding citizens, representatives of subcultures, Presbyterians, farmers, women from middle-class, divers, effeminate snobs or representatives or any other social and psychological category), in fact are open to all sort of "erroneous" decoding (Eco, 2005: 19). So I in no way insist that my interpretation of the analyzed media texts is absolutely true.

The techniques of visual language of the novel deserve special attention. The language of Adamov's novel is sometimes close to that of newspapers and sketches ("The captain looked through the radiogram and raised his pale face. He turned to the stiffen crew, cast a glance at these people, who became close and dear to him during the three month long unforgettable trip, and waving the sheet he exclaimed: "Listen to the radiogram of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the government"), but suddenly is filled with picturesque descriptions of underwater life ("A transparent medusa as if cast out of the purest glass swam by. Its gelatinous body was bordered with delicate fringe, and its long tentacles were streaming like a bunch of colorful laces... A small silver fish flashed by one of these gentle creatures, and the picture changed in an instant... The tentacles contracted, drew into the mouth of the medusa, and in a moment Pavlik was watching the dark outlines of the digested fish inside the medusa").

Audiovisual language of the film *Mystery of Two Oceans* is much more interesting. So an experienced film critic drew analogies with the popular in the West in the late 1940s “film noir” genre. N. Tsyrukun wrote: “It happened so that I always watched *Mystery of Two Oceans* in black and white, so a classic “film noir” stuck in my memory: the dark streets in the predawn, the fluttering window curtains, the pavement shining after the rain, the evil face filmed through the windshield of the car racing at breakneck speed; on the sound track — snatches of radio signals, squeaking breaks... All this was presented in the first episodes. A stranger in black raincoat calls a lonely musician and demands to send a message to the Center (the transmitter is hidden in the grand piano; the spy messages are encoded in musical phrases. The codename of the agent-radioman is “The Pianist”, and it’s difficult to say whether it is irony or inadvertence). The doorbell rings again, it’s the security services. The musician helps the agent to escape through the window, then takes some drug and imitates death. The security services take away “the dead body” which mysteriously disappears on the way... Eventually it became clear that “film noir” was never formed in USSR as the genre, and the curiosity with black and white copies of the films should be referred to “The role of film mechanics in the history of cinema, or Once again about reception” (Tsyrukun. http://mega.km.ru/cinema/Encyclop.asp?Topic=lvn_flm_4976).

But you never know... Maybe Konstantin Pipinashvili — the Moscow Cinematography Institute’s student of Sergei Eisenstein — demonstrated the “coded” knowledge of the Western analogues of the genre, representation (reconsideration) of visual images and symbolism of “film noir” in (over)saturated colors.

Let’s add here the skillful use of an enigmatic melody of A. Machavariani which was indeed avant-garde for Soviet film music of those years...

In short unlike the novel the film adaptation was much more popular. Not only half a century ago, but also nowadays, which is evidenced by the fact that a well-known author of “Video guide” Mishail Ivanov writes at his website (videoguide.ru): “It’s a wonderful film, the classics of the genre. It’s really soothing and cheering. Of course I watched several times when I was a child. But I could not resist and watched it this year for “Video guide”.

3. "Amphibian Man": a novel and its adaptation

Being bedridden by serious illness for years, the science fiction writer Alexander Belyaev (1884–1942) created a whole gallery of characters which do not fit into the traditional world with its political and social problems. On the one hand there were romantic heroes who can live underwater and fly like birds. On the other hand there were brilliant scientists who could conduct most dangerous scientific experiments, which are often beyond the conventional moral standards. The amazingly realistic feelings of professor Dowel's severed head were not imagined but taken by A. Belyaev from his own biography. The paralyzed had plenty of time to think over the plots of his books slowly and thoroughly. Unfortunately, the free flying of Ariel has remained a dream for A. Belyaev who starved to death in the suburbs of Leningrad occupied by Nazi...

The writer didn't live to see his works filmed. However the first film adaptation of his novel *Amphibian Man* (1961) immediately overcame the value of 60 million viewers which was previously insuperable in the Soviet period (for the first 12 months of demonstration in cinemas) and was successfully sold to dozens of countries all over the world. This can be explained not only because of unique underwater filming and charming duet of V. Korneev and A. Vertinskaya, but also because *Amphibian Man* with its theme of responsibility for human life and destiny" became one of the symbols of the short period of "thaw" (Kharitonov, 2003).

In the "top ten" of Soviet films of the 1960s (Table 2) *Amphibian Man* took the honorable seventh place in the box office having pressed *War and Peace* and the first episode of *Elusive Avengers*. It was the only science fiction film among the top ten fiction films of the decade (three very popular in Russia comedies of Leonid Gaidai, four war and adventure film and one operetta).

Table 2. "Top 10" hit parade of Soviet films of the 1960s

1. *The Diamond Arm* (1969) by Leonid Gaidai. 76.7 million viewers.
2. *Prisoner of the Caucasus* (1967) by Leonid Gaidai. 76.5 million viewers.
3. *Wedding in Malinovka* (1967) by Andrew Tutyshkin. 74.6 million viewers.
4. *Operation "Y"* (1965) by Leonid Gaidai. 69.6 million viewers.
5. *Sword and Shield* (1968) by Vladimir Basov. 68.3 million viewers.
6. *The New Adventures of the Elusive* (1969) by E. Keosayan. 66.2 million viewers.
7. *Amphibian Man* (1962) by Gennady Kazansky and Vladimir Chebotarev. 65.4 million viewers.
8. *War and Peace* (1966) by Sergei Bondarchuk. 58 million viewers.
9. *Strong of Spirit* (1968) by Victor Georgiev. 55.2 million viewers.
10. *Elusive Avengers* (1967) by Edmond Keosayan. 54.5 million viewers.

As D. Gorelov truly noticed the screen version of *Amphibian Man* became the "first super blockbuster of post-Stalin era. Soviet cinema never knew such success, which overshadowed *Feat of the Spy* and the like... If only the competent producer could see that ocean of gold which yielded *Amphibian Man*... But Chebotarev and Kazansky lived in the wild, ugly and merciless world of freedom, equality and fraternity. The critics scolded them for lightness in the sacred struggle against capital... For the first time popular journal *Soviet Screen* boldly forged the results of its annual readers' contest and gave the first place to a dull and long dead drama... *Amphibian Man* was shifted to the third place and the readers were condescendingly scolded for their passion for tastelessness" (Gorelov, 2001).

The negative reaction of Soviet critics to G. Kazansky and V. Chebotarev's film coincides with the harsh criticism of Belyaev's novel. V. Revich reproached the writer in lack of talent and depravity of the scientific approach: Belyaev was defamed but his works were published, and his science fiction spoiled readers' tastes for a good long while (Revich, 1998).

However the analysis of the artistic level of Belyaev's novel and its screen version is a topic for another article. In this case we are interested in the following – Cultural Mythology Analysis of Media Texts, i.e. identification and analysis of mythologizing (including the so-called folklore sources – fairy tales, "urban legends", etc.) plot stereotypes, themes, characters, etc. in the particular work.

V.Y. Propp (Propp, 1976), N.M. Zorkaya (Zorkaya, 1981), M.I. Turovskaya (Turovskaya, 1979), O.F. Nechay (Nechay, 1993) and M. Yampolskiy (Yampolsky, 1987) brought out clearly that for the total success of works of mass culture it is necessary that their creators take into consideration the folklore type of aesthetical perception, so the archetypes of fairy tale and legend and the corresponding archetypes of folklore perception when meeting each other produce the effect of integral success of mass favorites (Zorkaya, 1981: 116).

It should be noted that researchers often mentioned the inseparability of folklore, fairy tales, legends and myths. V.Y. Propp was convinced that from the historical point of view a fairy tale in its morphological basis is a myth (Propp, 1998: 68). Moreover, a myth cannot be formally distinguished from a fairy tale. Fairy tales and myths sometimes coincide so much that in ethnography and folklore such myths are often called fairy tales (Propp, 1998: 124).

Indeed, the success with the audience is closely connected with the mythological layer of the work. “Strong” genres – thriller, science fiction, western always rest upon “strong” myths (Yampolsky, 1987: 41). The interconnection of unusual but “real” events is one of the fundamental archetypes (resting upon the deep-laid psychological structures which influence consciousness and subconsciousness) of fairy tales, legends. It is very important for massive popularity of media texts.

Having examined hundreds of fairy tale plots, V.Y. Propp singled out nearly 30 types of main events and characters with a limited set of their roles among which the specific characters and their functions are distributed in a certain way. Each of the characters/roles (a hero, a false hero, a sender, an assistant, an antagonist/villain, a grantor, a princess or her father), has its actions i.e. one or several functions (Propp, 1998: 24-49).

V.Y. Propp also proved the binary character of most of events/functions of the plot (shortage – elimination of shortage, prohibition – violation of prohibition, struggle – victory, etc.). At that “many functions are logically united in certain circles. Generally these circles correspond to the performers. These are action circles” (Propp, 1998: 60).

Further researches (Eco, 1960; Zorkaya, 1981; 1994, etc.) proved that V.Y. Propp’s approaches are applicable to the analysis of a great number of media texts, including almost all products of mass media culture (literary, cinematographic, television, etc.).

Indeed, cultural mythology can easily be found many popular media texts. The echoes of myths and fairy tales about Odysseus, Cyclops, Sirens, Aladdin, Cinderella, Little Red Riding Hood, Baba Yaga, The Dragon Snake, Bluebeard, etc. can be found there to a more or less extent. Of course deliberately or not the audience (eg. schoolchildren) reaches for fabulous, fantastic action, mythological heroes...

Thus the success of media texts of popular culture is influenced by many factors: the basis on folklore and mythological sources, constancy of metaphors, orientation toward the consecutive realization of the steadiest plot schemes, the synthesis of natural and supernatural, the address to emotions through identification (the imaginary transformation into the characters, fusion with the atmosphere of the work), “magical power” of the characters, standardization (replication, unification, adaptation) of the ideas, situations, characters, etc., serial and mosaic character of the work, compensation (the illusion of realization of cherished might-have-been dreams), happy ending, the use of such rhythmical organization of audiovisual media texts when not only the contents but also the order of frames influences the emotions of the audience; intuitive guessing of subconscious interests of the audience, etc..

Let’s analyze A. Belyaev’s novel *Amphibian Man* (1927) and its film adaptation (1961, screenwriters A. Golburt, A. Ksenofontov, A. Kapler, directed by G. Kazansky. V. Chebotarev) as it is a typical media text which rests upon folklore/mythological source (let’s make a table with mythological and fairy tale stereotypes of the novel *Amphibian Man* and its film adaptation (on the basis of the researches of V.Y. Propp, N.M. Zorkaya, M.I. Turovskaya) (see Table 3).

Table 3. Revelation of folklore and mythological stereotypes of media text

Key events (Propp, 1998: 24-49) of media texts which rest upon folklore/fairy tales/myths	Presence (+) or absence (-) of this event in the novel <i>Amphibian man</i> and its film adaptation
The positive character leaves his home (departure)	+ (The Amphibian Man Ichthyander leaves the greenhouse conditions of his father's (professor Salvator's villa)
The positive character is addressed to with a prohibition (prohibition)	+ (The father prohibits his son who leaves only in the guarded villa and in the ocean to communicate with ordinary people)
The positive character violates the prohibition	+ (Ichthyander violates his father's prohibition, saves and falls in love with a young beauty Guttiere)
The negative character tries to conduct a reconnaissance (worming out) and gets the necessary information about the positive character (giving away)	+ (A villain named Zurita finds out the "sea devil's" hideout in order to catch him in a net)
The negative character tries to deceive the positive character to capture him or seize his property (deception/trick)	+ (The artful Zurita deceives the naïve Ichthyander. He catches him in a net and then promises to set him free if he gets pearls for him from the bottom of the ocean)
The positive character is amenable to fraud and thus unwillingly helps the enemy (aiding)	+ (Ichthyander believes his lies: "All that Zurita said seemed convincing and plausible to Ichthyander")
The negative character harms or damages one of the positive character's family members (harm) or one of the family members lack something (shortage).	+ (Zurita makes Guttiere to become his wife)
The positive character finds out the truth about the harm/shortage or he is asked/made to do something or he is sent somewhere (the connective moment) and so he begins to act/resist.	+ (Guttiere tells Ichthyander the truth about Zurita's fraud: "The young man had already left the water when he heard Guttierrez's muffled voice: "Zurita is lying! Save yourself, Ichthyander!". Ichthyander tries to counteract Zurita).
The positive character is being attacked/tested/ questioned, etc., and then he receives some magical aid/somebody helps him (the function of the grantor).	+ (Ichthyander is enclosed into a barrel with rotten water, but with the help of Professor Salvator and a warder he prepares to escape).
The initial trouble/shortage is liquidated (liquidation of trouble/shortage).	+ (Thanks to the warder's help Ichthyander escapes and swims away into the depths of the ocean bidding farewell to Guttiere)
The negative character is punished/annihilated (punishment).	+ (Guttiere breaks all relations with Zurita)
The positive character gets married and reigns or receives love and wealth as a gift (wedding)	- (The marriage of Ichthyander and Guttiere is impossible because he is doomed to live underwater. However an imaginary version of the harmony can be found in Ichthyander's dreams shown in the film adaptation of "Amphibian Man" when Ichthyander and Guttiere are swimming freely holding hands)

Relying upon the fact that the given media texts have the distinct folklore and mythological basis, let us try to single out in *Amphibian Man* the seven action circles according to V.Y. Propp's classification (Propp, 1998: 60-61):

1) the action circle of the antagonist/wrecker (wrecking, battle or other form of struggle with the hero, persecution) - insidious action of the greedy Zurita.

2) the action circle of the grantor/supplier – the action of Professor Salvator;

3) the action circle of the helper (the hero's spatial movements, liquidation of trouble or shortage, rescue from persecution, resolution of difficult problems, transfiguration of the hero) – the actions of minor characters who help Professor Salvator and Ichthyander;

4) the action circle of the sought character (exposure, recognition) – the actions of Guttiere whom Ichthyander is trying to find;

5) the action circle of the sender (the dispatch of the hero): in “Amphibian Man” Ichthyander sets off to the surface on his own, but he searches pearls at Zurita's request;

6) the action circle of the hero (searches, the response to the grantor's demands, wedding): At first Ichthyander is searching for Guttiere, then he is searching for pearls, but alas, he was never destined to reach the final wedding...

7) the action circle of the false hero (searches, the response to the grantor's demands - always negative, and also a specific function – fraudulent claims): the actions of Zurita who fraudulently sends Ichthyander to search for pearls, and fraudulently tries to seize Guttiere (pretending to be her savior), etc.

As a result of this kind of analysis we can conclude that authors use almost all arsenal of mass success including folklore, fairy tale motives, they rest upon the functions of compensation, recreation, the aesthetical component which manifests in the professionalism of film direction, in cameraman's work, in filigree stunts, in melodiousness of soundtrack, in actor's technique and other factors that intensify entertainment and emotional appeal of the work.

The compositional preciseness is peculiar to the novel and to the screen version as well. At the same time the authors take into consideration the rules of “emotional pendulum” (the alternation of episodes which cause the audience's positive and negative emotions).

Thus we can clearly determine that the authors/agencies managed to use the peculiarities of “primary” identification (with the scene of action of the media text) and “secondary” identification (with the characters of the media text).

Of course, to some extent the plot of *Amphibian Man* bears the imprint of the “Cold War”, of confrontation with “bourgeois world of cash” and its “false values” (especially this applies to the handsome Zurita). However in general it is of course an exotic folklore and fairy tale plot made on a brilliant melodramatic story.

4. "Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin": a novel and its adaptation

As we know, the demand for this or that literary material for film adaptations depend on many political, social and cultural factors. In this regard it is curious to conduct a comparative analysis of screen interpretations of a popular novel by Alexey N. Tolstoy (1883-1945) *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* (1927) in the context of media education. Here we shall use the methodology developed by U. Eco (Eco, 1998: 209), A. Silverblatt (Silverblatt, 2001: 80-81), L. Masterman (Masterman, 1985), C. Bazalgette (Bazalgette, 1995), based on such key concepts of media education as media agencies, media/media text categories, media technologies, media languages, media representations and media audiences, because all these concepts are of direct relevance to value, ideological, market, structural and substantive, audio-visual, spatial and temporal aspects of the analysis of media products. It should be noted that this technology fits into the basic range of media educational goals of higher education, especially when training future culturologists, art historians, sociologists, linguists, psychologists and educators.

Author's ideology and moral principles in social and cultural context, market conditions that determined the concept and the process of creation of the media text (the dominant concepts: media agencies, media/ media text categories, media technologies, media representations, media audience).

After returning from a short emigration (1918-1923) "Red Count" A.N. Tolstoy apparently posed two main problems before himself: to earn positive reputation with the communist regime and significantly improve his financial situation in a fairly short period of time (and the New Economical Policy gave a lot of possibilities here). The trilogy *The Road to Cavalry*, started in 1922, was being written for a long while. And it was necessary to urgently publish some less ambitious though commercially attractive things. That's how his fantastic story *Aelita* appeared (1923), quickly filmed by Y. Protazanov in 1924. The ideological function was indicated clearly – the communists are able to organize revolution not only on Earth but also on Mars...

Since the second half of 1925 A. N. Tolstoy began publishing another fiction adventure work in a magazine – the political adventure detective novel *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* (Tolstoy 1925-1927), which was apparently designed for the subsequent screen adaptation as well. The ideological background was similar to that of *Aelita*: firstly the exposure of the bourgeois world of "yellow devil", and then the revolutionary uprising against the dictatorship of the technocratic maniac Pyotr Petrovich Garin. In 1927 the ending was remade: in the first version (Tolstoy 1927) after the miners' revolt under the leadership of Shelga the beauty Zoya dies and Garin disappears without a trace, whereas in the second version after the revolutionary uprising Zoya and Garin meet on the yacht "Arizona" and sail towards new adventures...

Later A.N. Tolstoy repeatedly changed the novel with perseverance worthy of a better use: in 1934 he partially shortened the text (in the edition of 1925-1927 there were lots of technical terms and blueprints), in 1936 he released an adaptation for children (with no mention of a brothel on Garin's island and other "adult" details). In 1937 the novel was revised again with the radical changes in the ending: the yacht "Arizona" suffered shipwreck and Garin and Zoya found themselves on an uninhabited island...

It seems that from the ideological point of view A.N. Tolstoy did all he could: now after the uprising of the "working masses" Garin didn't sail away with his beloved, but in retaliation had to while away the rest of his life feeding of seaweed and fish on a small piece of land in the middle of the ocean. But no: in 1939 the final edition of *Hyperboloid...* was published (this "canonical" text is preserved in the edition: Tolstoy, 2007), in which the author forced Garin to steal the idea of the "apparatus" from engineer Mantsev thus even more increasing the negative image of Garin...

Meanwhile despite all the efforts to adapt the novel to the ideological "agenda", the Soviet filmmakers of the 1920-1950s were not interested in it. It would seem that the plot of *Hyperboloid...* is cinematic in Hollywood style: the colorful characters are depicted vividly and brightly, the action takes unfolds rapidly in a mixture of detective, science fiction and parody genres.

The time for screening *Hyperboloid...* came in the 1960-1970es, at the peak of interest of the national cinema to adventures and science fiction, when not only cosmic stories were screened (*Planet of Storms*, *Andromeda Nebula*, etc.), but also film adaptations of A. Belyaev's novels

(*Amphibian Man, Air Seller*), and the collections of science fiction stories and novels were selling like hot cakes in bookstores. Science fiction as a genre significantly inhibited by the era of late Stalinism of 1940-es – the beginning of 1950-es once again became not only legitimate, but also officially approved (naturally subject to the rules of the ideological game of the time). So the first film adaptation appeared – *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* (1965) by A. Gintsburg, and later the second one – *Collaps of Engineer Garin* (1973) by L. Kvinihidze.

Of course, ideological clichés of Soviet times didn't spare A. Gintsburg's film as well: for example, the American billionaire Rolling is represented as an embodiment of the "yellow devil" of imperialism, while communist Shelga is a crystal-honest romantic of the Soviet country. However, despite this, the Soviet press of the 1960-s welcomed A. Gintsburg's film very skeptically. For instance, critic V.A. Revich specializing in fiction genre wrote that in the novel *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* A. Tolstoy perfectly reproduced the era of the 1920-es, the world-view of the writer who took the side of the young revolutionary country. In *Hyperboloid...* not scientific but social aspect is the most powerful: the mechanics of the bourgeois relations, stockjobbing, capitalist morality and economics. But this social aspect fell out of the film, with only simplistic detective aspect remaining (Revich, 1968: 83). After 16 years the same author returned to the analysis of this screen adaptation. This time he removed ideological pathos but once again stressed that "despite the eminent cast the film failed. The people who shot the screen version made a typical mistake. The desire not to miss the main story events leads to fluency – a character flashed, an event flew by – and on, and on, faster and faster; there is not enough screen time to peer into the facers, to understand the essence of the events" (Revich, 1984).

However the success with the audience (nearly 21 million people watched it during the first year of distribution) showed that the problems of "speed" of the media text didn't worry the audience. Moreover, perhaps the things that irritated V.A. Revich most in the first adaptation of *Hyperboloid...* served as an additional factor of attraction for the public drawn towards the rapidly developing action, detective intrigue and science fiction which is not burdened by ideology. Of course, at the same time we should keep in mind that the Soviet film market of 1960s - 1970s largely isolated the audience from spectacular Western films which gave the domestic entertaining films additional benefits.

Leonid Kvinikhidze's film *Collaps of Engineer Garin* (1973) was shot in the format of TV mini-series. Probably they were low on budget so the most expensive episodes (the construction of gold mines on the island, the destruction of the squadron of ships, etc.) were dropped out of the plot, and the fiction line of the novel was clearly in the background. Instead the ideological line of the Nazis who wanted to seize Garin's "apparatus" which was thought up by the Screenwriter S. Potepalov, was brought to the foreground.

It is difficult to judge the success of the "*Collaps...*" because in the 1970-es in our country no "TV ratings" have been recorded. However, due to the fact that the number of TV series was extremely small at the time, there is no doubt that this film adaptation attracted no less viewers than A. Gintsburg's film.

Narrative structure in the media text (the main concepts: "media/media text categories", "media technologies", "media languages", "media representations")

During the discussion with the students we can conclude that the novel *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* as well as its screen adaptations is built in the traditional structure of action (fiction, detective) media texts. The plot is clearly divided into the entanglement (in Soviet Russia on the 1920s a series of mysterious events and murders occur, connected with Garin's machine), the development of action (Garin transports the apparatus to the West, forces the billionaire Rolling to cooperate and meets his kept woman Zoya), climax (in various editions and screen adaptations of the novel it is either the destruction of European chemical plants by the deadly beam, or the construction of the gold mine on the island and destruction of the enemy squadron by the hyperboloid) and denouement (in various editions/adaptations: the rise of "revolutionary masses" on the island and the disappearance of Garin; his readiness for new adventures; the shipwreck of Garin's yacht near an uninhabited island; and Garin's death). Psychological and social motivations (in the novel as well as in its film adaptations) are given as a rule without deep nuances (exception – the original interpretation on Garin's role in *Failure...* by O. Borisov).

Schematically the peculiarities of genre modifications, iconography, character ethics, problems of the novel *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* and its film adaptations can be represented as follows:

Historical period, scene of action. In general it is the second half of the 1920s – Soviet Russia, Western Europe (mostly Paris), the seas, an island in the ocean.

The setting, household goods. Modest life, interiors and household goods in Soviet Russia, where the central object is an abandoned cottage near St. Petersburg, where Garin secretly conducts his experiments with the deadly beam. The rich office of billionaire Rolling. Luxurious setting of Garin's empire on the "golden island", comfortable yacht "Arizona"...

Audio-visual techniques, iconography. The visuals of color film *Collaps...* (1973) are rather standard, while the first black and white adaptation *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* is remarkable for its exquisitely fine color performed in the spirit of film noir (American and French criminal films of 1940s – 1950s with its grim motives of doom, fatalism and the elements of expressionism): play with linear light and shade in night scenes; contrasting variations of black and white in daytime scenes, the use of wide-angle lens, unusual camera angles, etc. I believe that the director Alexander Gintsburg (1907-1972), the former cameraman himself, who shot the legendary film *Two Soldiers* (1943), intentionally set this task to the talented cameraman Alexander Rybin. The fast and nervous soundtrack composed by M. Vaynberg (1919-1996), who was already famous for his music to the films *The Cranes are Flying* (1957) and *The Last Inch* (1958), matches the visual style of the film. I suppose that namely the originality of audio-visual solution was evaluated by the jury of the International Fantastic Film Festival in Trieste (1966), which awarded the Grand Prize to A. Gintsburg's film.

The characters, their values, ideas, clothing, constitution, vocabulary, mimics, gestures. V.A. Revich justly noted that in the novel *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* we can "clearly trace mockery, ridicule in relation to most characters. Thus Pyotr Petrovich Garin, a "superman", a dictator and a villain is a typical action adventure character, but his ambition, lust for power, resourcefulness and immorality are served with such excesses that he is perceived as a parody of such character" (Revich, 1984). Brilliant actor Evgeny Evstigneev (1926-1992) why played the role of Garin in the film adaptation in 1965 removed these excesses making the main character a psychologically convincing fanatic of the idea of conquering the world: intelligent, prudent and persistent, not devoid of irony. His character's vocabulary, mimics and gestures are laconic and are subject to the pragmatics of plot circumstances. For the time being his clothes are purely functional, and only on the "golden island" Garin allows himself to realize his design fantasies...

Another outstanding master Oleg Borisov (1929-1994) painted his Garin (in the adaptation of 1973) with different colors, which gave rise to the following ironic passage of the critic: "The engineer rants about lust for power, but in the film he turns out to be rather a gentle lad. Thought he killed two men, it was self-defense. He didn't blow up the plants. Yes, he took away the millionaire's mistress, but we must agree that this cannot be compared with delusional and truly fascist plans of Garin portrayed in the novel. The failure of this Garin and the failure of the small individualist who dreams to become rich with the help of his invention are, as they say, two big differences. Do you want us to see the novel's contemporization in such degradation of the protagonist?" (Revich, 1984).

In my opinion, O. Borisov's work received a clearly distorted assessment here. In *Collaps...* Borisov played not a "gentle lad", but a devilishly clever and shrewd cynic aspiring to conquer the world at any cost. No wonder his character has the ability to appear and disappear mysteriously, possesses the persistence of the tempter and the charm of seduction. Indeed the authors of *Collaps...* removed the "rough edges" of Tolstoy's interpretation of Garin from their adaptation. Not Garin, but Rolling directs the deadly beam at the plants. Garin doesn't abandon Mantsev to die in a distant expedition... Also Garin doesn't create his "golden empire". Facing the fierce and powerful Nazi organization, O. Borisov's character perishes with his apparatus in the ocean...

Playing the role of Garin, O. Borisov demonstrated his rich arsenal of facial expressions and gestures, his unique plasticity and the ability for transformation. Compared to him Garin played by Evgeny Evstigneev is more harsh, cruel and predictable...

As for the main female character, Zoya played by Nonna Terentyeva (1942-1996) from *Collaps...* (1973) looks more spectacular in all aspects than Natalya Klimova in the film adaptation from 1965. Moreover, Zoya in *Collaps...* is presented less schematically than in A. Tolstoy's novel. In

L. Kvinikhidze's film the demonic fanatic of world domination Garin finds a decent girlfriend. This female adventurer puts everything at stake: the men she encounters – Rolling, captain Yanson, and Garin himself – are only pawns in her own big game. There is kind of a sinister charm in Zoya, which reminds of the charm of Milady from *The Three Musketeers* (Revich 1984).

As for the “positive” character, the communist Shelga, it seems to me that both in the novel and in its film adaptations he remains a pale “walking function” of the plot...

Significant changes in lives of the characters. The lives of the main characters – Garin, Zoya, Shelga and Rolling – changes from the moment they meet and enter into a (voluntary/forced) alliance. The culmination of these events in the final version of the novel and in its first film adaptation falls on the creation of Garin's “empire” on the “golden island”. In L. Kvinikhidze's film the culminating events occur on the yacht “Arizona”, on which a Nazi agent Shefer acts.

Originated problem. In the main version of A. Tolstoy's novel and its 1965 adaptation the main problem for Garin is an uprising of “working masses” on the island. In 1973 adaptation a Nazi plot became the main danger for Garin's plans.

Searches for the solution of the problem. Using a small hyperboloid from the yacht “Arizona” Zoya destroys the big hyperboloid on the “golden island”. Garin arrives to her on a zeppelin (later versions of the novel and 1965 film adaptation). In Leonid Kvinikhidze's version it seems that Garin relies only on luck...

The solution of the problem. In the first versions of the novel A. Tolstoy allows Garin to disappear or rush to new adventures... In later versions of the novel and in A. Gintsburg's film adaptation the “solution” of the problem is the shipwreck of the yacht “Arizona”, when Garin and Zoya end up on an uninhabited island. In *The Failure...* Garin's landing on the ocean shore ends with his death...

P.S. Despite the radical changes on political, social and cultural situation in Russia, the popularity of the novel *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* has not declined. For instance, its “sequel”, the novel *The Second Advent of Engineer Garin* was rather successful with the readers (Alko 2001), also we can remember the unfinished attempt of Alexander Abdulov to make another film adaptation of the story about the failed ruler of the world (*Excommunicate*, 2008). And who knows, maybe someday we will see a Hollywood version of *The Hyperboloid...*

5. Soviet science fiction at the turn of the 1950s — 1960s and its American screen transformations

The hermeneutic analysis of cultural context stands for study of the media text interpretation process, of cultural and historical factors that may have an impact both on the media texts authors/agencies and the audience's viewpoint. The hermeneutic analysis is connected with the comprehension of a media text by matching with the cultural tradition and reality; penetration into the logic of a media text; media text analysis based on artistic images comparison in the historical and cultural contexts. The objectives of the audience's film / media education in this case are the following: development of the audience's media culture; their apprehension, analysis and interpretation skills applied to media texts; critical thinking.

Since nearly all modern universities are equipped with networked multi-media one can make the best use of e-libraries and web-archives in film / media studies. Among them we can name the American non-profit Internet archive founded in San Francisco in 1996 (www.archive.org). Its aim is to provide anytime access for researchers and the public at large to various digital historic artifacts (print, visual and audiovisual texts). As the great bulk of media texts presented in the Internet Archive is open and free, it is very convenient for educational aims.

We offer a study guide for using fantasy genre media texts in teaching the media. The teaching methods used at such a lesson are based on the combination of the hermeneutic analysis with the structural, narrative, ethical, ideological, iconographic/visual analyses, the analysis of media stereotypes and media texts characters. We thought it interesting to pursue the transformation of such a typical (and archival) fantastic media text as *Planet of Storm* produced by P. Klushantsev (1961) in the American films – *Voyage to the Prehistoric Planet* (1965) by C. Harrington and *Voyage to the Planet of Prehistoric Women* (1968) by P. Bogdanovich.

The comparative analysis of these media texts will enable us to touch upon not only the socio-cultural, historical, and ideological contexts but also the urgent problem of copyright infringement and counterfeit media products.

A. Silverblatt (Silverblatt, 2001: 80-81), developed the following set of questions for media text hermeneutic analysis in the historical, cultural and structural contexts. In accordance with this scheme we have developed a method of constructing a lesson in media studies for university students.

A. Historical context (Silverblatt, 2001: 80-81).

1. What does the media text tell about the time of its creation?
 - a) When did the premier of this media text take place?
 - b) How did the events of that time affect the media text?
 - c) How does the media text comment on the events of the day?
2. Does the knowledge of the historic events contribute to the media text understanding?
 - a) media texts created during a certain historic event:
 - What events occurred when the media text was being created?
 - How does the understanding of these events contribute to our understanding of the media text?
 - What are genuine historical allusions?
 - Are there any historical references in the media text?
 - How does the understanding of these historical references affect our understanding of the media text?

P. Klushantsev's *Planet of Storms* was produced in the age when the topic of space was extremely popular thought the world. Hence arose scores of fantastic novels, stories, strip cartoons, sci-fi films about faraway planets, intergalactic flights and extraterrestrial civilizations. It was connected not only with the definite progress in space exploration (in the late 1950s the first Earth satellites were launched, some of them with animals on board) but also with a stiff competition between the two antagonistic state systems – the USSR and the USA – both in the world domination and space leadership.

A year before the shooting of the film *Planet of Storms* – on May 1st of 1960, a spy plane of the American pilot F.G. Powers was shot down in the USSR airspace. On April 8, 1961, the then leader of the USSR N.S. Khrushchev sent a note of protest to the USA President J. Kennedy concerning the anti-Castro landing of troops in Cuba. On August 13, 1961, the Kremlin ordered to

begin the building of the infamous Berlin Wall. In 1962 (the year of the beginning of successful distribution of *Planet of Storms*) the USSR started the deployment of missiles in Cuba, and in response to this the USA declared a blockade of the island. That led to the politically tense Cuban Missile Crisis which forced the USSR to withdraw the rockets from Cuba in exchange for the promise of the USA to abandon the occupation of the 'Liberty Island'. And namely in the year when the film *Planet of Storms* (1961) was produced – the Soviet Union triumphantly took the lead over the USA on 12 April – for the first time in the world history a ship with a man on board (it was Yuri Gagarin) was put into orbit. Americans managed to launch a spaceship with their astronaut (A. Shepard) only on 5 May of 1961. On 6-7 August of 1961 G. Titov became the second Soviet cosmonaut to fly in space. In 1962 (the year when the film *Planet of Storms* was released) 5 more people flew into the outer space.

It goes without saying that the political developments of that period could not fail to influence the plot of the media text. As the story unfolds, the crew of the first starship was joint – a Soviet astronaut lands on the surface of Venus together with an American colleague and his robot. The authors' of the film *Planet of Storms* never intended to depict the American character as a greedy and malicious product of the capitalist world: Prof. Kern was presented as a pragmatic person who did not believe (at first) in friendship, but generally as a likable character. That is why we would not insist that the incident with F.G. Powers or the Cuban events affected *Planet of Storms* directly. Most likely, the film of P. Klushantsev and his Screenwriter – A. Kazantsev – the author of numerous sci-fi novels, was a sort of commentary to the general political and socio-cultural context of the late 1950s – early 1960s in the framework of the so-called 'peaceful co-existence' of the two ideologically irreconcilable systems that was officially proclaimed by the USSR. On the tide of the USSR's space advancement *Planet of Storms* was bought by dozens of countries including the USA. As regards the re-edited version of *Planet of Storms* which was shown in the USA under the title *Voyage to the Prehistoric Planet* (1965) it got to the transatlantic screens in the different epoch – after the US President J. Kennedy was killed (November 24th, 1963) and before (since August 2nd, 1964) America began the interminable war in Vietnam...

By that time the first woman – V. Tereshkova (1963) and about a dozen of Soviet and American cosmo/astronauts had already been in the outer space. The relations between the USSR and the USA were far from optimistic, and numerous American outer-space flights had already smoothed the initial shock caused by the Soviet priority in astronautics. That is why it does not seem surprising that the authors of the re-edited version of *Planet of Storms* – film director Curtis Harrington (mentioned in the credit line under the pseudonym of John Sebastian) and producer Roger Corman – by simple renaming and dubbing-in into English transmuted all the characters of the film *Voyage to the Prehistoric Planet* into people of the Western world. No Russians: only Americans plus a Frenchman and a German. G. Zhyonov, Y. Sarantsev, G. Teykh, G. Vernov were mentioned in the credits under Americanized pseudonyms so that American spectators might not guess that the movie used to be Soviet.

However, they went behind renaming and dubbing-in and removed direct visual hints at the Soviet origin of the movie by re-editing, though some of such clues nevertheless remained in the film (for example, the Russian inscription *Sirius* on the cassette recorder), they also cut some episodes that made the action slow (such remarks as: 'We assure the Soviet government, our communist party, all Soviet people that we shall justify the trust...'). And, contrariwise, the American authors added some new episodes (the scenes with an orbiting station 'borrowed' from another Soviet sci-fi film – *The Heavens Call* (1959) and the scenes shot in addition at R. Corman's studio now with true American actors involved). It is hard to tell why the American cinematographers disliked K. Ignatova acting as astronaut Masha. But in the American version of 1965 American actress F. Domergue replaced her and played a similar part of American Marsha Evans instead of Russian Masha.

As a result, the American spectators of 1965 saw the 'American' movie *Voyage to the Prehistoric Planet* about the 'American' flight to Venus.

However, *Voyage to the Prehistoric Planet* (1965) was not a big hitter and, apparently, discouraged the producers. In 1968, Roger Corman made a decision about remaking (of C. Harrington's version this time), having entrusted this mission to American film critic Peter

Bogdanovich who was popular then. As the majority of his colleagues, critic Bogdanovich could not brag of million incomes, that is why he willingly accepted R. Korman's modest offer of \$6000...

P. Bogdanovich did not only remove the elements prolonging the movie (in particular, the by-plot of Masha/Marsha was completely cut) and re-edited it but also added (under the pseudonym Derek Thomas) several huge 'Venusian' scenes to the movie involving some sex-appealing females. That is why the movies deservedly got the enticing title *Voyage to the Planet of Prehistoric Women* (1968).

P. Bogdanovich's version appeared on transatlantic screens a year prior to the American landing on the Moon (though after 1965 another dozen of earthmen flew to space), but almost simultaneously with the invasion of the Soviet troops into Czechoslovakia that nearly returned the relations between the USSR and the USA to the level of the Cuban Missile Crisis. It is quite logical that in this situation the characters of *Voyage to the Planet of Prehistoric Women* kept on having western names and speaking English.

As for the general reason why Americans had an opportunity to alter *Planet of Storms* as they wished, it was quite simple – before 1973 the USSR persistently rejected to sign the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. That is why the people who purchased Soviet artistic products could use them at their option. On the other hand, the Kremlin enjoyed the same right before 1973. Though western films did not contain additional scenes they were frequently re-edited, cut and mutilated in the Soviet Union.

B. Cultural Context (Silverblatt, 2001: 80-81).

1. Media and popular culture: How does the media text reflect, strengthen, suggest or create cultural: a) relations, b) values, c) conduct, d) concern; e) myths.

Depending on the analysis of the chosen media texts in the course of debate students can come to a conclusion that *Planet of Storms* (though within the conventional framework of the fantastic genre) aimed to mirror the relations, values and conduct of Soviet characters taken from the so-called 'code of communism builders'. Whereas C. Harrington's and P. Bogdanovich's versions represented everything in the pragmatic context promoting at the same time the team spirit. In addition, P. Bogdanovich's version presented the mythology of existence of extra-terrestrial civilizations more brightly and obviously (with an accent on mysticism). And, certainly, in every case the authors were concerned about a hypothetical problem of crash of various worlds.

2. Outlook: What world is shown in the media text? (Silverblatt 2001, 80-81).

When answering the question of the 'cultural context' section the students can be offered to fill in Table 4:

Table 4. Philosophy and Outlook of the World Pictured in Media Texts of the Soviet Film Fantasy of the 1950s – 1960s and Its American Screen Transformation

Key questions to media texts	<i>Planet of Storms</i> (1961)	<i>Voyage to the Prehistoric Planet</i> (1965)	<i>Voyage to the Planet of Prehistoric Women</i> (1968)
<i>What is the ideology of this world?</i>	Communist 'peaceful' ideology (USSR, Soviet characters) Pragmatic philosophy (American characters)	Pragmatic ideology	Pragmatic ideology
<i>What outlook does this world represent – optimistic or pessimistic?</i>	Optimistic	Optimistic	Optimistic
<i>What is the hierarchy of values in this outlook?</i> <i>What values can be found in the media</i>	Patriotism – communist values – friendship – professionalism – science – family	Pragmatism – professionalism – science – family	Pragmatism – professionalism – science – family

<i>text?</i>			
<i>What does it mean to be a success in this world? How does a person succeed in this world? What kind of behavior is rewarded in the world?</i>	It means to be a patriot, a skillful and courageous explorer of the cosmos, a true friend and a family man. All the characters without exclusion are stereotypic; their individual traits are feebly presented.	It means to be a skillful and courageous explorer of the outer space, a good professional. All the characters without exclusion are stereotypic; their individual traits are feebly presented.	It means to be a skillful and courageous explorer of the outer space, a good professional. All the characters without exclusion are stereotypic; their individual traits are feebly presented.
<i>Are there any supernatural phenomena in this world?</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 5 will enable the students to better analyze the typology of the characters of the media texts and justify their answers.

Table 5. Typology of Media Texts Characters of the Soviet Film Fantasy of the 1950s – 1960s and Its American Screen Transformation

Description of the category representation in the media text:	<i>Gender signs</i>	Male and female characters
	<i>Age of the character</i>	25-50 years of age (men), 25-30 years of age (women)
	<i>Race of the character</i>	White
	<i>Appearance, clothing, constitution of the character</i>	Earth's male characters, as a rule, strong-built, dressed in costumes of cosmo/astronauts, people at the space station are dressed in traditional civilian clothes. Shapely Venus female inhabitants are dressed in something resembling swimsuits made of marine shells and fall trousers. The only woman-astronaut looks quite ordinary in outward appearance.
	<i>Educational level, occupation of the character</i>	The earthmen, apparently, have higher education. The Venus females – spontaneous.
	<i>Marital status of the character</i>	The earth dwellers are married or single. The Venus females, apparently, do not need men...
	<i>Social position of the character</i>	The earth dwellers are astronauts, research scientists. The Venus females seem to live in the primitive-communal system.
	<i>Character traits</i>	Strength, inventiveness, energy, optimism, boldness, purposefulness (earth characters). Beauty, purposefulness, mystical capabilities, vindictiveness, religiosity (Venus characters)
	<i>Value system (ideological, religious, etc.) of the character</i>	Patriotic, communist values (Soviet characters), pragmatic, bourgeois values (western characters), religious values (Venus characters).
	<i>Acts of the character, his/her methods of the conflict resolution</i>	Acts of the characters depend on the development of the media text plot. Right after the landing on Venus the earth characters demonstrate their best professional qualities. The Venus characters show their ability to cause spontaneous storms trying to resolve the conflict with the aliens who killed their god (pterodactyl) with their help.

It is also possible to use the iconographical analysis of a typical scene of media texts by means of Table 6.

Table 6. Typical Iconographical Scene Codes in Media Texts of the 1950s – 1960s and Their American Screen Transformation

Conventional codes of a typical scene in media texts	Visual characteristics of these codes manifested in media texts
Habitat of characters	They show only the characters' habitat in the space – at the station and on shipboard: control cabins with panel boards, compartments, mess rooms, berths. Everything corresponds to the technology of the 1960s though the action takes place in the distant future.
Space stations and rockets	Outwardly they look rather ingenious, especially the space stations (there is a version that S. Kubrick used this design in his fantastic film <i>2001: A Space Odyssey</i> , 1969).
Venus	Something resembling a semi-desert with fleshy plants like cactuses, with dinosaurs of various sizes, the sea, gross vegetation and manifold underwater world. In P. Bogdanovich's version Venus is populated by half-naked sex-appealing blond sirens that use telepathic communication and mystical faculty.

In the last decade the activities of media teachers of different countries are being consolidated due to the usage of the generalized scheme of key concepts of media education which is based on the works of C. Bazalgette, (Bazalgette, 1995: 48), J. Bowker (Bowker, 1991) and A. Hart (Hart, 1997: 202): *Media Agencies, Media Categories, Media Technologies, Media Languages, Media Representations, Media Audiences*.

As a result, depending on these key concepts and the viewed and studied material students can build a generalized structure of stereotypes characteristic of the Soviet film fantasy of the 1950s – 1960s and its American screen transformation.

The Stereotypes Structure of the Soviet Film Fantasy of the 1950s – 1960s and Its American Screen Transformation

Historical period, scene, genre: relatively far future, the USSR, the USA, Venus. Genre: space sci-fi adventure film. Thematic examples: *Planet of Storms (1961)*, *Voyage to the Prehistoric Planet (1965)*, *Voyage to the Planet of Prehistoric Women (1968)*.

Setting, household objects: functional habitat and household objects of the earthmen, unitized structure of the space objects – bases, cabins and compartments of space crafts. The Venus dwellers have no possessions. They are envired by fleshy plants resembling cactuses, dinosaurs of various sizes, the sea (the underwater world of Venus is rather manifold).

Representation of reality: life of the earthmen (predominantly, astronauts) is shown, as a rule, relatively verisimilarly and always positively. The Venus dwellers are every time presented with some mystical gauze (visual and musical). Venusian dinosaurs and the carnivorous flower behave rather aggressively and incessantly attack the astronauts.

Characters, their values, ideas, morality, clothing, constitution, lexicon, mime, gestures: among the earth dwellers there are no negative characters but their values depend on whether it is a Soviet film (*Planet of Storms*) or its American versions. In the Soviet version USSR astronauts propagate communist values and friendly mutual assistance; in the American ones the western astronauts are pragmatists to the backbone. The American professor from *Planet of Storms* is at first an earnest and consistent pragmatist but after the Russians pull him out of the fire he begins to value the significance of friendship and mutual assistance. The Venusian females in P. Bogdanovich's version have mystical and religious values.

The male characters, as a rule, have a strong constitution and are dressed in space costumes and are presented in the positive way: they are purposeful, active scientists and explorers with a commercial lexicon, restrained gestures and facial expressions. Certainly, the characters of the personages are given only in outline, in all the cases without any penetration into their psychology. All the characters speak (for the convenience of the target language audience) either only Russian or only English. However, in the American versions the astronaut who became a Frenchman pronounces the word **voilà**.

A special character – crazy robot ‘Iron John’ is the envy of Hollywood cinematographers (a real articulated robot actually plays in the film – you won’t meet anything like that even in American movies of the 1940s-1960s! (Kharitonov 2003).

Significant change in the plot of the media text and the characters’ life: the earthmen land on the surface of Venus after a preliminary preparation and discussing their action plan.

Incipient problem: because of the aliens attacks (dinosaurs and the carnivorous flower), volcanic eruptions the lives of the positive characters are under the threat.

Search for solutions to the problem: a struggle of the positive characters with aggressive alien creatures and the elements (with the help of the robot and go-anywhere vehicle and without).

Problem solution: killing of the aggressive Venusian creatures, overcoming the aftereffects of the raging elements (caused by sex-appealing Venusian females in P. Bogdanovich's version), and a successful flight of the astronauts back home...

Students can make a more detailed splitting of the media texts into subject units using (see the Appendix A).

Conclusions. The principal result of the media education lesson is not only the audience’s comprehension of the historical-political, social-cultural contexts and mechanism of propagandist stereotypes formation in sci-fi space movies in the USSR and the USA, but also the audience’s media perception, analytical and interpretation skills, development of critical thinking.

Conclusion

The results of my analysis of the content of Soviet films and TV series of the fantastic genre showed that in total from 1919 to 1991 at least 172 of them were filmed, of which 29 (16.9%) were short films, and 39 (22.7%) television films.

The filmography we have compiled convincingly refutes the popular assertion that the bulk of Soviet science fiction films were shot for children. In fact, only 24 films and series of the fantastic genre were designed specifically for the children's audience, which is only 13.9% of the total number of films shot from 1919 to 1991. The bulk of Soviet science fiction films (86.1%) were films for an adult and family audience. At the same time, due to the fact that the action of many science fiction films did not take place in the USSR, in 42 such films (24.4 %) Baltic actors with a "Western appearance" were filmed, that is, in almost every fourth Soviet science fiction film, Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian actors.

Of all Soviet science fiction films about space and aliens, 59 movies were associated, which is 34.3%.

The distribution of Soviet films by year of release on the screen is as follows (Table 7).

Table 7. Distribution of Soviet films by year of release on screen *

Year of issue on the screen	The number of films of the fantastic genre	Year of issue on the screen	The number of films of the fantastic genre
1919	1	1971	3
1924	1	1972	2
1925	4	1973	7
1928	1	1974	3
1935	1	1975	3
1936	1	1976	4
1941	1	1977	2
1956	1	1978	3
1957	2	1979	5
1958		1980	9
1959	2	1981	4
1960		1982	4
1961	2	1983	3
1962	3	1984	9
1963	2	1985	8
1964		1986	6
1965	2	1987	10
1966	3	1988	13
1967	1	1989	15
1968	5	1990	8
1969	1	1991	13
1970	1		

* Excluding the TV cycle "This Fantastic World".

Thus, from 1919 to 1949, only 10 fantastic films were shot, from 1950 to 1960 — 5. In the 1960s — 19, in the 1970s — 33, in the 1980s — 83, of which the maximum number of fantastic films fall on the years of perestroika. A total of 58 films were released from 1985 to 1991, which is about the same as for the entire period from 1919 to 1980.

So, from Table 7 it is clearly seen that at the time of the peak of the USSR's space achievements (the second half of the 1950s — the first half of the 1960s), the number of science

fiction films (including films about space), contrary to logic, was at a low level (1—3 films per year), while in 1984—1991 it sharply increased to 6—15 films per year.

Most likely, this was due to the following factors: the leaders of Soviet cinematography in the 1950s — 1970s believed (and not without reason) that it was too expensive to mass produce high—quality science fiction related to space flights, whereas during perestroika, science fiction on the screen was often low—budget, parable, arthouse. In addition, one should not forget that in the late 1970s, the State Committee for Cinematography of the USSR officially set a course to increase the spectacularity of film production, therefore, perhaps for the first time in the history of Soviet cinema, the production of science fiction films (including for children) began to be encouraged.

I have no doubt that if the USSR had not collapsed in 1991, and, consequently, the state funding of the film industry would have continued, many films of the fantastic genre would have been shot in the 1990s.

Filmography

(Soviet science fiction films: 1919—1991)

Abduction of the Sorcerer. USSR, 1981. Director and screenwriter Gleb Selyanin (based on the novel of the same name by Kir Bulychev). Actors: Natalia Danilova, Yuri Demich, Vitaly Yushkov, Anatoly Abramov, Anatoly Slyassky, Ivan Krasko and others. **TV premiere on August 5, 1983.**

Abduction of the Sorcerer. USSR, 1989. Directed by Victor Kobzev. Screenwriters Victor Kobzev, Kir Bulychev (based on the novel of the same name by Kir Bulychev). Actors: Julia Aug, Sergey Varchuk, Romualdas Ramanauskas, Victor Solovyov, Vladimir Gostyukhin, Andrey Boltnev, Lev Borisov and others.

Abdullajan, or Dedicated to Steven Spielberg. USSR, 1991. Directed by Zulfikar Musakov. Screenwriters Zulfikar Musakov, Rikhsiva Mukhamedzhanov. Actors: Tuti Yusupova, Rajab Adashev, Shukhrat Kayumov, Sergey Dreiden, Vladimir Menshov, Vladimir Tsvetov and others.

Accident in Utinoozersk. USSR, 1989. Directed by Semyon Morozov. Screenwriter Leonid Treer. Actors: Evdokia Germanova, Lyubov Polishchuk, Vladimir Steklov, Alexander Pankratov—Cherny, Victor Ilyichev, Alexander Pashutin, Alexander Belyavsky, Valentin Smirnitsky, Boris Novikov, Natalia Krachkovskaya, Yuri Prokopovich, Svetlana Starikova, etc.

Adventure of Electronic. USSR, 1979. Directed by Konstantin Bromberg. Screenwriter Evgeny Veltistov (based on his own book). Actors: Yuri Torsuev, Vladimir Torsuev, Vasily Modest, Oksana Alekseeva, Maxim Kalinin, Dmitry Maksimov, Evgeny Livshits, Valeria Soluyan, Nikolay Grinko, Elizaveta Nikishchikhina, Vladimir Basov, Nikolai Karachentsov, Evgeny Vesnik, Maya Bulgakova, Nikolai Makoyarsky, Roza Yuri Chernov, Lev Perfilov and others. **TV premiere: May 2, 1980.**

Aelita. USSR, 1924. Directed by Yakov Protazanov. Screenwriters: Fedor Otsep, Alexey Tolstoy, Alexey Faiko (based on the story of the same name by A. Tolstoy). Actors: Julia Solntseva, Nikolai Batalov, Igor Ilyinsky, Nikolai Tseretelli, Vera Orlova, Valentina Kuindzhi, Konstantin Eggert, Yuri Zavadsky and others.

Aero NT—54. USSR, 1925. Directed by Nikolai Petrov. Screenwriter Nikolai Surovtsev. Actors: Ekaterina Korchagina—Alexandrovskaya, Vladimir Voronov, Alexander Orlov and others. **The film has not survived.**

Air Seller. USSR, 1968. Directed by Vladimir Ryabtsev. Screenwriter Alexander Petrovsky (based on the story of the same name by Alexander Belyaev). Actors: Gennady Nilov, Gleb Strizhenov, Valentina Titova, Pavel Kadochnikov, Artyom Karapetyan, Evgeny Zharikov and others. **TV premiere on March 23, 1968.**

Alien Girl. USSR, 1984. Directed by Yakov Segel. Screenwriters Iosif Olshansky, Yakov Segel. Actors: Liliana Aleshnikova, Vladimir Nosik, Lyudmila Shagalova, Victor Shulgin, Andrey Yurenev and others. **5.9 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Alien Ship. USSR, 1986. Directed by Sergei Nikonenko. Scriptwriter Vladimir Gubarev. Actors: Oleg Tabakov, Ekaterina Voronina, Sergey Nikonenko, Raivo Trass, Valery Gataev, Vladimir Steklov, Natalia Arinbasarova and others. **6.6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Alternative. USSR, 1987. Directed by Anna Victorova. Screenwriter Kir Bulychev (based on his own story "Choice"). Cast: V. Baranov, A. Zolotnitsky, E. Borzova, Yu. Sarantsev and others. **Short film.**

Amphibian Man. USSR, 1962. Directed by Vladimir Chebotarev, Gennady Kazansky. Screenwriters: A. Golburt, A. Kapler, A. Ksenofontov (based on the novel by A. Belyaev). Actors: Vladimir Korenev, Anastasia Vertinskaya, Mikhail Kozakov, Nikolay Simonov and others. Composer Andrey Petrov. **65.5 million viewers in the first year of the show.**

And It Will Echo. USSR, 1987. Director and screenwriter Gennady Tishchenko (based on his own story "Heritage"). Actors: Fakhraddin Manafov, Nadezhda Georgieva, Z. Khaidarova and others.

And Then I looked Back ... / Wedding Photo. USSR, 1981. Directed by Raul Tammet. Screenwriter Svyatoslav Gervassiev. Actors: Rein Aren, Lembit Ulfsak, Raul Tammet and others. **Short film.**

Andromeda's Nebula. USSR, 1968. Directed by Evgeny Sherstobitov. Screenwriters: V. Dmitrievsky, Evgeny Sherstobitov (based on the novel of the same name by Ivan Efremov). Actors: Viya Artmane, Sergei Stolyarov, Nikolai Kryukov, Tatiana Voloshina, Alexander Gai, Yuri Gavriilyuk, Lyudmila Chursina, Gennady Yukhtin, Alexander Goloborodko and others. **15 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Apostate. USSR—West Germany—Austria, 1988. Director and screenwriter Valery Rubinchik (based on the novel by P. Bagryak "Five Presidents"). Actors: Grigory Gladiy, Nikolay Eremenko (senior), Larisa Belogurova, Valentina Shendrikova and others. **1.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Aquanauts. USSR, 1980... Director and screenwriter Igor Voznesensky (based on the story of the same name by S. Pavlov). Actors: German Poloskov, Alexander Yakovlev, Irina Azer, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, Paul Butkevich, Arnis Litsitis, Elena Valaeva, Nikolai Kryukov, Yuri Sarantsev, Artyom Karapetyan, Regina Razuma and others. **8,3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Barrier. USSR, 1991. Director Zaza Iluridze (based on the story of Pavel Vezhinov). Actors: Rodion Nakhapetov, Vera Glagoleva and others. **Short film.**

Birthmark. USSR, 1986. Directed by Leonid Gorovets. Screenwriter Kir Bulychev (based on his own story "Birthmarks"). Actors: Vladimir Nikolenko, Irina Pulina, Maria Vinogradova and others. **Short film.**

Boomerang. USSR, 1980. Directed by Victor Prokhorov. Screenwriter Alexander Lapshin. Actors: Bob Tsymba, Anatoly Solonitsyn, Paul Butkevich, Algimantas Masiulis, Laimonas Noreika, Lembit Ulfsak and others. **Short film.**

Bright Personality. USSR, 1989. Directed by Alexander Pavlovsky. Screenwriters Igor Shevtsov, Alexander Pavlovsky (based on the story "The Bright Personality", the story "Kloop", the play "A Strong Feeling" by Ilya Ilf and Yevgeny Petrov). Actors: Nikolai Karachentsov, Alexandra Yakovleva, Abessalom Loria, Galina Polskikh, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Mikhail Svetin, Andrei Ankudinov, Borislav Brondukov, Victor Pavlov, Vsevolod Shilovsky, Alexander Demyanenko, Igor Dmitriev, Mikhail Kokshenov, Victor Ilyichev and others.

Captain Nemo. USSR, 1975. Directed by Vasily Levin. Screenwriters Vasily Levin, Edgar Smirnov (based on the novels by Jules Verne "20,000 Leagues Under the Sea" and "The Steam House"). Actors: Vladislav Dvorzhetsky, Yuri Rodionov, Mikhail Kononov, Vladimir Talashko, Marianna Vertinskaya, Vladimir Basov, Gennady Nilov, Alexander Porokhovshchikov and others. **TV premiere: March 29, 1976.**

Chance. USSR, 1984. Directed by Alexander Mayorov. Screenwriters Kir Bulychev, Alexander Mayorov (based on the novel "The Martian Potion" by Kir Bulychev). Actors: Sergei Plotnikov, Igor Shkurin, Maria Kapnist, Dilorom Kamarova, Raisa Kurkina, Veronika Izotova, Victor Pavlov, Sasha Evteev, Lyudmila Ivanova, Maya Menglet, Elena Tonunts, Boris Ivanov, Igor Yasulovich, Sergei Zhigunov and others. **13,8 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Charming Aliens. USSR, 1991. Directed by Nikolai Fomin. Screenwriters Varlen Strongin, Nikolai Fomin. Actors: Alexander Pyatkov, Irina Malysheva, Alexander Kulyamin, Raisa Ryazanova, Roman Filippov, Timofey Spivak, Alexander Belyavsky, Alexander Pankratov—Cherny, Irina Feofanova and others.

Children under 16 ... USSR, 1973. Directed by Igor Voznesensky. Screenwriter Vladimir Vasiliev. Actors: Seryozha Zavodchikov, Igor Shakryl, Victor Kozankov, Dima Kuntyshev, Elena Valaeva, Evgeny Kindinov, Oleg Golubitsky and others. **Short film.**

Choice. USSR, 1976. Directed by Nikolai Lukyanov (based on a story by Kir Bulychev). **Short film.**

City of Zero. USSR, 1989. Directed by Karen Shakhnazarov. Screenwriters Alexander Borodyansky, Karen Shakhnazarov. Actors: Leonid Filatov, Oleg Basilashvili, Vladimir Menshov, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Evgeny Evstigneev, Alexey Zharkov, Pyotr Shcherbakov, Elena Arzhanik and others.

Collapse of Engineer Garin. USSR, 1973. Directed by Leonid Kvinikhidze. Scriptwriter Sergei Potepalov (based on the novel by A. Tolstoy "The Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin"). Actors: Oleg Borisov, Nonna Terentyeva, Alexander Belyavsky, Vasily Korzun, Gennady Saifulin, Mikhail Volkov, Vladimir Tatosov, Efim Kopelyan, Grigory Gai, Ernst Romanov, Vitaly Yushkov, Alexander Kaidanovsky, Algimantas Masulis, Valentin Premier Nikulin, etc. **TV premiere - October 15, 1973.**

Comet. USSR, 1984. Directed by Richard Victorov, Yuri Chulyukin. Screenwriters Kir Bulychev, Richard Victorov. Actors: Anatoly Kuznetsov, Nadezhda Sementsova, Alena Belyak, Dmitry Zolotukhin, Vladimir Basov, Svetlana Radchenko, Natalya Martinson, Valentin Smirnitsky, Fedor Stukov, Yuri Chulyukin, Pavel Arsenov, Georgy Millyar and others. **2,2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Communit. USSR, 1925. Directed by Yakov Morin. Actors: Lyantse, Banovsky, Vladimir Shakhovskoy, V. Arnoldov, Semyon Bryumer and others. **The film has not survived.**

Dandelion Wine. USSR, 1972. Director and screenwriter Rodion Nakhapetov (based on the novel by R. Bradbury). Actors: Maria Durasova, Vladimir Zeldin, Mahmud Esambaev, Inga Volodina, Andrey Musin and others. **Short film.**

Day of Spirits. USSR, 1991. Directed by Sergei Selyanov. Screenwriters Mikhail Konovalchuk, Sergey Selyanov. Actors: Yuri Shevchuk, Borya Golyatkin, Gennady Garbuk, Victor Semyonovsky, Olga Grigorieva and others.

Day of Wrath. USSR, 1985. Directed by Sulambek Mamilov. Screenwriter Alexander Lapshin (based on the story of the same name by Sever Gansovsky). Actors: Juozas Budraitis, Aleksey Petrenko, Anatoly Ivanov, Grazhina Baikshite, Svetlana Svetlichnaya, Konstantin Zakharchenko, Maryana Polteva, Vladimir Ivashov, Evgeny Dvorzhetsky and others. **10.8 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Dead Man's Letters. USSR, 1986. Directed by Konstantin Lopushansky. Screenwriters: Konstantin Lopushansky, Vyacheslav Rybakov, Boris Strugatsky. Actors: Rolan Bykov, Iosif Ryklin, Victor Mikhailov, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, Svetlana Smirnova and others. **9.1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Death of a Sensation. USSR, 1935. Directed by Alexander Andrievsky. Screenwriter Georgy Grebner (based on the play "RUR" by Karel Chapek). Actors: Sergei Vecheslov, Vladimir Gardin, Maria Volgina, Anna Chekulaeva, Vasily Orlov, Sergei Martinson, Sergei Minin, Pavel Poltoratsky, Alexandra Khokhlova, etc.

Death Ray. USSR, 1925. Directed by Lev Kuleshov. Screenwriter Vsevolod Pudovkin (based on V. Kataev's novel "The Lord of Iron"). Actors: Porfiry Podobed, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Sergey Komarov, Vladimir Fogel, Alexandra Khokhlova, Semyon Khokhlov, N. Stravinskaya, Andrey Gorchilin, Pyotr Galadzhhev, Leonid Obolensky, Mikhail Doller and others.

District Domino Competitions. USSR, 1989. Director and screenwriter Mikhail Borshchevsky (based on the story of the same name by Kir Bulychev). Actors: V. Kuraskua, Anatoly Skoryakin, Vyacheslav Kirilichev, Yuri Ovchinnikov, etc. **Short film.**

Do You Exist, Mr. Jones? USSR, 1961. Directed by Leonid Piver (based on the work of the same name by Stanislaw Lem). **TV. Short film.**

Document "R". USSR, 1985. Directed by Valery Kharchenko. Screenwriter Alexander Jurowski (based on the novel of the same name by Irving Wallace). Actors: Osvalds Berzins, Evald Hermakula, Romualds Ancans, Klara Belova, Mikk Mikiver, Elle Kull and others. **TV premiere on August 7, 1985.**

Dog's Heart. USSR, 1988. Directed by Vladimir Bortko. Screenwriter Natalia Bortko (based on the story of the same name by Mikhail Bulgakov). Actors: Evgeny Evstigneev, Boris Plotnikov, Vladimir Tolokonnikov, Nina Ruslanova, Olga Melikhova, Alexey Mironov, Roman Kartsev, Angelica Nevolina and others. **TV premiere: November 20, 1988.**

Dolphin's Cry. USSR, 1987. Directed by Alexey Saltykov. Screenwriter Nikolai Cherkashin (based on his own story "The Secret of "Archelon"). Actors: Ivar Kalninch, Donatas Banionis, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Yuri Vasiliev, Paul Butkevich, Rostislav Yankovsky and others. **16.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Dominus. USSR, 1989. Directed by Alexander Khvan. Screenwriter Ivan Loshchilin (based on the story "The Spit" by Ray Bradbury). Actors: Victor Evgrafov, Elena Evseenko and others. **Short Film.**

Don't Fly Away, Earthling! USSR, 1991. Directed by Vadim Kostromenko. Screenwriter Dmitry Kostromenko. Actors: Lena Naumchik, Grigory Goldstein, Alla Oding and others. **Short film.**

Dr. Abst's Experiment. USSR, 1969. Directed by Anton Timonishin. Screenwriter Alexander Nasibov (based on his novel "Mad Men"). Actors: Sergei Desnitsky, Laimonas Noreika, Zhanna Vladimirskaia, Gennady Voropaev, Uldis Pucitis, Vytautas Tomkus, Vyacheslav Voronin, Peeter Card, Olev Eskola, Les Serdyuk, Evgeny Vesnik and others. **29.4 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Dragon Hunt. USSR – Nicaragua, 1987. Directed by Latif Fayziev. Screenwriter Nikolai Ivanov. Actors: Alisher Pirmukhamedov, Mirdza Martinsone, Albert Filozov, Bakhodir Yuldashev, Boris Zaydenberg, Lembit Ulfsak and others **15.2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Dream to Meet. USSR, 1963. Directed by Mikhail Karyukov, Otar Koberidze. Screenwriters: Alexander Berdnik, Ivan Bondin, Mikhail Karyukov. Actors: Nikolai Timofeev, Otar Koberidze, Larisa Gordeychik, Boris Borisenok, Nikolai Volkov and others. **12,7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Dungeon of Witches. USSR–Czechoslovakia, 1990. Directed by Yuri Moroz. Screenwriter Kir Bulychev. Actors: Sergey Zhigunov, Marina Levtova, Nikolay Karachentsov, Dmitry Pevtsov, Igor Yasulovich, Zhanna Prokhorenko, Vladimir Talashko and others.

Eclipse Days. USSR, 1988. Directed by Alexander Sokurov. Screenwriters: Yuri Arabov, Arkady Strugatsky, Boris Strugatsky (based on the story by A. and B. Strugatsky "A Billion Years Before the End of the World"). Actors: Alexey Ananishnov, Iskander Umarov, Irina Sokolova, Vladimir Zamansky, Victor Belovolsky and others. **0.7 million viewers in the first year of demonstration in cinemas.**

Eighth Day of Creation. USSR, 1980. Directed by Suren Babayan. Screenwriters Suren Babayan, Friedrich Gorenstein (based on the stories of R. Bradbury "The Martian Chronicles", "April 2026", "Long Years"). Actors: Afanasy Trishkin, Yuri Bogatyrev, Vladimir Kocharyan, Ara Ter–Grigoryan, E. Krasnoshchekova and others. **Short film.**

Electronic Grandmother. USSR, 1985. Directed by Algimantas Puipa. Scriptwriters Olga Rukenglaz (based on stories by Ray Bradbury). Actors: Ingeborga Dapkunaite, Ina Rosenaitė, Darius Palekas and others. **TV.**

End of Eternity. USSR, 1988. Directed by Andrey Ermash. Screenwriters Andrey Ermash, Budimir Metalnikov (based on the novel of the same name by I. Asimov). Actors: Oleg Vavilov, Vera Sotnikova, Georgy Zhzhonov, Sergei Yursky, Gediminas Girdvainis, Boris Ivanov, Boris Klyuev and others. **4.0 million viewers in the first year of distribution.**

Eolomea. DDR–Bulgaria–USSR, 1972. Directed by Herrmann Zschoche. Screenwriters Willie Brueckner, Angel Wagenstein (based on the book by Angel Wagenstein). Actors: Cox Hubbema, Ivan Andonov, Rolf Hoppe, Vsevolod Sanaev, Petr Slabakov and others. **1,5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Escape of Mr. McKinley. USSR, 1975. Directed by Mikhail Schweitzer. Screenwriter Leonid Leonov (based on his own story of the same name). Actors: Donatas Banionis, Zhanna Bolotova, Angelina Stepanova, Boris Babochkin, Alla Demidova, Vladimir Vysotsky, Alexander Vokach, Sophia Garrel, Leonid Kuravlev, Tatyana Lavrova, Victor Sergachev, Vladimir Kenigson, Olga Barnet, Yuri Volyntsev, Igor Kashvasha, Igor Alexey Safonov, Nikolay Volkov, Natalia Leble and others. **11,4 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Escape to the Ends of the World. USSR, 1991. Directed by Alexander Mayorov. Scriptwriters Vladimir Akimov, Alexander Mayorov. Actors: Alexander Rosenbaum, Tengiz Archvadze, Alexander Ivashkevich, Ekaterina Strizhenova and others.

Eternal Man. USSR, 1988. Directed by Edgar Virapyan. **Short film.**

Executor 977. USSR, 1989. Directed by Otar Litanishvili. Screenwriters David Akhobadze, Otar Litanishvili. Actors: Gogi Todriya, Nugzar Kurashvili, Khatuna Ioseliani and others.

Experiment 200. USSR, 1986. Director Yuri Moroz (based on K. Bulychev's story "Jubilee—200"). Actors: Alexey Petrenko, Alexander Feklistov, Olga Gobzeva, Vadim Zakharchenko, Alexander Berda, Vladimir Sychev, Victor Rakov, Andrey Gusev and others. **Short film.**

Extraordinary Adventures of Karik and Valya. USSR, 1987. Directed by Valery Rodchenko. Screenwriter Alexander Alexandrov (based on the novel of Ian Larry). Actors: Vasily Livanov, Anna Dikul, Alexei Chertsov, Elena Popova, Victor Mikhailov, Olga Volkova, Mikhail Svetin, Leonid Yarmolnik and others. **TV premiere on March 25, 1988.**

Ferris Wheel. USSR, 1989. Directed by Marina Tsurtsumia. Screenwriters Ivan Loshchilin, Marina Tsurtsumia (based on a story by Ray Bradbury). Actors: Boris Yukhananov, Ignat Chikov, Dima Brodov and others. **Short Film.**

Five of the Brave. USSR, 1971. Directed by Leonid Martynyuk. Screenwriter Ales Osipenko. Actors: Alexander Primako, Raimundas Banionis, Tanya Shchigelskaya, Kostya Lenevsky, Lenya Shepelev, Nikolai Nikitsky and others. **8,1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Five Seconds Before the Catastrophe. USSR, 1978. Directed by Anatoly Ivanov. Screenwriter Pyotr Popogrebsky. Actors: Pavel Pankov, Valentina Talyzina, Alexander Movchan, Stepan Oleksenko, Paul Butkevich, Eugenia Pleshkita, Vitaly Doroshenko, Nikita Podgorny, Laimonas Noreika, Olga Mateshko, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, etc. **2,7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Flight to Thousands of Suns. USSR, 1963. Directed by Alexey Erin. Screenwriter V. Ponomarev. Actors: Victor Birtsev, Misha Ess. **Short film.**

Go Ahead, Manya! USSR, 1991. Directed by Roman Ershov. Screenwriters Igor Vinnichenko, Roman Ershov. Actors: Sergei Bekhterev, Yulia Menshova, Evgeny Vesnik, Alexander Slastin, Leonard Varfolomeev, Georgy Millyar, Roman Filippov, Victor Bychkov, Evgeny Morgunov, Anatoly Azo, Stanislaw Sadalsky and others.

Gold Chain. USSR, 1987. Directed by Alexander Muratov. Screenwriters Alexander Muratov, Vladimir Sosyura (based on the novel of the same name by Alexander Green). Actors: Vladislav Galkin, Valentinas Masalskis, Boris Khimichev, Povilas Gaidis, Igor Slobodskoy, Svetlana Romashko, Vladimir Golovin, Vladimir Simonov, Eleonora Koriznaite, Janis Zarinsh, Arnis Licitis, Juris Strenga and others.

Goldfishes. USSR, 1981. Directed by Alexander Mayorov. Screenwriters: Alexander Mayorov, Kir Bulychev (based on the fantastic the story of Kir Bulychev "Goldfish are on sale"). Actors: Elena Maksimova, Nikolay Parfyonov, Galina Polskikh, Mikhail Kononov, Alyosha Gusev, Tatiana Bozhok, Sergey Balabanov, Valentina Titova, Igor Yasulovich and others.

Great Space Journey. USSR, 1975. Directed by Valentin Selivanov. Screenwriters: Sergei Mikhalkov, Valentin Selivanov (based on the play by Sergei Mikhalkov "The First Three, or Year 2001"). Actors: Lyudmila Berlinskaya, Sergey Obraz, Igor Sakharov, Luciena Ovchinnikova and others. **7,1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Green Doll. USSR, 1980. Directed by Avtandil Kvirikashvili. Screenwriter Vytautas Zhalakevicius (based on the story "Doll" by Ray Bradbury). Actors: Donatas Banionis, Juozas Kiselyus, Alexander Abdulov, David Mkrtychyan, Algimantas Masiulis, Albert Filozov. **Short film.**

Guest from the Future. USSR, 1984. Directed by Pavel Arsenov. Scriptwriters Pavel Arsenov, Kir Bulychev (based on the science fiction novel by Kir Bulychev "One Hundred Years Ahead"). Actors: Natalya Guseva, Alexey Fomkin, Ilya Naumov, Vyacheslav Nevinny, Mikhail Kononov, Maryana Ionesyan, Elena Metelkina, Evgeny Gerasimov, Vladimir Nosik, Igor Yasulovich, Georgy Burkov, Valentina Talyzina, Natalya Varley, Andrey Gradov, Elena Tsyplakova and others. **TV: March 25, 1985.**

Gum—Gam. USSR, 1985. Directed by Oleg Eryshev. Screenwriter Leonid Paley (based on the fantastic story by Evgeny Veltistov). Actors: Volodya Mitrofanov, Denis Zaitsev, Illarion Naydenko, Vika Bocharova, Ivan Dorrer, Nikita Eryshev, Ksenia Balandina, Mikhail Boyarsky and others. **TV premiere on November 2, 1985.**

His Name was Robert. USSR, 1967. Directed by Ilya Olschwanger. Screenwriters Lev Kuklin, Yusef Princev. Actors: Oleg Strizhenov, Marianna Vertinskaya, Mikhail Pugovkin, Alexey

Dranitsyn, Marcel Marceau, Nina Mamaeva and others. **17,5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Hotel "At the Dead Mountaineer's". USSR, 1980. Directed by Grigory Kromanov. Screenwriters Arkady and Boris Strugatsky. Actors: Uldis Pucitis, Juri Jarvet, Lembit Peterson, Mikk Mikiver, Karlis Sebris, Irena Kryuzaitė, Sulev Luik, Tiit Härm, Nijole Ozhelite and others. **17,5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

How to be Happy. USSR, 1986. Directed by Yuri Chulyukin. Screenwriters Georgy Kushnirenko, Yuri Chulyukin. Actors: Nikolai Karachentsov, Lev Durov, Marina Dyuzheva, Vsevolod Shilovsky, Vladimir Shevelkov, Elena Valyushkina, Tatiana Peltzer, Lyudmila Chulyukina, Semyon Farada and others. **11.2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin. USSR, 1966. Directed by Alexander Gintsburg. Screenwriters Alexander Gintsburg, Joseph Manevich (based on the story of the same name by Alexei Tolstoy). Actors: Evgeny Evstigneev, Vsevolod Safonov, Mikhail Astangov, Natalya Klimova, Vladimir Druzhnikov, Mikhail Kuznetsov, Yuri Sarantsev, Pavel Springfeld and others. **20.8 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

I was a Satellite of the Sun. USSR, 1959. Director: Victor Morgenstern. Screenwriters Vladimir Kapitanovsky, Vladimir Shreiberg. Actors: Pavel Makhotin, Vladimir Emelyanov, Grigory Shamshurin, Anatoly Shamshurin, Georgy Vitsin and others.

Ideal Crime. USSR, 1990. Directed by Igor Voznesensky. Screenwriter Zinovy Yuriev (based on his own novel "Complete Rework"). Actors: Remigius Sabulis, Elena Proklova, Alexander Vokach, Vladimir Steklov, Vytautas Paukšė and others.

If this Happens to You. USSR, 1973. Directed by Igor Nikolaev. Screenwriter Vyacheslav Naumov. Actors: Sergey Obraz, Ekaterina Malinina, Seryozha Komolov, Volodya Tsvetkov, Vladlen Paulus, Svetlana Konovalova and others. **5,4 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Incredible Case. USSR, 1990. Directed by Rashid Malikov. Screenwriter Sergei Beglerov. Actors: Bahram Matchanov, Khusan Sharipov, Andrey Bubashkin, Andrey Shitikov, Ingrida Mikyalionite and others.

Invisible Man. USSR, 1977. Director and screenwriter Gleb Selyanin (based on the novel of the same name by H.G. Wells). Actors: Rostislav Katansky, Mikhail Danilov, Galina Volkova, Boris Ulitin, Mikhail Svetin, Anatoly Ravikovich, Olga Volkova, Anatoly Puzyrev and others. **TV.**

Invisible Man. USSR, 1985. Directed by Alexander Zakharov. Screenwriters Alexander Zakharov, Vladlen Kagarlitsky (based on the novel of the same name by H.G. Wells). Actors: Andrei Kharitonov, Romualdas Ramanauskas, Leonid Kuravlyov, Natalia Danilova, Oleg Golubitsky, Nina Agapova, Victor Sergachev, Yuri Katin—Yartsev, Emmanuel Geller and others. **20.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Iron Heel. Russian Federation, 1919. Directors: Vladimir Gardin, Tamara Glebova, Andrey Gorchilin, Evgeny Ivanov—Barkov, Leonid Leonidov, Olga Preobrazhenskaya. Screenwriters: Vladimir Gardin, Anatoly Lunacharsky (based on the novel of the same name by Jack London). **The film has not survived.**

Island of the Rusty General. USSR, 1988. Directed by Valentin Khovenko. Screenwriter Kir Bulychev (based on his story "Island of the Rusty Lieutenant"). Actors: Ekaterina Prizhbiljak, Alexander Lenkov, Mikhail Danilov, Lyudmila Artemieva, Stanislaw Sokolov, Sergei Skripkin, Vladimir Balon and others. **TV premiere on May 1, 1988.**

It's Hard to Be a God. Germany—USSR—France—Switzerland, 1990. Directed by Peter Fleischmann. Screenwriters: Jean—Claude Carriere, Dal Orlov, Peter Fleischmann (based on the novel of the same name by the Strugatsky brothers). Actors: Edward Zhentara, Alexander Filippenko, Anne Gauthier, Christina Kaufman, Andrey Boltnev, Pierre Clementi, Mikhail Gluzsky, Elguja Burduli, Werner Herzog, Regimantas Adomaitis and others.

Ivan Vasilievich Changes his Profession. USSR, 1973. Directed by Leonid Gaidai. Screenwriters: Vladlen Bakhnov, Leonid Gaidai (based on the play by Mikhail Bulgakov). Actors: Yuri Yakovlev, Leonid Kuravlyov, Alexander Demyanenko, Savely Kramarov, Natalya Selezneva, Natalya Krachkovskaya, Natalya Kustinskaya, Vladimir Etush, Mikhail Pugovkin, Sergey Filippov, etc. **60, 7 million viewers in the first year of screening in cinemas.**

June 31st. USSR, 1978. Directed by Leonid Kvinikhidze. Screenwriters Nina Fomina, Leonid Kvinikhidze (based on the story by John B. Priestley). Actors: Natalia Trubnikova, Nikolay Eremenko, Vladimir Zeldin, Vladimir Etush, Lyudmila Vlasova, Alexander Godunov, Lyubov Polishchuk, Igor Yasulovich, Emmanuel Geller, Mikhail Kokshenov, Vladimir Soshalsky and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1978.**

Just Awful! USSR, 1982. Directed by Alexander Polynnikov. Screenwriter Yaroslav Kharechko (based on the play of the same name by Yuri Sotnik). Actors: Dmitry Zamulin, Semyon Morozov, Fyokla Tolstaya, Galina Venevitinova, Alla Budnitskaya, Leonid Kuravlyov, Lydia Ezhevskaya, Alexander Shirvindt, Natalya Krachkovskaya, Elizaveta Nikishchikina, Evgenia Khanaeva, Georgy Georgiu and others.

Kid. USSR, 1987. Directed by Alexey Borodin, Yulia Kosareva. Screenwriter Dina Danilova (the story of the same name by Arkady and Boris Strugatsky). Actors: Tatiana Kuryanova, Yulien Balmusov and others. **Premiere on TV June 23, 1987.**

Kind of Contacts. USSR, 1987. Directed by Valery Obogrelov (adaptation of K. Bulychev's story "May I ask Nina?"). Actors: Ernst Romanov, Anastasia Nikolskaya and others. **TV, short film.**

Kin—Dza—Dza! USSR, 1987. Directed by Georgy Danelia. Screenwriters Revaz Gabriadze, Georgy Danelia. Actors: Stanislaw Lyubshin, Evgeny Leonov, Yuri Yakovlev, Levan Gabriadze, Olga Mashnaya, Irina Shmeleva, Lev Perfilov and others. **15.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Last Alternative. USSR, 1978. Directed by Vladimir Latyshev. Screenwriters Vladislav Nechaev, Vladimir Latyshev (based on I. Asimov's novel "The Naked Sun"). Actors: Igor Komarov, Georgy Vasiliev, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Lyudmila Kryachun, Vladimir Erenberg and others. **TV.**

Loyal Robot. USSR, 1965. Director and screenwriter Ivan Rassomakhin (based on the play by Stanislaw Lem). Actors: Sergey Yursky, Vladislav Strzhelchik, Vladimir Erenberg and others. **TV.**

Madman and Angel / Orult es angyal. Hungary—USSR, 1989. Director: Tamas Toth. Actors: Zoltan Ternyak, Gyorgy Cerhalmi, Geza Balkai, Assan Koyat, Anita Zhukovskaya and others.

Madmen's Trial. USSR, 1962. Director and screenwriter Grigory Roshal. Actors: Vasily Livanov, Irina Skobtseva, Victor Khokhryakov, Vladimir Belokurov, Vladimir Emelyanov, Andrei Konchalovsky, Alexander Smirnov, Lidia Sukharevskaya, Mikhail Kozakov, Vladimir Balashov, Yuri Yakovlev, Maya Bulgakova, Harry Duntz, Ariadna Shengelaya and others. **8.6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Man from Nowhere. USSR, 1961. Directed by Eldar Ryazanov. Screenwriter Leonid Zorin. Actors: Sergey Yursky, Yuri Yakovlev, Anatoly Papanov, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Ninel Myshkova, Anatoly Adoskin, Vladimir Muravyov, Yuri Belov and others.

Means Makropulos. USSR, 1978. Directed by Maya Markova, Vladimir Monakhov (based on the play of the same name by Karel Čapek). Actors: Nelly Kornienko, Vladimir Kenigson, Eduard Martsevich, Alexander Ovchinnikov, Evgeny Vesnik, Evgenia Glushenko and others. **Premiere on TV March 11, 1979.**

Mediator. USSR, 1990. Directed by Vladimir Potapov. Screenwriter Alexander Mirer (based on the first part of his own novel "House of Wanderers".) Actors: Olesya Sudzilovskaya, Andrey Tarasenko, Dasha Sidorina, Denis Chlenov, Inara Slutska, Valery Storozhik, Algis Matulionis and others. **Premiere on TV December 22, 1990.**

Memory Formula. USSR, 1982. Directed by Alexander Krivonos, M. Novitsky. Screenwriter Boris Nikolsky (based on his own novel of the same name). Actors: Ivan Solovyov, Igor Vasiliev, Irina Akulova, Oleg Efremov, Zinaida Sharko and others. **TV.**

Mirror for the Hero. USSR, 1988. Directed by Vladimir Khotinenko. Screenwriter Nadezhda Kozhushanaya (based on the story of the same name by Svyatoslav Rybas). Actors: Sergei Koltakov, Ivan Bortnik, Boris Galkin, Felix Stepun, Natalya Akimova, Elena Golyanova, Nikolai Stotsky, Alexander Peskov and others. **3.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Möbius Leaf. USSR, 1988. Directed by Leonid Partigul. Scriptwriter Vladimir Gribanov (based on the story of the same name by A. J. Deutsch). Actors: Vladimir Salnikov, B. Breslavsky. **Short film.**

Monday Starts Saturday. USSR, 1965. Director Alexander Belinsky (based on the novel of the same name by the Strugatsky brothers). Actors: Vladimir Smirnov, Inna Slobodskaya, Leonard Sekirin, Victor Kostetsky, Roman Litvinov, etc. **Premiere on TV December 28, 1965.**

Moonlight Rainbow. USSR, 1983. Directed by Andrei Ermash. Screenwriters Valentin Yezhov, Andrei Ermash (based on the novel of the same name by S. Pavlov). Actors: Vladimir Gostyukhin, Igor Starygin, Vasily Livanov, Yuri Solomin, Vladimir Kenigson, Georgy Taratorkin, Grazhina Baikshite, Natalia Sayko, Alexander Porokhovshchikov, Gediminas Girdvainis, Boris Ivanov, Leonid Nevedomsky and others. **10,6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Moscow – Cassiopeia. USSR, 1974. Directed by Richard Victorov. Screenwriters Abner Zak, Isai Kuznetsov. Actors: Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Vasily Merkuriev, Lev Durov, Yuri Medvedev, Pyotr Merkuriev, Misha Ershov, Vladimir Basov (Jr.), Olga Bityukova and others. **7,2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Museum Visitor. USSR—Switzerland, 1990. Director and screenwriter Konstantin Lopushansky. Actors: Victor Mikhailov, Vera Mayorova—Zemskaya, Vadim Lobanov, Irina Rakshina, Alexander Rasinsky, etc.

Musical Games. USSR, 1989. Directed by Vitaly Aksenov. Screenwriters Vitaly Aksenov, Sergey Kurekhin. Actors: Igor Kornelyuk, Yan Smelyansky, Georgy Traugot, Anatoly Slivnikov, Evgeny Tilicheev, Semyon Furman, Edita Piekha, Boris Shtokolov, Andrei Voznesensky and others.

Mysterious Island. USSR, 1941. Directed by Edward Penzlin. Screenwriters Boris Shelontsev, Mikhail Kalinin (based on the science fiction novel of the same name by Jules Verne). Actors: Alexey Krasnopolsky, Pavel Kiyansky, Andrey Andrienko—Zemskov and others. **17 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Mysterious Wall. USSR, 1968. Directed by Irina Povolotskaya, Mikhail Sadkovich. Screenwriters: Irina Povolotskaya, Alexander Chervinsky, Nikolai Sadkovich. Actors: Lev Krugly, Tatyana Lavrova, Irakli Uchaneishvili, Andrei Mironov, Valentin Nikulin, Irina Povolotskaya, Alexander Kaidanovsky and others. **3,7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Mystery of the Eternal Night. USSR, 1956. Directed by Dmitry Vasiliev. Screenwriter Igor Lukovsky (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Ivan Pereverzev, Konstantin Bartashevich, Mikhail Astangov, Apollon Yachnitsky, Danuta Stolyarskaya and others. **18 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Mystery of Two Oceans. USSR, 1957. Directed by Konstantin Pipinashvili. Screenwriters: Vladimir Alekseev, Nikolai Rozhkov, Konstantin Pipinashvili (based on the novel by G. Adamov). Actors: Sergei Stolyarov, Igor Vladimirov, Sergei Golovanov, Pyotr Sobolevsky, Vakhtang Ninua, Sergei Komarov, Antonina Maksimova, Leonid Pirogov, Pavel Luspekaev, Mikhail Gluzsky and others. **31.2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Napoleon Gas. USSR, 1925. Director and screenwriter Semyon Timoshenko. Actors: Elena Chaika, Evgeny Boronikhin, Roman Rubinstein, Iona Talanov, Pyotr Kuznetsov, Olga Spirova and others.

New Adventures of the Yankees at the Court of King Arthur. USSR, 1989. Directed by Victor Gres. Screenwriters Mikhail Roshchin, Victor Gres (based on the story of Mark Twain). Actors: Sergei Koltakov, Albert Filozov, Elena Finogeeva, Alexander Kaidanovsky, Anastasia Vertinskaya, Evgeny Evstigneev, Evdokia Germanova, Vladimir Soshalsky and others. **4.4 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Oh, This Awful, Awful TV. USSR, 1990. Directed by Temur Palavandishvili. Screenwriters: Levan Chelidze, Devi Ivanov—Chikovani, Temur Palavandishvili. Actors: Vakhtang Panchulidze, Abessalom Loria, Baya Dvalishvili, Mamuka Kikaleishvili and others. **TV.**

One Fine Day. USSR, 1976. Directed by July Gusman. Screenwriter Maksud Ibragimbekov. Actors: Cast: Semyon Farada, Sergey Yursky, Inara Guliyeva and others. **Short film.**

One Fine Evening in 2000. USSR, 1973. Directed by Vitaly Aksenov. **Short film.**

Orion's Loop. USSR, 1981. Directed by Vasily Levin. Screenwriters Alexey Leonov, Valentin Selivanov. Actors: Leonid Bakshataev, Gennady Shkuratov, Vitaly Doroshenko, Anatoly Mateshko, Lyudmila Smorodina, Anatoly Azo, Andrey Gradov, Givi Tokhadze, Liya Eliava, Elena Tonunts, Yuri Menshagin, Boris Rudnev, Alexey Leonov, Vitaly Sevastianov and others. **9,4 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Paradise Apples. USSR, 1974. Director and screenwriter Georgy Shchukin (based on Martti Larni's story "Socrates in Helsinki"). Actors: Vyacheslav Shalevich, Boris Tenin, Lidia Sukharevskaya, Galina Pirnazarova, Yuri Chulyukin, Leonid Satanovsky, Yuri Volyntsev, Zinoviy Gerdt, Rita Gladunko, Eve Kivi, Valery Nosik, Gotlib Roninson, Victor Filippov and others. **7,1 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

People and Dolphins. USSR, 1984. Directed by Vladimir Khmelnitsky. Screenwriters: Yuri Alikov, Alexey Leontiev, Vladimir Khmelnitsky. Actors: Igor Ledogorov, Galina Yatskina, Vasily Yatskin, Natalya Fateeva, Vladimir Talashko, Milena Tontegode, Evgeny Leonov—Gladyshev and others. **TV premiere on August 14, 1984.**

Pilot Pirx's Inquiry. USSR – Poland, 1980. Directed by Marek Piestrak. Scriptwriters Vladimir Valutsky, Marek Piestrak (based on Stanislaw Lem's story "Inquiry"). Actors: Sergei Desnitsky, Alexander Kaidanovsky, Vladimir Ivashov, Tynu Saar and others. **15,8 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Planet of Storms. USSR, 1962. Directed by Pavel Klushantsev. Screenwriters Alexander Kazantsev, Pavel Klushantsev (based on the story of the same name by Alexander Kazantsev). Actors: Vladimir Emelyanov, Gennady Vernov, Georgy Zhzhonov, Kyunna Ignatova, Yuri Sarantsev, Georgy Teikh. **20 million viewers in the first year of the show.**

Poltergeist—90. USSR, 1991. Directed by Vladislav Semernin, Boris Zagryazhsky. Screenwriter Vladislav Semernin. Actors: Alexey Batalov, Remigius Sabulis, Inna Pivars, Natalia Florenskaya, Igor Andrianov, Boris Gorbunov and others.

Privy Counselor. USSR, 1989. Director and screenwriter Aghasy Ayvazyan. Actors: Karen Janibekyan, Yuri Aroyan, Igor Kvasha and others.

Professor Dowell's Testament. USSR, 1984. Director and screenwriter Leonid Menaker (based on the story of A. Belyaev "The Head of Professor Dowell"). Actors: Olgert Kroders, Igor Vasiliev, Alexey Bobrov, Valentina Titova, Natalia Sayko, Nikolai Lavrov, Alexander Porokhovshchikov, Ernst Romanov and others. **18.7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Puppy from the Constellation Hounds. USSR, 1991. Directed by Eduard Gavrilov. Screenwriters Eduard Gavrilov, Lilia Nemenova (based on the story of the same name by Lilia Nemenova). Actors: Boris Shuvalov, Evgenia Dobrovolskaya, Vera Voronkova, Valentin Smirnitsky, Spartak Mishulin, Lyubov Polishchuk, Valery Nosik, Alexander Lazarev (Jr.), Nikolai Parfyonov and others.

Purple Ball. USSR, 1987. Director and screenwriter Pavel Arsenov (based on the story of the same name by Kir Bulychev). Actors: Natalia Guseva, Alexander Gusev, Vyacheslav Neviny, Boris Shcherbakov, Vyacheslav Baranov, Svetlana Kharitonova, Igor Yasulovich, Victor Pavlov, Sergey Nikonenko, Vladimir Nosik, Marina Levtova and others.

Rainbow Formula. USSR, 1966. Directed by Georgy Yungvald—Khilkevich. Screenwriter Yuri Chernyavsky. Actors: Nikolai Fedortsov, Raisa Nedashkovskaya, Savely Kramarov, Ivan Ryzhov, Frunzik Mkrtchyan, Georgy Vitsin, Lev Stepanov, Roman Tkachuk, Natalya Varley, Nikolai Grinko, Evgeny Shutov, Zoya Fedorova, etc. **The film was not released on a wide screen (although some reports went in limited rental on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR).**

Recipe for Her Youth. USSR, 1984. Directed by Evgeny Ginzburg. Screenwriter Alexander Adabashyan (based on the play by Karel Čapek "The Makropulos Means"). Actors: Lyudmila Gurchenko, Oleg Borisov, Alexander Abdulov, Anatoly Romashin, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Elena Stepanova, Sergey Shakurov and others. **14.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Return from the Stars. USSR, 1989. Directed by Vladimir Latyshev, O. Larionov (based on Stanislaw Lem's novel "Return from the Stars"). Actors: Valery Solovyov, Sergey Vlasov, A. Oleinikov, Olga Onishchenko, Marina Solopchenko, Svetlana Slizhikova and others. **TV.**

Return of the Doctor. USSR, 1980. Directed by Andrey Ermash. Screenwriters Valentin Yezhov, Andrey Ermash (based on the stories by J. Seidel "There and Back" and R. Dahl "Sound Machine"). Actors: Georgy Taratorkin, Vyacheslav Ezepev, Boris Ivanov, Yuris Strenga and others. **Short film.**

Road to the Stars. USSR, 1957. Directed by Pavel Klushantsev. Screenwriters Boris Lyapunov, Vasily Soloviev. Actors: Georgy Solovyov, Georgy Kulbush, Dmitry Shatrov and others.

Sandwich. USSR, 1989. Directed by Peter Stein (based on Stanislaw Lem's story "Do You Exist, Mr. Jones?"). Actors: Victor Rakov, Vladimir Belousov, Tatiana Ryleeva, Marina Troshina and others. **TV.**

Satellite of the Planet Uranus. USSR, 1991. Director and screenwriter Haji Akhmar (based on the story of A. Belyaev "Ariel"). Actors: Iskander Akhmar, Yuri Volkov, Pavel Makhotin, Alexey Alekseev and others.

Seven Elements. USSR, 1985. Directed by Gennady Ivanov. Screenwriters Gennady Ivanov, Vladimir Shcherbakov (based on the science fiction novel of the same name by V. Shcherbakov). Actors: Igor Starygin, Irina Alferova, Hanna Dunovskaya, Uldis Norenbergs, Alexander Filippenko, Boris Khimichev, Lyubov Virolainen, etc. **7,2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Shining World. USSR, 1984. Director and screenwriter Bulat Mansurov (based on the works of Alexander Green). Actors: Tiit Härm, Ilze Liepa, Pavel Kadochnikov, Lev Prygunov, Alexander Vokach, Gleb Strizhenov, Yuri Katin—Yartsev and others. **14.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Silence of Dr. Evens. USSR, 1974. Director and screenwriter Budimir Metalnikov. Actors: Sergei Bondarchuk, Janna Bolotova, Irina Skobtseva, Leonid Obolensky, Igor Kuznetsov, Boris Romanov and others. **16 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Sky is Calling. USSR, 1959. Directed by Alexander Kozyr, Mikhail Karyukov. Screenwriters: Evgeny Pomeschchikov, Alexey Sazonov, Mikhail Karyukov. Actors: Ivan Pereverzev, Alexander Shvorin, Konstantin Bartashevich, Gurgun Tonunts and others. **20 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Solaris. USSR, 1968. Directed by Boris Nirenburg, Lidiya Ishimbaeva. Screenwriter Nikolai Kemarsky (based on the novel of the same name by Stanislaw Lem). Actors: Vasily Lanovoy, Antonina Pilyus, Vladimir Etush, Victor Zozulin and others. **TV premiere — 1968.**

Solaris. USSR, 1973. Directed by Andrei Tarkovsky. Screenwriters Andrei Tarkovsky, Friedrich Gorenstein (based on the novel of the same name by Stanislaw Lem). Actors: Donatas Banionis, Natalia Bondarchuk, Yuri Yarvet, Vladislav Dvorzhetsky, Nikolai Grinko, Anatoly Solonitsyn and others. **10.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Sold Appetite. USSR, 1928. Directed by Nikolai Okhlopkov, Iosif Rona. Screenwriters Anatoly Mariengof, Nikolai Erdman (based on the pamphlet of the same name by Paul Lafargue). Actors: Ambrose Buchma, Mark Tsibulsky, Anisim Suslov (Reznikov) and others. **The film has not survived.**

Solo. USSR, 1979. Director and screenwriter Raul Tammet (based on the story "Death of a Ferryman" by Peeter Vallack). Actors: Viyu Kirvits, Mikk Mikiver, Gunnar Graps, Utah Lehiste, Peet Raig and others. **Short film.**

Something with the Phone. USSR, 1979. Directed by Konstantin Osin. Screenwriter Anatoly Grebnev (adaptation of K. Bulychev's story "May I ask Nina?"). Actors: Anatoly Grachev, Iya Arepina, Lyudmila Marchenko and others.

Space Flight. USSR, 1936. Directed by Vasily Zhuravlev. Screenwriter Alexander Filimonov. Actors: Sergei Komarov, Vasily Kovrigin, Nikolai Feoktistov, V. Gaponenko, Ksenia Moskalenko, Sergei Stolyarov and others. **20.0 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Spiral. USSR, 1990. Directed by Giuli Chokhanelidze. Screenwriter Vazha Gigashvili (based on the novel of the same name by Guram Panjikidze). Actors: Levan Uchaneishvili, Otar Megvinetukhutsesi, Edisher Magalashvili, Liya Eliava, Iya Parulava and others. **TV.**

Stalker. USSR, 1979. Directed by Andrei Tarkovsky. Screenwriters Arkady Strugatsky, Boris Strugatsky, Andrei Tarkovsky (based on the "Roadside Picnic" by the Strugatsky brothers).

Actors: Alexander Kaidanovsky, Anatoly Solonitsyn, Nikolai Grinko, Alisa Freindlikh and others. **4.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Star Inspector. USSR, 1980. Directed by Mark Kovalev, Vladimir Polin. Screenwriters: V. Smirnov, Mark Kovalev, Boris Travkin. Actors: Vladimir Ivashov, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Yuri Gusev, Timofey Spivak, Valentina Titova and others. **5,6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Star Trip. USSR, 1982. Directed by Boris Ivchenko. Screenwriter Evgeny Shatko (based on his own story "Alien—73"). Actors: Vladimir Nosik, Elena Melnikova, Grazhina Baikshite, Les Serdyuk, Borislav Brondukov, Vsevolod Gavrilov, Bogdan Brondukov and others. **6.7 million spectators in the first year of the demonstration.**

Step from the Roof. USSR, 1971. Director: Radomir Vasilevsky. Screenwriter Radiy Pogodin. Actors: Dmitry Nikolaev, Neta Boyarskaya, Georgy Millyar, Nikolai Kornoukhov, Anatoly Yabbarov, Alexander Potapov, Lev Prygunov, Anatoly Obukhov, Vladimir Balon, Roman Tkachuk, Georgy Vitsin, Elizaveta Nikishchikina, Borislav Brondukov, Antonina Shuranova and others.

Story of an Experienced Pilot. USSR, 1984. Directed by Omar Gvasalia. Screenwriters: Omar Gvasalia, Goderdzi Chokheli. Actors: Gia Badridze, Guram Pirtskhalava, Georgy Mataradze, Sofiko Chiaureli and others. **TV.**

Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. USSR, 1986. Directed by Alexander Orlov. Screenwriters Georgy Kapralov, Alexander Orlov (based on the novel of the same name by R.L. Stevenson). Actors: Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Alexander Feklistov, Anatoly Adoskin, Alexander Lazarev (senior), Bruno Freundlich, Alla Budnitskaya, Eduard Martsevich, Leonid Satanovsky, Alexander Vokach, Alexander Kirillov, Tatiana Okunevskaya and others. **14.0 million viewers in the first year demonstrations.**

Summer Impressions of the Planet Z. USSR, 1986. Directed by Evgeny Markovsky. Screenwriter Yuri Tomin (based on his own book "Carousels over the city"). Actors: Arnas Katinas, Giedrius Puskunigis, Sergey Shakurov and others. **TV premiere on January 5, 1987.**

Talking Machine. USSR, 1970. Director and screenwriter Gleb Selyanin (based on the story by J. Kruss). Actors: Nikolai Boyarsky, Natalya Markova, Elizaveta Uvarova, Alexey Savostyanov, Irina Zarubina, Natalya Brodskaya, Elena Efimova, Tatyana Bedova, etc. **TV.**

Temptation B. USSR, 1991. Directed by Arkady Sirenko. Screenwriters Arkady Strugatsky, Boris Strugatsky (based on his own work "Five Spoons of Elixir"). Actors: Lembit Ulfsak, Oleg Borisov, Natalya Gundareva, Vladimir Zeldin, Stanislaw Sadalsky, Alexander Pashutin and others.

The Last Crook. USSR, 1966. Directed by Vadim Mass, Jan Ebner. Screenwriters Alexey Sazonov, Zinovy Paperny. Actors: Nikolai Gubenko, Sergey Filippov, Anastasia Georgievskaya, Svetlana Savyolova, Oleg Popov, Boris Sichkin and others. **3,6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Third Planet. USSR, 1991. Director and screenwriter Alexander Rogozhkin. Actors: Anna Matyukhina, Boris Sokolov, Svetlana Mikhailchenko, Konstantin Polyansky, etc.

Thirteenth Apostle. USSR, 1988. Directed by Suren Babayan. Screenwriters Suren Babayan, Georgy Nikolaev (based on Ray Bradbury's "The Martian Chronicles"). Actors: Juozas Budraitis, Andrey Boltnev, Vladas Bagdonas, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Donatas Banionis, Algis Matulionis, Valentinas Masalskis, Juris Riinieks, Mikk Mikiver, Vladimir Kocharyan, Ingeborga Dapkunaite, Elle Kull and others.

This Fantastic World. USSR, 1979—1990. Directors: Tamara Pavlyuchenko, Victor Spiridonov, Antonina Zinovieva. Cast: Yuri Bogatyrev, Eduard Martsevich, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, Victor Sergachev, Evgeny Evstigneev, Juozas Budraitis, Leonid Kayurov, Yuri Yakovlev, Sergei Yursky and others. **TV. 16 series.**

This Fun Planet. USSR, 1973. Directed by Yuri Saakov, Yuri Tsvetkov. Screenwriters: Dmitry Ivanov, Yuri Saakov, Vladimir Trifonov. Actors: Victor Sergachev, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Leonid Kuravlyov, Alexander Vokach, Larisa Barabanova, Savely Kramarov, Natalia Krachkovskaya, Vladimir Nosik and others. **The premiere on TV on December 31, 1973.**

Through Hardship to the Stars. USSR, 1981. Directed by Richard Victorov. Screenwriters Kir Bulychev, Richard Victorov. Actors: Elena Metelkina, Vadim Ledogorov, Nadezhda Sementsova, Alexander Lazarev, Alexander Mikhailov, Boris Shcherbakov, Igor

Ledogorov, Igor Yasulovich, Vladimir Fedorov, Gleb Strizhenov, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, Yevgeny Karelskikh, Uldis Lieldidzh, Lyudmila Filyadiy Nilskaya and other. **20.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Throw, or It All Started on Saturday. USSR, 1976. Directed by Serik Raibayev. Screenwriters Felix Frantsuzov, Alexander Shlepyanov (based on the fantastic story "The Ability to Throw a Ball" by Kir Bulychev). Actors: Esbolgan Zhaisanbaev, Asanali Ashimov, Galina Shetenova, Lev Tyomkin and others. **TV.**

To Aldebaran! USSR, 1989. Directed by Boris Nikolaevsky. Screenwriter Sergei Bondarenko (based on the play by A. Sudarev). Actors: Vyacheslav Baranov, Alexey Zolotnitsky and others. **TV. Short film.**

Trial 1968, USSR. Directed by Evgeny Ostashenko. Screenwriters: Victor Arkhangelsky, Evgeny Ostashenko (based on the story of the same name by Stanislaw Lem). Actors: Victor Pavlov, Mikhail Kolkunov, Nikolay Kryukov and others. **Short film.**

Under the Constellation of Tweens. USSR, 1979. Directed by Boris Ivchenko. Screenwriters Igor Rosokhovatsky, Ivan Mykolaichuk (based on the story "The Guest" by Igor Rosokhovatsky). Actors: Vsevolod Gavrillov, Gennady Shkuratov, Boris Belov and others. **3,8 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Unicum. USSR, 1984. Directed by Vitaly Melnikov. Screenwriters: Alexander Zhitinsky, Vitaly Melnikov (based on Alexander Zhitinsky's story "Dreams"). Actors: Vasily Bochkarev, Evgenia Glushenko, Olga Starostina, Tatyana Plotnikova, Stanislaw Sadalsky, Galina Volchek, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Mikhail Kozakov, Evgeny Leonov, Yuri Bogatyrev, Nina Ruslanova, Baadur Bronlaviduerjakova, Borislauschina Sharnova Ekaterina Durova and others. **6,7 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Valley of the Serpents. USSR – Poland – Vietnam, 1988. Directed by Marek Piestrak. Screenwriters: Vladimir Valutsky, Marek Piestrak, Wojciech Nijniński (based on the science fiction novel by Robert Stratton (pseudonym of Wieslaw Gurnicki) "Dr. Traven's Hobby"). Actors: Krzysztof Kohlberger, Eva Salacka, Roman Wilhelmi, Sergei Desnitsky and others. **32.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Veld. USSR, 1988. Director and screenwriter Nazim Tulyakhodzhaev (based on stories by Ray Bradbury). Actors: Yuri Belyaev, Nelly Pshennaya, Georgy Gegechkori, Tamara Skhirtladze and others. **7.2 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Voice of Memory. USSR, 1983. Directed by Victor Zhilko. Screenwriter Georgy Nikolaev (based on the stories of Ray Bradbury "The Martian Chronicles"). Actors: Yuris Strenga, Nikolay Grinko, Sasha Zhilko, Tambet Yurno and others. **Short Film.**

Wake up Mukhin. USSR, 1968. Directed by Yakov Segel. Screenwriters Anatoly Grebnev, Yakov Segel. Actors: Sergey Shakurov, Liliana Aleshnikova, Alexander Palees, Valery Kozinets, Nikolai Rybnikov, Nikolai Sergeev, Ivan Ryzhov and others.

Weapon of Zeus. USSR, 1991. Directed by Nikolai Zaseev—Rudenko. Screenwriters Evgeny Veltistov, Boris Chirkov (based on the novel "Nocturne of Emptiness" by Evgeny Veltistov). Actors: Igor Vasiliev, Juozas Kiselyus, Nele Savichenko—Klimene, Svetlana Kopylova, Peteris Gaudins, Alla Larionova, Milena Tontegode, Andrejs agars, Valery Storozhik, Vladimir Korenev and others. **TV.**

Who is Behind the Wall? USSR, 1977. Director and screenwriter Semyon Reitburt. Actors: Anatoly Grachev, Irina Kalinovskaya, Evgeny Lazarev, Felix Ivanov and others. **Short Film.**

Wise Measure. USSR, 1988. Directed by Valery Ponomarev. Screenwriter Nikolai Matukovsky (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Borislav Brondukov, Victor Tarasov, Tatyana Vasilyeva, Victor Gogolev, Tatyana Rogozina, Vladimir Konkin, Stefania Stanyuta, Raisa Ryazanova and others.

Wizards. USSR, 1982. Directed by Konstantin Bromberg. Screenwriters Arkady Strugatsky, Boris Strugatsky (based on his own story "Monday starts on Saturday"). Actors: Alexandra Yakovleva, Alexander Abdulov, Valentin Gaft, Ekaterina Vasilieva, Valery Zolotukhin, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Mikhail Svetin, Roman Filippov, Semyon Farada, Leonid Kharitonov, Nikolai Parfyonov and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1982.**

Wonderful Boy. USSR, 1970. Directed by Alexander Orlov, Leonid Pekur. Screenwriters: Oscar Volin, Igor Vinogradsky, Alexander Orlov. Actors: Nikita Golubentsev, Zane Lieldija, Valentin Nikulin, Valentin Gaft, Yuri Sarantsev, Leonid Kanevsky, Alla Budnitskaya and others. **TV premiere on January 1, 1971.**

Youths in the Universe. USSR, 1975. Directed by Richard Victorov. Screenwriters Abner Zak, Isai Kuznetsov. Actors: Misha Ershov, Sasha Grigoriev, Volodya Savin, Vladimir Basov (Jr.), Olga Bitjukova, Nadezhda Ovcharova, Irina Savina, Vadim Ledogorov, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Igor Ledogorov, Lev Durov and others. **10.6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

Zombie Variant. USSR, 1985. Directed by Evgeny Egorov. Screenwriters Vyacheslav Naumov, Evgeny Egorov. Actors: Aristarkh Livanov, Yuri Gusev, Valery Ivchenko, Irena Dubrovskaya, Romualdas Ramanauskas and others. **11.5 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration.**

About the Author

Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov is the former President of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (2003-2014), editor-in-chief of Journal "Media Education".

He is the member of Russian Academy of Cinematographic Arts & Sciences, Russian Union of Filmmakers and FIPRESCI.

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

Postdoctoral affiliation: guest professor and visiting senior research scholar in: *Central European University* (Budapest, Hungary: 1998, 2006), *Kassel University* (Germany, 2000, grant DAAD), *Humboldt University* (Berlin, Germany, 2005, grant DAAD), *Maison des sciences de l'homme* (Paris, France, 2002, 2009), *Kennan Institute* (The Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, D.C., U.S., 2003), *Mainz University* (2010, grant DAAD), *University of Frankfurt* (2014, grant DAAD).

He is the holder of UNESCO Global Media and Information Literacy Award (2019) and many prizes for his books and scientific achievements.

He received the scientific grants/fellowships from: *Russian Science Foundation* (2017-2019), *Russian Foundation for the Basis Research* (2018-2020), *Federal Target Program of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science* (2010-2013), *Program of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science "Development of Science University Potential"* (2006-2008), *Russian President Program for Leading Scientific Schools* (2003-2005), *MacArthur Foundation* (USA, 1997, 2003-2004), *Russian Foundation for Humanities* (1999-2010); *President of Russian Federation Cultural Foundation* (2002), *The Russian Ministry of Education The Program "Russian Universities"* (2002); *Research Support Scheme* (2000-2002, USA); *Program "Civil Society"* (1998-1999, USA); *HESP-CDC - Course Development Competition* (1998, USA); *Education Program for the best text of university lectures* (1997); *Switzerland Scientific Foundation* (2000); *Russian Ministry of Education: research in humanities area* (1997-2000), DAAD (Germany, 2000, 2005; 2010; 2014), *Kennan Institute* (USA, 2003), *Maison des sciences de l'homme* (Paris, France, 2002, 2009), etc.

He was the speaker in the many international media culture and media education/literacy conferences: "Megatrends and media" (Slovakia, 2016, 2017), World United Nation Forum 'Alliance of civilizations" (Media Literacy Section, Madrid, 2008), Council of Europe Conference "Media Literacy" (Graz, Dec. 2007), International Media Literacy Conference (Prague, Apr. 2007), UNESCO Media Education Conference (Paris, June, 2007), Information Technologies International Conference (Moscow, May, 2007), International Conference E-Citizen. (Moscow, Feb. 2006), UNESCO Conference on the Information Society (St.Petersburg, May, 2005), Conference of Association for Media and Technology in Education, Concordia University (Montreal, Canada, May, 2003), National Media Education Conference: 'Literacy & Liberty' (AMLA: Alliance for Media Literate America) (Baltimore, U.S., June, 2003), World Congress 'Toys, Games and Media', University of London, Institute of Education (London, UK, Aug. 2002), The Council of Europe: Hearing on Internet Literacy (Strasbourg, France, March 2002), 3rd World Summit on Media for Children (Thessaloniki, Greece, March 2001), International Council for Educational Media ICEM-CIME – Conference 'Pedagogy and Media' (Geneva, Switzerland, Nov. 2000), World Summit 2000: Children, Youth and the Media - Beyond the Millennium (Toronto, Canada, May 2000), AGORA European Children's' Television Center Summit (Thessaloniki, Greece, June, 1999), Educating for the Media and the Digital Age: UNESCO International Conference (Vienna, Austria, UNESCO, Apr. 1999), World Media Education/Literacy Summit (Sao-Paulo, Brazil, May 1998), Media & Science Forum (Montreal, Canada, Oct. 1997), Youth and the Media, Tomorrow: UNESCO International Conference (Paris, France. UNESCO, Apr. 1997) and many others.

He is the author of 500 articles and 30 books about film history and film criticism, media culture, media literacy education. e-mail: 1954alex@mail.ru

List of Selected Publications of Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov

- Fedorov, A. (1994). The Russian Screen since 1960. *Audience (USA)*, N 179, p. 20-22.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Film & TV – The Features of Mass Culture. *Audience (USA)*, N 184, p. 40-41.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Filmclubs Yesterday & Today. *Audience (USA)*, N 183, p. 15-17.
- Fedorov, A. (1996). Crime on the Russian Screen. *Audience (USA)*, N 186, p. 14-16.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Cinema Art in the Structure of Russian Modern Media Education. In: *Educating for the Media and Digital Age*. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, p. 100-105.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Media Education in Russia. In: *Educating for the Media and Digital Age*. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, p. 93-95.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). The Cinema Market: What about Russia? *Canadian Journal of Communication*, N 24, p. 141-142.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). En Sammenlignende Analyse Mellom Tyskland og Russland. *Media I Skole og Samfunn (Norway)*, N 4, p. 38-41.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). The Digital Media Challenge & Russian Media Education. In: *Pedagogy and Media: The Digital Shift*. Geneva: ICEM-CIME, p. 21.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). The Terminology of Media Education. *Art & Education*, N 2, p. 33-38.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). A Russian Perspective. *Educommunication (Belgium)*, N 55, p. 92-95.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Media and Media Education. *Alma Mater*, N 11, p. 15-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Violence on the TV and Russian Youth. *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities*, N 1, p. 131-145.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Von der Filmpadagogie zur Medienpädagogik. *MERZ: Medien + Merziehung (Germany)*, N 4, p. 256-261.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Elektroniske og digitale medier og russiske barn: Problemet med lovregulering. *Tilt (Norway)*, N 4, p. 22-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. In: *MENTOR. A Media Education Curriculum for Teachers in the Mediterranean*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Austrian Issue in the Mirror of Russian Media (1945-1955). *Mediaenimpulse (Austria)*, N 12, p. 37-39.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Russia//Media Education in Europe. *Media Education Journal (Scotland)*. N 37, p.20-21.
- Fedorov, A. (2006.) Media Education Must Become Part and Parcel of the Curriculum. In: *Thinking Classroom*. Vol.7. N 3, p.25-30.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media Study in the Classroom: Creative Assignments for Character Analysis. *Thinking Classroom*. 2007. N 3. p.13-19.
- Fedorov, A. (2009). Media Education in Russia: A Brief History. In: Marcus Leaning (Ed.). *Issues in Information and Media Literacy: Criticism, History and Policy*. Santa Rosa, California: Informing Science Press, p.167-188.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Media Educational Practices in Teacher Training. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2010, Vol. 3, N 3, p.57-70.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Russian Media education Literacy Centers in the 21st Century. *The Journal of Media Literacy (USA)*. 2010. Vol. 57. NN 1-2, p.62-68.
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Alfabetización mediática en el mundo. *Infoamérica*. 2011. N 5, p.7-23. http://www.infoamerica.org/icr/icr_05.htm
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Assessment of Students' Media Competence: Test Results Analysis. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2011, vol.4, N 4, p.67-81. <http://adn.teaching.ro>
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Modern Media Education Models. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2011, vol.4, N 1, p.73-82. <http://adn.teaching.ro>

- Fedorov, A. (2012). "The Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin": the Novel and its Adaptation to Media Education Lessons in the Student Audience. *European Researcher*. 2012. Vol. 30. № 9-3, p.1579-1584.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). Elevers grep om detektivfortellinger. *Tilt*. 2012. N 1. Mediepedagogene. <http://www.mediepedagogene.no/elevs-grep-om-detektivfortellinger>
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Production Dynamics of Western Films Connected with 'The Soviet/Russian Topic'. *Film International*. 2012. N 2, p.53-64.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Hermeneutical Analysis of the Soviet Fantasy Genre of the 1950s – 1960s and Its American Screen Transformation in Media Studies in a Student Audience. *European researcher*. 2012. N 11-3, p.2042-2055.
- Fedorov, A. (2013) The Image of the West on the Soviet Screen in the Era of the "Cold War": Case Studies. *European Researcher*. 2013. N 2. Vol.3, p. 497-507.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). The Ideological, Structural Analysis of the Russian Image Representation in the Cold War Times' Film 'White Nights'. *European researcher*. 2013. N 4, Vol. 3, p.1044-1050.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). The Image of Russia on the Western Screen: the Present Stage (1992–2013). *European researcher*. 2013. N 4, Vol. 3, p. 1051-1064.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Analysis of Media Stereotypes of the Russian Image in Media Studies in the Student Audience (example: the screen versions of Jules Verne's Novel "Michael Strogoff"). *European Researcher*, 2014, Vol.(83), № 9-2, pp. 1718-1724.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Hermeneutic Analysis of Soviet Feature Films of 1941-1942 on the Military Theme. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 69, N 2-2, p.358-371.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Media Education in Russia: Past and Present. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 67, N 1-2, p.168-175.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Media Education Literacy in the World: Trends. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 67, N 1-2, p.176-187.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Moscow Media Education Centers for Non-professionals in the Media Fields. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 69, N 2-2, p.176-187.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Nazi Feature Films on the Russian Topic: Hermeneutic Analysis. *European Journal of Social and Human Sciences*. 2014, Vol. 3, № 3, pp.111-117.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russian and Western Media Literacy Education Models. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 73, № 4-2, pp. 764-780.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russian Image on the Federal Republic of Germany Screen. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 77, N 6-2, p.1194-1212.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). The Opinions of Russian School Students and Teachers about Media Violence. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 73, № 4-2, pp. 781-804. URL: http://www.erjournal.ru/journals_n/1399226928.pdf
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russia. In: Silverblatt, A. (Ed.). *The Praeger Handbook of Media Literacy* (in 2 volumes). Santa Barbara, California and Oxford, England: Praeger, 2014, pp.918-929.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Ukraine. In: Silverblatt, A. (Ed.). *The Praeger Handbook of Media Literacy* (in 2 volumes). Santa Barbara, California and Oxford, England: Praeger, 2014, pp.941-946.
- Gilbert, L., Fedorov, A. (2004). A Model for Media Education Research in Russia and the US. *Educational Media International*, Vol. 41, N 2, p. 157-162.
- Fedorov, A. et al. (2017). Directions, goals, tasks, author's concepts of audiovisual media interpretations of the topic of the school and university in the Russian cinema (1992-2017). *Media Education*. 4: 206-235.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). The Image of the white movement in the Western feature cinema (1931-2016). *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 1(1): 11-17.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). Western cinema in the mirror of the Soviet film criticism. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 1(2): 75-107.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). Leviathan and Sunstroke: opinions of the Russian film critics. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 2(1): 9-15.

- Fedorov, A. (2017). Polish cinema in the mirror of the Soviet and Russian film critics. *Media Education*. 2: 220-239.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). Soviet cinema in Cinema Art Journal. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 2(2): 79-89.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). Soviet film critics about soviet cinema: from censorship to Gorbachev's perestroika. *Media Education*. 1: 213-277.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). The Western World in Soviet and Russian Cinema (1946–2016). *Russian Education & Society*. 59(7-9): 319-464.
- Fedorov, A. (2019). Schools and universities in audiovisual media: experts opinions. *Communication Today*. 10(1): 110-122.
- Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Camarero, E. (2016). Curricula for Media Literacy Education According to International Experts. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*. 17(3): 324-334.
- Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Gorbatkova, O. (2018). The structural model of the contents of audiovisual media texts on school and university topic. *Media Education*. 56(1): 197-203.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). Media education. In: Big Russian Encyclopedia. Vol. 17. M.: Big Russian Encyclopedia: 480.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Analysis of audiovisual media texts. M.: Direct—Media, 182 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Children's rights and the problem of violence on the Russian screen. Moscow: Direct—Media, 406 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Ecological theme in Russian fiction cinematography of the sound period: problems and tendencies. M.: Direct—Media.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Film Studies in the University Students' Audience: From Entertainment Genres to Art House. Moscow, 233 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education and media literacy. Moscow: Direct—Media, 343 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education in foreign countries. Moscow: Direct—Media, 139 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education in pedagogical universities. Moscow: Direct—Media.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education of future teachers. Moscow: Direct—Media, 315 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education: sociological surveys. Moscow: Direct—Media, 217 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education: yesterday and today. Moscow: Direct—Media, 233 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Transformations of the image of Russia on the Western screen: from the era of ideological confrontation (1946–1991) to the modern stage (1992–2010). Moscow: Direct—Media, 230 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education: history, theory and methodology. M.: Direct—Media.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Western Screen: Authors and Stars (Notes from the Last Century). Moscow: Direct—Media, 338 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Development of media competence and critical thinking of students of a pedagogical university. Moscow: Direct—media, 618 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Film studies in the university students' audience: from entertainment genres to art house. Moscow, 232 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Glossary of terms on media education, media pedagogy, media literacy, media competence. Moscow: Direct—media.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russia. In: Silverblatt, A. (Ed.). The Praeger Handbook of Media Literacy (Vol. 2). Santa Barbara, California and Oxford, England: Praeger: 918–929.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Evolution of the image of the White movement in Russian and foreign fiction cinematography of the sound period. Moscow, 120 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Film Criticism. Moscow, 382 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Media education: history and theory. M.: “Information for all”, 450 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Media Literacy Education. Moscow, 577 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Russia in the Mirror of the Western Screen. Moscow, 117 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Transformations of the image of Russia on the Western screen: from the era of ideological confrontation (1946–1991) to the modern stage (1992–2015). Moscow, 221 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). Cinematography in the mirror of Soviet and Russian film criticism. Moscow: Information for all, 228 p.

- Fedorov, A. (2016). Domestic feature cinematography in the mirror of Soviet film criticism. Moscow, 111 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). Transformations of the image of the Western world on Soviet and Russian screens: from the era of ideological confrontation (1946—1991) to the modern stage (1992—2016). Moscow: Information for all.
- Fedorov, A. (2021). Record holders of the banned Soviet cinema (1951-1991) in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: “Information for all”. 102 p.
- Fedorov, A., (2013). Media Pedagogy in Russia. In *Enzyklopädie Erziehungswissenschaft Online (Medienpädagogik, Medienpädagogik international)*. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Juventa.

References

- Abdullaeva, Z. (1990). Three, seven, zero ... *Cinema Art*. 9: 25-31.
- Adamov, G.B. (1939). *Mystery of Two Oceans*. Moscow.
<http://lib.ru/RUFANT/ADAMOW/tajna1.txt>
- Alco, V. (2001). *The Second Coming of Engineer Garin*. Moscow: Attorney.
- Andreev, F. (1984). There, on unknown roads. *Soviet Screen*. 22: 8-9.
- Andreev, F. (1984). Using the incredible to change the obvious. *Soviet Screen*. 18: 10-11.
- Anokhina, Yu. (2011). "Solaris": before and after Tarkovsky. *Film studies notes*. 98.
- Aronov, A. (1984). Stars and Thorns. *Cinema Art*. 6: 29-34.
- Bar-Sella, Z. (1996). Prayer for a cup (About the work of G. Adamov). *Worlds...* 1: 67-72.
- Bazalgette, C. (1995). *Key aspects of media education*. Moscow, 51 p.
- Belenky, I. (2019). *History of cinema. Filming, film industry, cinematography*. Moscow: Alpina.
- Belikov, E. (2019). "Solaris" — a science fiction film without science and fiction. *Ria.ru*.
18.12.2019. <https://ria.ru/20191218/1562497226.html>
- Berman, B. (1989). "City of Zero". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 8: 1-2.
- Bogomolov, Y. (1984). "The Shining World". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 9: 6-7.
- Bogomolov, Y. (1986). "Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 5: 8-9.
- Bogomolov, Y. (1989). Cinema for every day... *Literary newspaper*. 24: 11.
- Butovsky, L.V. (1978). Kosmatov. *Ten biographies of cameramen*. Moscow: Art: 157-176.
- Chernenko, M. (1968). Fantasy without fantasy. *Cinema Art*. 4: 77-80.
- Chernenko, M. (1985). "Zombie Variant". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 8: 8-9.
- Chernenko, M. (1987). "Dragon Hunt". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 2: 6-7.
- Chernyaev, P. (1991). "Temptation B.". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 7: 1.
- Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Moscow, 2010.
- Corliss, R. (1990). Dina-Films Attack. *Video-Ace Express*. 1: 8.
- Demin, V. (1966). *A film without intrigue*. Moscow: Art.
- Demin, V. (1966). Lessons of a detective. *Soviet Screen*. 17: 3-4.
- Demin, V. (1973). Blue hares. Funny and serious in comedy films. *Literary Russia*. 11.11.1973. p. 13.
- Demin, V. (1975). In the genre of laughter ("Ivan Vasilyevich Changes his Profession"). *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art: 48-51.
- Demin, V. (1977). *First Person: Artist and Screen Arts*. Moscow: Art, 287 p.
- Demin, V. (1979). One in the field is not a warrior. *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 2: 2-3.
- Demin, V. (1981). Dignity of the fast-paced genre. *Big problems of the small screen*. Moscow: Art: 103-122.
- Demin, V. (1982). Action with imaginary values. *Cinema Art*. 7: 70.
- Demin, V. (1984). Let's talk about cinema. Moscow: Knowledge, 64 p.
- Demin, V. (1987). Model of cosmic evil. *Literary Russia*. 15.05.1987, p. 22-23.
- Demin, V. (1988). Love, music and death. *Cinema*. 5.
- Demin, V. (1990). Experiment on experimenters. *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 5: 6.
- Demin, V. (1990). Our dear evil spirits. *Soviet Screen*. 18.
- Demin, V. (1990). Sad cunning of the old owner. *Opinions*. 4: 6-8.
- Dobrotvorsky, S. (1997). Lovely fish. *Premiere*. 2.
- Eco, U. (1960). Narrative Structure in Fleming. In: Buono, E., Eco, U. (eds.). *The Bond Affair*. London: Macdonald, p. 52.
- Eco, U. (1976). *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Eco, U. (1998). *Absent structure. Introduction to Semiology*. St. Petersburg: Petropolis, 432 p.
- Eco, U. (1998). *From the Internet to Gutenberg: Text and Hypertext*. 20.05.1998.
<http://www.philosophy.ru/library/eco/internet.html>
- Eco, U. (2005). *The role of the reader. Studies in the semiotics of the text*. St. Petersburg: Symposium, 502 p.
- Eremin, A. (1990). Meditation on the Exodus. *Cinema Art*. 8: 69-74.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). "Mystery of Two Oceans" — a novel and its adaptation: the possibilities of structural analysis in media education classes. *Media Education*. 3: 17-27.
- Fedorov, A. (2008). Analysis of the cultural mythology of the media text on the example of A. Belyaev's story "Amphibian Man" (1927) and its adaptation (1961). *Media Education*. 1: 79-87.

Fedorov, A. (2011). Hermeneutic analysis of Soviet science fiction at the turn of the 1950s – 1960s and its American screen transformation in media education classes in student audiences. *Innovations in Education*. 9: 47-69.

Fedorov, A. (2011). Soviet science fiction about war and space: a hermeneutic analysis. *Questions of Cultural Studies*. 11.

Fedorov, A. (2012). "Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin": a novel and its adaptation in media education classes in a student audience. *Media Education*. 3: 101-110.

Fink, L. (1976). On the screen Leonid Leonov... *Cinema Art*. 5: 59-76.

Focus on infinity. "Stalker". (2006). *Cinema Art*. 4.

Fomenko, S. (2017). Clever, dangerous, clubfoot. *25-1 frame*. 20.11.2017. <http://www.25-k.com/page-id-4702.html>

Fomin, V.I., Grashchenkova, I.N., Ziborova, O.P., Kosinova, M.R. (2012). *The history of the film industry in Russia: management, film production, distribution*. Moscow: VGIK, 2759 p.

For success! (1967). *Cinema Art*. 2: 1.

For success! (1968). *Cinema Art*. 1: 4-5.

Frolov, V. (1961). And find serious in the funny. *Cinema Art*. 11: 89–97.

Furikov, L. (1990). Myths and reality of cinema audience preferences. *Cinema Projectionist*. 3: 13-16; 4: 10-13; 5: 15-17; 6: 12-17.

Galanov, B. (1961). Closer to man. *Youth*. 12: 8.

Gerber, A. (1989). Stop the runner! *Soviet Screen*. 2: 10-12.

Gordeev, G. (2008). *Tell me, why do you need these Martians? – Well, in principle, it is possible without them...* 15.04.2008. <http://www.ekranka.ru/film/1017/>

Gordeev, V. (2008). *In order to combat incommunicability, I order ... to send to the past!* 16.06.2008. <http://www.ekranka.ru/film/1106/>

Gordeev, V. (2009). "Dead Man's Letters". 04.09.2009. <http://www.ekranka.ru/film/1687/>

Gordeev, V. (2010). "The Dungeon of witches". 15.04.2010. <https://web.archive.org/web/20201128231502/http://www.ekranka.ru/film/2202/>

Gordeev, V. (2011). *Giant fighting robots against the working class*. 29.06.2011. <https://web.archive.org/web/20201128221725/http://www.ekranka.ru/film/2728/>

Gordeev, V. (2011). *Soviet science fiction is the most humane in the world*. 17.03.2011. <https://web.archive.org/web/20200928130339/http://www.ekranka.ru/film/2589/>

Gorelov, D. "City Zero" (2004). *Recent history of national cinema. Cinema and context*. Vol. IV. St. Petersburg: Seans: 613-614.

Gorelov, D. (2001). *First row-61: "Amphibian Man"*. <http://www.ozon.ru/context/detail/id/200781/>

Gorelov, D. (2009). Four on the side - yours are not in Odessa-mom. *Russian Life*. 25.02.2009. <http://rulife.ru/old/mode/article/1171/>

Gorelov, D. (2018). *Homeland of Elephants*. Moscow: Fluid FreeFly, 384 p.

Gorelov, D. (2019). The Spy lives one floor above. *Komsomolskaya Pravda*. 23.12.2019. <https://www.kp.md/daily/27071.5/4141098/>

Grafov, E. (1991). Who is not strange? *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 2: 2.

Grashchenkova, I. (2010). Basov Vladimir Pavlovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 60–62.

Gribanov, A. (2014). Marek Piestrak, East European Ed Wood. *Darker*. 11. <https://darkermagazine.ru/page/marek-Piestrak-vostochnoevropejskij-ed-vud>

Gromov, E. (1973). Sharp peaks of comedy. *Literary newspaper*. 29.08.1973, p. 8.

Gromova, A. (1973). A fruitless dispute with the novel. *Literary newspaper*. 7.03.1973.

Gulin, I., Derbeneva, E. (2019). Doll House. *Colta*. 4.09.2019. <https://www.colta.ru/articles/cinema/22283-kukolnyy-dom>

Gurevich, L. (1987). The polysemy of common sense. *Cinema Art*. 7: 60-67.

Ignatenko, A.A., Gusak, V.A. (2014). *On the question of Ichthyander*. Moscow: Direct-Media, 192 p.

Istratova, S. (1983). Richard Victorov's earthly fantasy. *Cinema Art*. 3: 44-53.

Ivanov, M. "Mystery of Two Oceans". http://www.videoguide.ru/card_film.asp?idFilm=15501

Ivanova, V. (1968). Alexey Tolstoy and cinema. *Screen*. 1967-1968. Moscow: Art: 199–200.

Ivanova, V. (1987). "Cry of the Dolphin". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 4: 6.

Kalgatina, L. (1987). "Fragments are used ..." *Soviet Screen*. 11: 15.

Kapralov, G. (1988). "After", which should not be. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art: 84-86.

- Kapterev, S. (2010). Kazansky Gennady Sergeevich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 200–203.
- Kapterev, S. (2010). Zhuravlev Vasily Nikolaevich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 180–183.
- Khanyutin, Yu. (1975). Scientific and technological revolution, man, cinema. *Cinema Art*. 4.
- Kharitonov, E.V. (2003). "Amphibian man" and those who after... In: Kharitonov, E.V., Shcherbak-Zhukov, A.V. *On the screen - Miracle: Domestic science fiction and film fairy tale (1909-2002): Materials for the popular encyclopedia*. Moscow, 320 p. http://www.fandom.ru/about_fan/kino/_st11.htm
- Khokhlova, E. (2010). Kuleshov Lev Vladimirovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 251-254.
- Kichin, V. (1974). To the viewer who cannot wait. *Cinema Art*. 11.
- Kichin, V. (1978). An experiment that did not take place. *Soviet Screen*. 10: 4-5.
- Kichin, V. (1984). Improvisation on the theme... *Cinema Art*. 6: 22-28.
- Kiselev, A. (1991). History of one barrel. *Opinions*. 2: 39-41.
- Kiselev, A. et al. (1991). The fantastic action movie "Witches' Dungeon" competes with Hollywood. Is it possible to? *Screen*. 7: 6-7.
- Kokorevich, B. (1983). "Moonlight Rainbow". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 12: 2-3.
- Koltunov, Ya. (1958). Film about the storming of the sky. *Technics - for youth*. 3: 24-25.
- Kornienko, I.S. (1975). *Cinematography of Soviet Ukraine. Pages of history*. Moscow: Art, 240 p.
- Kosinova, M.I. (2016). Falling film attendance in the era of stagnation. Causes and effects. *Bulletin of the University*. 7-8: 271-276.
- Kovalov, O. (2014). Children of Marx and Doctor Salvator. In: Ignatenko, A., Gusak, V. *On the issue of Ichthyander*. Moscow: Direct Media: 5-8.
- Kozhukhova, G. (1973). Just a Comedy. *Pravda*. 24.09.1973, p. 4.
- Kudryavtsev, S. (1998). *Our Cinema*. Moscow: Duble "D", 492 p.
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2007). "Dandelion Wine". 7.08.2007. <https://kinanet.livejournal.com/1037438.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2007). *Simplified things*. <http://www.kinopressa.ru/news/256.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2008). "Solaris". 1978/2008. <https://kinanet.livejournal.com/1413549.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2009). *A total of 7250 Soviet films were shot for film distribution*. 11.08.2009. <https://kinanet.livejournal.com/1729870.html>
- Kushnir, E. (2017). And thunder struck. *Lumiere*. 28.08.2017. <http://www.lumiere-mag.ru/novye-priklyucheniya-yanki-pri-dvore-korolya-artura-recenziya/>
- Kushnirov, M. (1987). In the third breath. *Cinema Art*. 7.
- Kuznetsov, M. (1973). Laughter is a wall. *Komsomolskaya Pravda*. 6.10.1973, p. 2.
- Lavrentiev, S. (1991). Wonderful cinema! *Cinema Art*. 2: 45-48.
- Lebedev, N.A. (1965). *Essay on the history of cinema. Silent cinema (1918-1934)*. Moscow: Art.
- Lem, S. (1987). In: S. Beres'. *Rozmowy ze Stanislawem Lemem*. Krakow, WL: 133-135.
- Levshina, I. (1983). *How a work of art is perceived*. Moscow: Knowledge, 95 p.
- Lotman, Y.M. (1964). Lectures on structural poetics. *Works on sign systems: Scientific notes of the University of Tartu*. 160: 53-187.
- Lotman, Y.M. (1973). *Semiotics of cinema and problems of cinema aesthetics*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat. <http://biblioteka.teatr-obraz.ru/node/4480>
- Lotman, Y.M. (1992). *Articles on the semiotics and topology of culture*. Vol. 1. Tallinn: Alexandra, 247 p.
- Lukinykh, N. (1989). "Bright personality". *Satellite of the moviegoer*: 6.
- Makarov, A. (1986). After the catastrophe. *Soviet Screen*. 18: 8-9.
- Malyukova, L. (1991). Day of loneliness. *Session*. 3.
- Marchenko, T. (1977). Sergei Yursky. *Actor on television*: Vol. 2. Moscow: Art: 62-63.
- Martynov, V. (1992). Supergirl. *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 10: 3.
- Masterman, L. (1985). *Teaching the Media*. London: Comedia Publishing Group, 341 p.
- Masterman, L. (1997). A Rational for Media Education. In: Kubey, R. (ed.). *Media Literacy in the Information Age*. New Brunswick (USA) and London (UK): Transaction Publishers: 15-68.
- Matyushina, S. (2019). Three visits to Solaris: from Lem through Tarkovsky to Soderbergh. *Cinema Art*. 11-12. <https://kinoart.ru/texts/tri-vizita-na-solyaris-ot-lema-cherez-tarkovskogo-k-soderbergu>
- Mikhalkovich, V. (1984). "The recipe for her youth". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 3.

- Mikhalkovich, V. (1987). Foreman-alien. *Soviet Screen*. 9: 11.
- Mikhalkovich, V. (1989). *Andrey Tarkovsky*. Moscow: Knowledge.
- Mikhalkovich, V. (1990). Tale of our main deficit. *Opinions*. 1: 23-25.
- Mikhalkovich, V. (1991). Ivan, who remembered kinship. *Cinema Art*. 1991. 4: 64-68.
- Miloserdova, N. (2003). "Kin-dza-dza". *Russian Illusion. Anthology*. Moscow: Materik: 675-680
- Miloserdova, N. (2010). Danelia Georgy Nikolaevich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 143-147.
- Miloserdova, N. (2010). Melnikov Vitaly Vyacheslavovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 302-306.
- Mints, K. (1961). Take care of comedians. *Soviet Screen*. 10: 10-11.
- Mystery of Two Oceans (1957). *Teachers' newspaper*. 42. 6.04.1957.
- Moskovitza (2007). My Top 10 Zombie Movies. 09.21.2007.
<https://moskovitza.livejournal.com/14374.html>
- Moskvitin, E. (2013). Solving Gaidai. *Fire...* 3: 44.
- Muravyova, O. (1986). Miracles have nothing to do with it. *Soviet Screen*. 10: 14-15.
- Nechay, O.F. (1993). Film education in the context of fiction. *Specialist*. 5: 11-13.
- Nefedov, E. (2006). "Ivan Vasilievich Changes His Profession". *World Art*. <http://www.world-art.ru/cinema/cinema.php?id=4277>
- Nefedov, E. (2016). "New Adventures of a Yankee at the Court of King Arthur". *All of Cinema*. 29.11.2016. <http://allofcinema.com/novyie-priklyucheniya-yanki-pri-dvore-korolya-artura-novyie-priklyucheniya-yanki-pri-dvore-korolya-artura-1988/>
- Nefedov, E. (2017). "Through hardships to the stars". *All of Cinema*. 24.07.2017. <http://allofcinema.com/cherez-ternii-k-zvyozdam-cherez-ternii-k-zvyozdam-1981/#ixzz6R7Ch2YMz>
- Nefedov, E. (2018). "Cry of the Dolphin". *All of Cinema*. 31.01.2018. <http://allofcinema.com/krik-delfina-krik-delfina-1986/#ixzz6TasVMdTc>
- Nefedov, E. (2020). "Andromeda Nebula". *All of Cinema*. 20.04.2020. <http://allofcinema.com/tumannost-andromedyi-tumannost-andromedy-1967/#ixzz6RbvTMWBY>
- Noah's Ark of Russian Cinema: From Stenka Razin to Hipsters*. (2012). Moscow: Globus-Press, 552 p.
- Novitsky, E. (2018). *Gaidai's ten best comedies*. 30.01.2018. <https://www.irk.ru/afisha/articles/20180130/comedy/>
- Paperny, Z. (1968). Who is dreaming. *Soviet Screen*. 17: 3.
- Parnov, E. (1983). On the thorny path of knowledge. *Soviet Screen*. 12: 6-7.
- Pisarevsky, D. (1970). Comedy-detective. *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art: 58-61.
- Plakhov, A. (1981). Reliability of the unknown. *Soviet Screen*. 11: 2-4.
- Pomerants, G. (2000). At the door of the castle. *Cinema Art*. 11.
- Pondopulo, G. (1973). Cognition of the "Unknown" and "Mystery" in A. Tarkovsky's film "Solaris". *Moskovskaya Pravda*. 21.02.1973.
- Popova, I. (1990). "Privy Counselor". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 2: 9.
- Postupalskaya, M. (1959). G.B. Adamov. In: Adamov G.B. *Mystery of Two Oceans*. Moscow, 1959. <http://lib.ru/RUFANT/ADAMOW/tajna1.txt>
- Potter, W.J. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Thousand Oaks - London: Sage, 423 p.
- Potter, W.J. (2008). *Media Literacy*. Thousand Oaks - London: Sage.
- Pozdeev, A. (2011). "Bradbarian" - about film adaptations of science fiction writer Ray Bradbury in Soviet and Russian cinema. *Horror Zone*. 8.05.2011. <https://horrorzone.ru/page/bredberiana-ob-kino-ekranizacijah-fantasta-reja-bredberi-v-sovetskom-i-rossijskom-kino-acircnbsp-acircnbsp>
- Propp, V.Y. (1976). *Folklore and reality*. Moscow: Art: 51-63.
- Propp, V.Y. (1998). *The morphology of a fairy tale. The historical roots of the fairy tale*. Moscow: Labyrinth, 512 p.
- Rassadin, S. (1962). Beauty or prettiness? *Soviet Screen*. 5: 7.
- Revich, V. (1968). About cinema science fiction. *Screen. 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art: 82-86.
- Revich, V. (1981). So that the Earth does not become Dessa... *Soviet Screen*. 23: 14-15.
- Revich, V. (1984). The third front. *Soviet Screen*. 16: 8-9.
- Revich, V. (1984). We are thrown into improbability. *Science Fiction: Collection of Science Fiction*. Moscow: Knowledge. Vol. 29: 196-210.
- Revich, V. (1985). In the open ocean. *Soviet Screen*. 16: 9.
- Revich, V. (1985). Science Fiction: Genre or Way of Thinking? *Cinema Art*. 1: 61-72.

- Revich, V. (1986). Defeat of Jekyll. *Soviet Screen*. 15: 14-15.
- Revich, V. (1989). Larpulyarchiki. About the film "New Adventures of the Yankees at the Court of King Arthur". *Soviet Culture*. 68: 5.
- Revich, V. (1989). Why would an indifferent fairy tale. *Soviet Screen*. 7.
- Revich, V. (1990). Informals on an alien planet. *Soviet Screen*. 9: 13.
- Revich, V. (1998). The Legend of Belyaev. M0sc0w: Institute of Oriental Studies RAS: 117-140.
http://www.fandom.ru/about_fan/revich_20_06.htm
- Rostotsky, S. (2018). Through hardships to star wars. *Kommersant Weekend*. 24: 20.
- Rudenko, A. (2007). "Air Seller". 09.09.2007. <http://www.ekranka.ru/film/610/>
- Rybak, L. (1973). "Ivan Vasilyevich is changing his profession". *Soviet Film*. 12: 20.
- Rybak, L. (1977). Refusal to Escape. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art: 102-107.
- Salynsky, D. (2002). Tarkovsky's Canon. *Cinematography*. 56.
- Salynsky, D. (2009). *Tarkovsky's Film Hermeneutics*. Moscow: Quadriga.
- Savitsky, N. (1986). "How to become happy". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 1: 6-7.
- Semenovsky, V. (1984). Just don't hold on... *Soviet Screen*. 8: 8-9.
- Senchakova, G. (1967). "His name was Robert". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 8.
- Shemyakin, A. (1989). Bell in the desert. *Cinema Art*. 3: 87-91.
- Shemyakin, A. (1989). Beyond Common Sense. *Soviet Screen*. 16: 14-15.
- Shemyakin, A. (1992). What is "mass culture"? *Screen and scene*. 25.
- Shilova, I. (1984). Overcoming Inertia. *Cinema Art*. 6: 34-44.
- Shilova, V. (1980). "Stalker". *Soviet Film*. 10.
- Silverblatt, A. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut - London: Praeger, 449 p.
- Smelkov, J. (1973). Unrealized Possibilities. *Soviet Screen*. 5.
- Smirnov, P. (1987). "Kin-dza-dza!" In a distant galaxy... *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 5: 6-8.
- Sobolev, R. (1968). "Andromeda Nebula". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 3: 14-15.
- Sobolev, R. (1974). "Moscow - Cassiopeia". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 9.
- Sorvina, M. (2007). *Undeclared War*. <http://www.kino-teatr.ru/kino/art/kino/a6/210/>
- Stepanov, V. (2013). The pride of the Soviet country. *Russian reporter*. 21.
- Stepanov, V. (2016). From Tarkovsky to Nolan through Soderberg. In: *After Tarkovsky: materials of the IV international scientific conference held as part of the IX International Film Festival named after Andrei Tarkovsky "Mirror"*. St. Petersburg: Seans.
- Sukharevich, V. (1959). With humor about the serious. *Komsomolskaya Pravda*. 11.07.1959.
- Sukharevich, V. (1961). Fairy Tale and Life. *Izvestia*. 14.06.1961.
- Tolstoy, A.N. (1925-1927). Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin. *Krasnaya nov*. 1925. 7-9; 1926. 4-9. 1927. 2.
- Tolstoy, A.N. (2007). *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin*. Moscow: AST.
- Trofimenkov, M. (2007). Nothing Martian is alien. *Kommersant Weekend*. 55: 31.
- Trofimenkov, M. et al. (2008). Elsinore of the XXI century. Around table "Seance". *Seance*. 35/36.
- Tsyркun, N. (1992). Inappropriate direct speech. *Cinema Art*. 9: 35-39.
- Tsyркun, N. (2001). "Mystery of Two Oceans". <http://mega.km.ru/cinema/Encyclop.asp>
- Turovskaya, M. (1973). No, in accordance with the author's intention. *Literaturnaya gazeta*. 7.03.1973.
- Turovskaya, M. (1979). Why the viewer goes to the cinema. *Genres of cinema*. Moscow: Art, 319 p.
- Turovskaya, M. (1991). *7^{1/2}, or the Films of Andrei Tarkovsky*. Moscow: Art.
- Turovskoy, V. (1989). In the genre of a costume ball. *Soviet Screen*. 7.
- Turovsky, V. (1989). "The Thirteenth Apostle". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 1: 7.
- Usov, Y.N. (1980). The method of using cinematography in the ideological and aesthetic education of students in grades 8-10. Tallinn, 125 p.
- Usov, Y.N. (1989). *Film education as a means of aesthetic education and artistic development of schoolchildren*. Ph.D. Dis. Moscow, 362 p.
- Usov, Y.N. (1993). Fundamentals of screen culture. Moscow: New School, 90 p.
- Usov, Y.N. (1995). In the world of screen arts. Moscow: SVR-Argus, 224 p.
- Vasiliev, A. (2018). *About shaky masculinity and persistent femininity*.
<https://chapaev.media/articles/10335>
- Vasiliev, A. (2018). *It is not possible to cement in one state*.
<https://chapaev.media/articles/10266>

- Velminsky, V. (2012). "The Head of Professor Dowell". *Noah's Ark of Russian Cinema: From Stenka Razin to Hipsters*. Moscow: Globus-Press.
- Vladimov, A. (1974). Are we ready? *Soviet Screen*. 19: 8-9.
- Volkov, A. (2020). Presentiment of trouble. *Darker*. 12. <https://darkermagazine.ru/page/predchuvstvie-bedy>
- Vyatkin, A. (1995). "Robots work in - a man is happy": the experience of cataloging themes of Russian science fiction. *Fantacrim – MEGA*. 1: 29–31.
- Vyatkin, A. (2003). Through hardships to the viewer. Soviet space film expeditions. *World of Fantasy*. 2: 23-25.
- Vyatkin, A. (2020). Two Engineers Garin. <https://zen.yandex.ru/media/id/5cd05bf19680af00b2c7f413/dva-injenera-garina-5e250e761a860800ac442c6e?&secdata=CLCv6OT%2BLSABMAI%3D>. <https://zen.yandex.ru/media/id/5cd05bf19680af00b2c7f413/dva-injenera-garina-chast-2-5e25cb380ce57b00ae1a74a0?&secdata=CIXEq5D%2FLSABMAI%3D>
- What the audience is watching (1987). *Soviet Screen*. 22: 5.
- What the audience is watching (1988). *Soviet Screen*. 14: 19.
- What the audience is watching (1988). *Soviet Screen*. 19: 9.
- What the audience is watching (1988). *Soviet Screen*. 4: 10.
- What the audience is watching (1988). *Soviet Screen*. 9: 5.
- What the audience is watching (1989). *Soviet Screen*. 4: 26.
- What the audience is watching (1989). *Soviet Screen*. 8: 19.
- What the audience is watching (1989). *Soviet Screen*. 15: 19.
- Yampolsky, M. (1987). Polemic notes on the aesthetics of mass film. *Transcript of the meeting of the "round table" of film critics*, October 12-13, 1987. Moscow: 31-44.
- Yemtsev, M. (1988). Lace to shreds. *Soviet Screen*. 22: 3.
- Zaika, V. (1979). Prince is required. *Cinema Art*. 6: 45-53.
- Zaitsev, N. (1978). Nobody is forgotten and nothing is forgotten. *Soviet Screen*. 16: 2-3.
- Zak, M. (1967). Let's do without toastmaster. *Cinema Art*. 7: 82-85.
- Zelenko, N. (1971). Struggle? No, the game. *Cinema Art*. 1: 37-43.
- Zelenko, N. (1974). In the summer of next year. *Soviet Screen*. 8: 6.
- Zelenko, N. (1975). Looking for an outdated robot. *Soviet Screen*. 16.
- Zemlyanukhin, S., Segida, M. (1996). Home Cinematheque. National cinema. 1918-1996. Moscow: Duble "D", 520 p.
- Zharkov, E. (2010). "The Valley of Serpents", or How were the Poles and Russians on friendly terms? *School of Life*. 2. <https://shkolazhizni.ru/archive/0/n-40663/>
- Zorkaya, N. (1966). *Portraits*. Moscow: Art, 310 p.
- Zorkaya, N. (1973). "Solaris" by Andrei Tarkovsky. *Soviet Screen*. 5.
- Zorkaya, N. (1981). *Unique and Replicated: Mass Media and Reproduced Art*. Moscow: Art, 167 p.
- Zorkaya, N. (1994). *Folklore. Splint. Screen*. Moscow.
- Zorkaya, N., Zorky, A. (1982). *Notes about the director: Georgy Danelia*. Moscow.
- Zorky, A. (1962). Lamentation for Ichthyander. *Literary newspaper*. 20.01.1962.
- Zorky, A. (1974). "Ivan Vasilievich" changes ... expression. *Cinema Art*. 1: 78–79.
- Zorky, A. (1980). Georgy Danelia. *Soviet Screen*. 7.
- Zorky, A. (1984). "Chance". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 7: 2-3.

Alexander Fedorov

Soviet science fiction movies in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: Information for all, 2021. 162 p.

Monograph

Electronic edition

Publisher:
SM "Information for All"
Email contact (at) ifap.ru
http: //www.ifap.ru

The full text of the monograph is freely available to download at:
<http://www.mediagram.ru/library/>

© Alexander Fedorov, 2021
e—mail: 1954alex@mail.ru