

**Anastasia Levitskaya, Alexander Fedorov,
Elena Kornienko**

**Western cinematography on the
pages of *Soviet Screen* magazine
(1925-1991)**

Moscow, 2024

Levitskaya A., Fedorov A., Kornienko E. Western cinematography on the pages of *Soviet Screen* magazine (1925-1991). Moscow: SM "Information for All", 2024. 248 p.

This monograph* analyzes the film criticism interpretations of the works of Western cinema in the *Soviet Screen* magazine, from the year of its foundation (1925) to the year of the end of its Soviet period (1991).

The results obtained can be used in the scientific activities of film scholars, culturologists, art critics, sociologists, historians, scientists studying media culture, and will be useful to teachers, graduate students, and a wide range of audience interested in this topic.

*** This research was funded by the Russian Science Foundation grant (RSF, project No. 23-28-00015, <https://rscf.ru/project/23-28-00015/>) at the Taganrog Institute of Management and Economics. Project theme: “Western cinema on the pages of the Soviet Screen Magazine (1925-1991)”. Head of the project is Professor A. Levitskaya.**

**** Some fragments of the text of the monograph were written with the participation of A. Novikov.**

Reviewers: Professor Marina Tselykh, Professor Valery Gura.

© Anastasia Levitskaya, Alexander Fedorov, 2024.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	4
Western Cinematography on the Pages of the <i>Soviet Screen</i> Magazine of 1925-1927.....	5
Western Cinematography on the Pages of the <i>Soviet Screen</i> Magazine: 1928-1930.....	20
Western Cinematography on the Pages of the <i>Soviet Cinema Screen</i> Magazine: 1939-1941...	32
Western Cinema on the Pages of the Magazine <i>Soviet Screen</i> : 1957-1968.....	36
Western Cinema on the Pages of the <i>Soviet Screen</i> Magazine (1969-1985).....	83
Western Cinema on the Pages of the <i>Soviet Screen</i> Magazine: 1986-1991.....	151
Appendix. The main dates and events related to the historical, political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural and cinematic context in which the publication of the <i>Soviet Screen</i> magazine was carried out in 1925-1991.....	194
References.....	216

Introduction

In most cases, topics related to the history of the *Soviet Screen* magazine were considered by researchers in a fragmentary way, without any attempts at a full-fledged content analysis (Bogatyreva, 2017; Fedorov, 2022; Golovskoy, 2011; Golovskoy, Rimberg, 1986; Mishchenko, 2012; Orlov, 2011; Shishkin, 2020; Voronova, 2019; Zhidkova, 2014), therefore, a comprehensive interdisciplinary analysis of the transformation of film criticism concepts of interpretations of Western cinematography in the *Soviet Screen* magazine – from the year of its foundation (1925) to the year of the end of its Soviet period (1991) is very relevant – both in film criticism and cultural studies, and in historical, philosophical, political science, sociological aspects.

It is in these contexts that we analyze the evolution of film-critical interpretations of works of foreign cinema in the *Soviet Screen* magazine.

We see the applied significance of the study in the fact that the results obtained can be used in the scientific activities of film critics, culturologists, art critics, sociologists, historians, scientists studying media culture; will be useful to teachers, graduate students, students, a wide range of audiences interested in this topic.

Here we intend to proceed from the following periods of the journal's development:

1925 – 1927: the initial period of the development of the magazine, the stage of relative creative freedom of Soviet film criticism, when foreign topics often accounted for up to half of the text of each magazine;

1928 – 1930: the period of the journal's reaction to the results First All-Union Conference of Film and Photo Workers (December 12-17, 1927), First All-Union Party Conference on Cinema (convened by the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party(b), March 15-21, 1928 and approved the Resolution “Results of the construction of cinema in the USSR and the tasks of Soviet cinematography”); meeting in the *Glavrepertkom* to revise the fund of films and clear the screen of “ideologically harmful” films (April 7, 1928), after which foreign topics in the magazine were gradually reduced to a minimum. Here we take into account that at the end of 1929 the *Soviet Screen* was transformed into *Cinema and Life*, and at the beginning of 1931 it was merged with the magazine *Cinema and Culture* under the name *Proletarian Cinema*, and from that year it began to count *Cinema Art* journal (Fedorov, 2022; Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022; Levitskaya, 2022).

1939 – 1941: a period of ideological unification, when the volume of materials devoted to Western cinema was minimal (during these years the magazine resumed its publication under the name *Soviet Cinema Screen*);

1957 – 1968: the “thaw” stage in the development of the revived *Soviet Screen* magazine (when the volume of articles on Western cinema began to increase again and was by no means always associated with a negative assessment of foreign works of cinema art);

1969 – 1985: a period of “stagnation” when, after the international “détente” of the 1970s was replaced by a new stream of the “cold war” of the early 1980s, a negative assessment of Western films was activated in the magazine (although the works of “progressive foreign screen masters” still received highly appreciated by Soviet film critics);

1986-1991: the period of “perestroika”, when on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* there was a reassessment of attitudes towards Western cinema in many respects.

Research methods: complex content analysis, comparative interdisciplinary analysis, methods of theoretical research: classification, comparison, analogy, induction and deduction, abstraction and concretization, theoretical analysis and synthesis, generalization; collection of information related to the subject of the project, comparative-historical and hermeneutic methods (Aristarco, 1951; Aronson, 2003; bakhtin,1996; Balazs, 1935; Bazin, 1971; Bibler, 1990; Casetti, 1999; Demin, 1966; Eco, 1975; 1976; Eisenstein, 1964; Gledhill, Williams, 2000; Hess, 1997; Hill, Gibson, 1998; Khrenov, 2006; 2011; Kuleshov, 1987; Lotman, 1973; 1992; 1994; Mast and Cohen 1985; Metz, 1974; Razlogov, 1984; Sokolov, 2010; Stam, 2000; Villarejo, 2007 and others).

Western Cinematography on the Pages of the *Soviet Screen* Magazine of 1925-1927

In this chapter, we will focus on the analysis of materials about foreign cinema published in the *Soviet Screen* magazine from 1925 to 1927, when its managing editors were: Kirill Shutko (1884-1941), Alexander Kurs (1892-1937), Vyacheslav Uspensky (1880-1929) and Nikolai Yakovlev (we, alas, could not find his life dates either in the archives or in other publications).

The subject of Western cinema on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine in the 1920s was extensive and varied. Due to rather significant creative freedoms in the *Soviet Screen* in 1925-1927, photographs of Western movie stars (including photos on the covers of magazines), ideologically neutral or positive biographies of Hollywood and European actors and directors, notes on the shooting of films and film distribution, reviews on Western films, etc.

Of course, in reviews of Western films and in discussions about the current state of the cinema process in Hollywood and Europe, there were also propaganda clichés that opposed bourgeois commercial film interests to proletarian cinema based on a Marxist class approach. But in general, the *Soviet Screen* of the 1920s tried to more or less objectively evaluate the works of Western cinema.

At [Table 1](#) statistics are presented reflecting the changes (from 1925 to 1927) of the titles of the journal, organizations, the organ of which the journal was, its circulation, periodicity, the names of the editors of the journal and time periods.

Table 1. Magazine *Soviet Screen* / *Cinema and Life* (1925-1927): statistical data

Year of issue	Magazine title	Publisher	Magazine circulation (in thousands of copies)	Magazine periodicity (issues per year)	Editors the magazine
1925	<i>Soviet Screen</i>	Russian Film Publishing House, Cinema Printing	35 – 100	39	Kirill Shutko №№ 1-23 Alexander Kurs №№ 24-39
1926	<i>Soviet Screen</i>	Cinema Printing	45 – 80	52	Alexander Kurs №№ 1-28. Vyacheslav Uspensky №№ 29-37. Nikolai Yakovlev №№ 38-52.
1927	<i>Soviet Screen</i>	Theater & Cinema Printing	70	52	Nikolai Yakovlev №№ 1-52.

The first issue of the *Soviet Screen* was published on March 24, 1925, and soon its orientation towards the balance between the communist ideology (articles and notes about important events and Soviet films from this point of view) and the orientation towards the “New Economic People”, which was keenly interested in photos of foreign movie stars, short notes about Western cinema without any “anti-bourgeois revelations”.

On June 18, 1925, the Resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist party “On the policy of the party in the field of fiction” was adopted, which emphasized that “just as the class struggle does not stop in our country in general, it certainly does not stop on the literary front. ... Communist criticism must mercilessly fight against counter-revolutionary manifestations in literature” (*Pravda*, 1925; *News...*, 1925: 8-9).

And in July 1926 the *Glavrepertkom* came up with an initiative to expand censorship, which was designed to combat the penetration of enemy ideas into cinema: 1) class conciliation; 2) pacifism; 3) anarcho-individualism; 4) banditry and romance of criminality; 5) idealization of hooliganism and bullying; 6) an apology for drunkenness and drug addiction; 7) boulevardism (cheap sensation, savoring love affairs and adventures of the “higher” society, poeticization of night chantans, etc.; 8) philistinism (idealization of the “holiness” of the bourgeois family, comfort, slavery of a woman, private property, etc. .); 9) decadence and psychopathology...); 10)

crude Sovietization, which has the opposite effect; 11) malicious disregard and perversion of Soviet life and the cultivation of bourgeois salonism; 12) kulak-populist idealization of the old village (Glavrepertkom, 1926: 57-64).

In the spirit of these ideological changes, the First All-Russian Conference of Filmmakers-Political Enlighteners took place on November 2-13, 1926.

However, since all events of this kind took place against the backdrop of a sharp struggle at the very top of the Soviet power structures (between I. Stalin, L. Trotsky, L. Kamenev, G. Zinoviev, etc.), which ultimately did not give the Power the possibility of censoring detail on level of magazines (especially not of a political, but of a cinematic orientation), this did not affect the work of the *Soviet Screen* in any serious way: from March 1925 to December 1927, the pages of the magazine were generously given to photographs of Western movie stars and often completely neutral, and even laudatory articles about foreign cinema, regular reviews of the turbulent foreign and often extravagant film life.

Based on the content analysis of the texts published in the *Soviet Screen* magazine in the period from 1925 to 1927, we identified the following main genres:

- biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors;
- reviews of Western films;
- reviews of Western national cinematographies;
- articles about Western newsreels;
- articles about foreign film technology, studios and cinemas;
- materials about censorship and perception of Western films by the Soviet public;
- short informational materials about events in foreign cinema, about everyday details of the life of movie stars.

Biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors

About Western actors and directors, mostly Hollywood, *Soviet screen* wrote generously in 1925-1927, often bypassing ideological passages.

In particular, it was emphasized that “the interest of millions of viewers in the best movie actors is due to two reasons. A minority of the public is interested in the art of the actor, art as skill, the actor as a performer, revealing a thought, an experience, an idea. ... The audience in the mass is absorbed, first of all, by the beauty, dexterity, strength of heroes ... The courageous “hero” has his own ideal. Douglas Fairbanks is very close to this physiological ideal. ... Health and strength, agility and cheerfulness ... He is a great athlete and “works” with muscles joking and playing, with a smile, with contagious cheerfulness and fun of a healthy person. Everyone is drawn to this ideal, strong with pride and competition, frail with hope. There is considerable merit in this, the encouraging and educational influence of the “screen hero” on the viewer. A healthy mind in a healthy body” (Game..., 1925: 10).

The pages of the magazine happily noted that Douglas Fairbanks (1883-1939) “finally appeared on Soviet screens in a number of major productions (*The Thief of Baghdad, Robin Hood, The Sign of Zorro*) ... Douglas plays all his roles very simply, without any stretch. This simplicity, perhaps, is what attracts the viewer so much. But, in addition, Douglas, being physically strong, cannot but arouse sympathy” (Douglas..., 1925: 12). And Douglas Fairbanks’ gimmickry, evolving from *Robin Hood* to *The Thief of Baghdad*, is perfected in *Don Q...* There is one thing – Douglas Fairbanks, his game, his movement, his jumps, there is himself. ... He chains to himself, holds the viewer in his hands, not for a minute letting him come to his senses” (Milman, 1925: 9). In *The Thief of Baghdad*, Douglas Fairbanks... “goes down the path of using dance techniques. His gestures, and especially his gait, are so unnaturally light and rhythmic, as if he were playing the lead role in the Diaghilev Ballet” (Abramov, 1925: 11).

The authors of the *Soviet Screen* also wrote very warmly about the Hollywood actress Mary Pickford (1892-1979), who, as is well known, was the wife of Douglas Fairbanks from 1919 to 1936. An ironic but laudatory article about her was published by director S. Yutkevich, who was beginning at that time (Yutkevich, 1925: 10). In the same positive vein, the creative portrait of this actress was painted (Falberg, 1925: 14-15).

From 20 to 22 July 1926 Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks made a triumphant visit to Moscow. And although here the *Soviet Screen* claimed that Fairbanks is “a filmmaker who pleases and hypnotizes the public” and noted that “Mary Pickford’s specific gravity is different – she is, first of all, a great master” (Korolevich, 1926: 13). True, so that the praise of the Hollywood actress does not seem overly sweet, a reservation was immediately followed that

“Mary’s films are always prosperous ... All their morality is: misfortune is followed by happiness, which is equal, in American terms, to the formula: poverty comes wealth. It is just as sentimental, cloying and deceptive as the tale of Little Red Riding Hood jumping out of the belly of a wolf, but more dangerous, because all this is furnished with sentimental plausibility” (Korolevich, 1926: 13).

But in relation to another Hollywood star – Pola Negri (1897-1987) – there were no reservations in the *Soviet Screen*: “The art of Pola Negri is hidden in the lightness and ease of the game, like her feminine charm... It seems to you that she does everything in passing, involuntarily, as if carelessly. But it only seems. Pola Negri draws her images very clearly and stubbornly... In all moments she is true to herself, alive, genuine. Only a great artist can tie up ends and beginnings in this way” (Yureneva, 1925: 7).

The work of Lillian Gish (1893-1993) was equally positively evaluated, in whose guise “the femininity of the Anglo-Saxon race reached its ideal expression. ... her talent is so remarkable that she raises the images that are akin to her to an unattainable height, transferring them to the sphere of poetic creativity of Dickens, Dostoevsky or Shakespeare” (Kaufman, 1927: 10).

Generous compliments were received in the magazine by Elisabeth Bergner (1897-1986), who “showed the strength of her talent and put herself in the position of the most famous German actress” (Elizabeth..., 1927: 13).

The performance of Western comedians: Charles Chaplin (1889-1977) (Inber, 1926: 14; Koltsova, 1925: 14-15), Max Linder (1883-1925) (Renz, 1925: 6-7); Harold Lloyd (1893-1971) (Attasheva, 1925: 14) and Buster Keaton (1895-1966) (Attasheva, 1925: 14).

The journalist, the future wife of Sergei Eisenstein, P. Fogelman (1900-1965), who chose the pseudonym Pera Attasheva (later there was a variant without doubling the “t”: Atasheva), was convinced that his mask plays the main role in Lloyd’s success—the mask is nothing out of the ordinary, a middle-class clerk... This mask hides the reason for his success: he is so close to all hearts (Attasheva, 1925: 14). A distinctive property of Keaton’s mask – “it is always a solemn, stony, frozen expression. Sad eyes and no sign of a smile. This is Hamlet from comedy. The movements are calculated and mechanical. An automaton with a human soul. In Keaton’s comedic devices you will not find any semitones or subtle nuances; there are no sharp transitions from grief to joy and vice versa. ... Where Lloyd makes the audience moan with a fit of laughter, Keaton will elicit an attentive, warm laugh. Reason: the mask of B. Keaton is thinner, more intelligent than the mask of Lloyd, but Lloyd is closer to the masses” (Attasheva, 1925: 14).

At that time, the duet of two Danish comedians was also very popular – Pat and Patachon. These mask roles were played by Karl Schoenström (1881-1942) (Pat) and Harald Madsen (1890-1949) (Patachon). In an article about their work on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*, the point of view was expressed that the duet of Pat and Patashon there is no solid system, their technique is often crude, the tricks are vulgar and inept, but instead of masks they show a living human face. The human face has that dignity, forgotten by the Americans, that it can simultaneously not only make you laugh, but also touch (Korolevich, 1926: 14).

Adventure movie actor William Desmond (1878-1949) also received a positive assessment in the *Soviet Screen*: “The stunt film of today has found its ideal expression in the person of William Desmond. ... Traces of former beauty, a courageous face with an energetic chin, a beautiful plastic gesture, create the impression of that noble brave fellow who, in strict accordance with the American “law”, is the defender of the oppressed, the guardian of the innocent and the fighter for the “right”. For all this, you need to be able to perfectly jump, swim, climb a wall, box, turn your cheekbones and take a beautiful pose while doing all this. Virtue triumphs, and the American audience is touched to tears” (Trick..., 1927: 13).

The highly popular Hollywood actor Wallace Beery (1885-1949) also received praise from the magazine: “The artistic appearance of Wallace Beery is determined by the plethora of his temperament. Beery portrays not a schematic villain, equipped with the gloomy colors of the screenwriter. First of all, he is a man with huge strong-willed impulses that fetter the outbursts of his passions, with healthy humor and a strong smile” (Wallace ..., 1927: 10).

Even such a frankly stunt artist as Harry Peel (1892-1963) in the *Soviet Screen*, albeit with reservations, was given a completely positive assessment: “The knight of bourgeois romanticism, guarding the peace of ladies and gentlemen from the encroachments of the “scum of society”, the defender of the powerful of this world, an amateur detective by vocation, a

selfless player with his life for the triumph of “law” and “justice” – such is Harry Peel, this irresistible boy scout of the world philistinism, claiming to be popular as a folk hero... propagandizing the dexterity of the bold movement of a trained body” (Pertsov, 2026: 14).

However, a different point of view about Harry Peel was expressed on the pages of the magazine: “His means are primitive to the limit. Anxiety is symbolized by bulging eyes, for contempt, lips curl a little, and for surprise, one raised eyebrow is enough. As an actor, he is infinitely flat. ... It is absolutely unthinkable to speak of the artistic or ideological good quality of his “creativity”. It marks too high a degree of spiritual squalor and bad taste to be widely used” (About..., 1926: 6).

The then wife of the famous journalist M. Koltsov (1898-1940) – Elizaveta Ratmanova-Koltsova (1901-1964), who signed her articles as Lizaveta Koltsova or Liz Koltz, assessed the work of Hollywood stars more strictly. In particular, she scolded Rudolph Valentino (1895-1926) for his languor and sweetness (Koltsova, 1925: 14-15).

Another Hollywood actor-lover – Ramon Novarro (1899-1968) – received a similar characteristic in the *Soviet Screen*: “young, handsome, well removed, and most importantly, extremely typical in roles where he plays himself, a representative of his caste. Novarro is one of those decadent actors who create the face of modern bourgeois cinematography” (Ramon..., 1927: 14).

The favorite director of the *Soviet Screen* of the 1920s was undoubtedly Charles Chaplin (Gul, 1926: 7; Inber, 1926: 14; Koltsova, 1925: 14-15; Sorokin, 1926: 11-12; Zilpert, 1927: 13).

In particular, T. Sorokin wrote that *Gold Rush* (1925) “is not just funny, it is a tragedy of laughter. “Charlot” is no longer a jester, but the hero of the best creations of contemporary art. His latest works contain more and more dramatic and less comedic. It is difficult to determine where the comedy ends and the drama begins, so perfect and elusive are the nuances of these complicated transitions from small to big. This, perhaps, gives the main strength of the vitality of his art. ... He uses the material of cinema in a logical connection with the character of the characters and the development of the action itself. Hence the impression of exceptional truthfulness, unusual clarity and disarming simplicity. ... *Gold Rush* is an unprecedented thing even for Chaplin. Its artistic solidity is exceptional – it is not for nothing that Chaplin worked on it for almost two years. What real poetry! The tragic essence there, as nowhere else, is subtly refracted in a comic environment” (Sorokin, 1926: 11-12).

The work of Erich von Stroheim (1875-1957) (Attasheva, 1926: 14), Fritz Lang (1890-1976) (Fritz ..., 1926: 14), Friedrich Murnau (1888-1931) (Attasheva, 1926: 14), Thomas Ince (1880-1924) (Thomas..., 1926: 13), Abel Gance (1889-1981) (Demi, 1926: 13), Richard Talmadge (1892-1981) (Richard..., 1927: 13) and Fred Niblo (1874-1948) (Sven, 1926 : 13).

For example, P. Attasheva wrote that among the largest American directors and film actors, Stroheim belongs to one of the first places, the artistic success of his paintings is always enormous (Attasheva, 1926: 14).

In her article about the work of F. Murnau (1888-1931), P. Attasheva rightly noted that a feature of Murnau’s directorial manner is the extraordinary thoroughness of working out the smallest details of the paintings. Every thing, every object matters in the course of the development of the action in his paintings (Attasheva, 1926: 14).

P. Attasheva equally positively assessed the films of the German director and screenwriter Ewald Dupont (1891-1956), who reveals the special style and manner of playing each actor. This feature of Dupont’s directorial technique is revealed in all its breadth in *Variety*, and in the picture that brought Dupont world fame (Attasheva, 1927: 13).

On the pages of the *Soviet Screen* it was argued that the value of the director's works of Abel Gance first of all, in his desire to reveal the feelings and thoughts of a person, things and make formal techniques, perfectly controlled by him, serve the ideas of inner value, deep and sublime (Demi, 1926: 13).

In an anonymous article about another major Western director, Thomas Ince (1880-1924), it was emphasized that “the most striking thing in his art is the power over color. Inner sensation of color and accurate knowledge of the transition of tones. Rhythm of the world. ... his instinctive and deep perception of light is invariably framed by the “algebra of light”. He performs his films always in the same style as they are made up. That is why they are always simple and free” (Thomas..., 1926: 13).

D. Sven believed that Fred Niblo (1874-1948) has enormous merit. He knows perfectly

well how to take the audience: he knows how to show an actor in spectacular shots. Niblo doesn't base his films on people, he bases them on premieres and accessories. His productions always resemble operas (Sven, 1926: 13).

D. Griffith (1875-1948) became a very significant Hollywood director for the *Soviet Screen* magazine, whose work was also devoted to several articles (David ..., 1926: 13; Zilpert, 1926: 13), where, however, it was interpreted ambiguously: "One of Griffith's most typical features is the unevenness in the quality of his production... In one picture he is a great artist, and in the next he is no different from an ordinary average director who produces ordinary works" (David ..., 1926: 13).

Reflecting on the career of director and actor Rex Ingram (1892-1950), one of the authors of *Soviet Screen* wrote that "Ingram encourages everyone to learn and imitate Griffith – himself, most of all, afraid of falling into imitation. Their creativity takes different paths. Griffith is, above all, the creator of monumental national films. American nationalism shines through in the smallest details of even his most chamber productions and reaches its climax in *The Birth of a Nation*. It is difficult to define Ingram's work in one word, but, perhaps, the most characteristic expression for him is directorial adventurism. Adventurism in the sense of striving for exotic romance, resolved with bright accentuated audacity, not embarrassed in the means to win over the public. ... In contrast to Griffith, who monumentalizes his crowd, Ingram individualizes the mass, giving each one an integral sculptural appearance. He is a master of masks, which he sculpts with flamboyant ingenuity. In actors, he is looking, first of all, for sculptural posture and movement. ... But his audacity is always poisoned by the desire for an sculptural pose, always shackled by the demands of the American consumer, whom he knows how to please" (Rex ..., 1926: 13).

The poet Nikolai Aseev (1889-1963) did not skimp on praise in particular, who titled his article quite definitely: "James Cruse is the best director in America".

N. Aseev wrote that this director in his films is "very subtle, perhaps even too much for the modern American audience. Cruse knows how to educate an actor... James Cruse knows how to play not only actors, but also things... On the topic of his productions... Cruse, I think, is close to us. He destroys romance, he resists with the power of his irony even such a molasses of the script... He fights for the exact human gesture... he fights for the human face, not deadened by puppet prettiness, for real life, not raped by the sham lies of pasted-on wigs, sideburns, and costumes" (Aseev, 1925: 4).

The work of René Clair (1898-1981) (Kaufman, 1927: 13; Tat, 1926: 13) and Louis Delluc (1890-1924) were also highly appreciated in the *Soviet Screen*. In particular, it was noted that, although there is no sociality in Delluc's works, in the sharpness of verbal expression, the staging and rearrangement of individual words of a phrase, words, in their rhythmic alternation aimed at identifying visual images, is the value of Delluc's scenario form. Delluc's literary phrase or a series of edited phrases are felt musically and perceived visually. This is some kind of combination of incompatible elements of sound and image (Scripts..., 1927: 5).

Of course, in some cases, the work of Western directors could receive in the *Soviet Screen* and not so broad evaluation.

So in an article about Cecil DeMille, it was stated that he "never" creates "anything". He painstakingly makes his films, as the first students at school honestly memorize their lessons. There is never any creativity in DeMille's work – only the painful pursuit of success. ... What wins the audience? The courage of the idea, the skill of the actors, the sharpness of the composition? No. Only grandiose figures, scale (Cecil..., 1936: 14).

The work of the director and screenwriter Allan Duane (1885-1981), director of the popular in the 1920s *Robin Hood* (1922) with Douglas Fairbanks, was evaluated more positively in the *Soviet Screen*: "Duane's editing sheets are an example of mathematical art. Starting the first shooting, he already firmly and relentlessly knows the entire order of the montage pieces and the number of frames for each piece. ... The actor plays a huge role in Duane's work. Duane's commandment: the quality of the film depends on the quality of the actor. Duane has a rare skill to reveal an actor, to reveal his possibilities. ... There is nothing to expect great searches from Duane, this is a first-class craftsman who passes off his superbly polished craft as art" (Allan ..., 1926: 13).

The *Soviet Screen* wrote rather sourly about the films of Herbert Brenon (1880-1958), Henry King (1886-1982) and Charles Hutchinson (1879-1949), each time emphasizing the

harmful influence of bourgeois Hollywood on these filmmakers:

About Herbert Brenon: "America, which gave him a world name, turned this artisan into a stamper, as it turns all its actors and directors" (Herbert ..., 1926: 13).

About Henry King: "Along with fashion and triumph, King had to change the nature of his work. He no longer puts on unpretentious farm pictures, he puts, but at the request of entrepreneurs, sensational action films that are very beneficial to the American cash box office but alien to us" (Ven, 1927: 13).

On Charles Hutchinson: "His films don't go to the big theaters where the audience is more sophisticated and demanding. Its base is some kind of low-grade screen of large centers and, mainly, the provinces, the entire huge American province" (Tolkachev, 1927: 13).

And the work of Marcel L'Herbier (1888-1979) received a completely negative assessment (in the spirit of the proletarian struggle against "formalism") in the magazine: "The self-sufficient importance of form, not justified by content, inevitably leads to the fact that aesthetics does not find its inner justification. ... L'Herbier's work ... bears the stamp of stressed refinement, of excessive complexity and detail, sometimes of formal coldness bordering on affectation, which cannot but lead to naked aestheticism" (Marcel..., 1926: 13).

On the whole, it can be concluded that the authors of the *Soviet Screen* in 1925-1927 were not only able to single out the most significant figures of Western directors at that time, but also did not skimp on their praise.

Western film reviews

In 1925-1927, the *Soviet Screen* tried to review the most notable Western films, and many of them received a very positive assessment.

So even another film adaptation of Tarzan's adventures received praise: "It turned out a fair amount of series of trick pictures: fights, chases, etc., along with a love affair. In these pictures, that exotic background is pleasant, which highlights the action so well. ... Of course, the jungle and everything else was done in California, but this could not significantly damage the overall impression" (Tarzan ..., 1925: 13).

The reviewer of the *Soviet screen* was pleased with the comedy *Three Ages* (1923) with the participation Buster Keaton: "The picture is very funny, very light, despite the fact that it is confused in three pines (three eras), and in essence very empty in terms of plot. There is, however, a bit of good irony over the family way of different eras. ... The picture is perceived as a very entertaining, masterfully executed spectacle" (Krasnov, 1926: 7).

Another comedy, this time with Chaplin in the title role – *Pay Day* (1922) received an enthusiastic rating in the magazine: "This (American) film is worth talking about. She is extremely excited. This movie is a comedy. And the worker Charlot must be funny. He is funny too. You laugh at his awkwardness and eternal failures, sometimes until you drop. But suddenly it becomes sad. And somehow I sincerely feel sorry for this typical (after all, we meet thousands of such Charlots: this is a genuine mass concentrated in a given person) simple worker. ... How does Charlie manage to combine the funny and the tragic in one face, and sometimes in a gesture? I would say comically funny and cosmically tragic. This is the real game. This is an actor" (Lemberg, 1925: 12).

The Hollywood film *A Society Scandal* (1924) was regarded in the *Soviet Screen* as "a satire on American marriage. ... the unnecessary trifle *A Society Scandal* looks without stopping, in one gulp ... The film ends and you regret that there is no second series. Leave and forget forever. Everything except acting. ... Gloria Swanson does not capture the experiences of her heroine, only skill. You keep a close eye not on what she will do, but on how she will do it. ... Gloria Swanson is a cold master, with the experience of an accountant, taking into account all the resources of her abilities and achievements. Maybe she touches little, but one cannot but follow the mastery of her art with surprise" (Korolevich, 1926: 13).

Another Hollywood film, *The Dangerous Maid* (1923) (in the Soviet box office, it was called *The Insurgent*), this time on a historical theme, was also received quite favorably in the magazine: there are all the typical elements that are so characteristic of American historical colors. The qualities are: the splendor of the production, the faithfully conveyed historical flavor, for the most part sustained in the style of the era, effective and varied scenes. Disadvantages: superficial approach to history" (Insurgent, 1925: 12).

K. Vidor's film *The Big Parade* (1925), which went to the USSR under the name *Long March* and told about the events of the First World War, was even more highly appreciated in

the *Soviet Screen*: “King Vidor made a lot of good pictures and continues to do them; but he has one, because of which you should look at his way of filmmaking. This picture is *Long March*, dedicated to the theme of the “Great War”. ... It is only necessary to say that it has an amazing effect on the viewer, even if the viewer is negatively disposed towards it. This exciting action of the *Long March* is ensured by the unusually well-found coherence of the parts, the excellent distribution of the material presented to the viewer, the unfolding of the tempo, which is completely invisible to the eye, and the rhythmic clarity” (Shutko, 1927: 6-7).

Quite sympathetically, the reviewer of the *Soviet Screen* reacted to the German drama *Outcasts (Die Verrufenen, 1925)*: “the film is really good, although it does not have any special innovations and directorial tricks. But the production is good, the best artists are playing. In addition, according to the American method, the types are perfectly matched. The content is also more significant and interesting than many other recent films. ... This gives hope that the German film market will be somewhat cleansed of the endless, boring “salon” films” (Season ..., 1925: 6-7).

It must be said that the *Soviet Screen* in 1925-1927, in general, followed the development of German cinematography quite closely, appreciating the works of R. Wiene, F. Lang, F. Murnau:

The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari (Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari, 1920) by R. Wiene: “in general, is a serious artistic achievement. ... strong, bright, beautifully filmed, amazingly acted out. It’s not for nothing that the public is blaming him” (Gul, 1925: 12).

The Nibelungs (Die Nibelungen, 1924) by F. Lang: “Defeated and crushed Germany wanted to show how great the spiritual wealth of the German people is, that the testaments of ancient heroes are alive, that spiritual forces have accumulated in it for centuries, that this spiritual power will raise its people to new exploits. During a period of severe financial collapse, under incredibly difficult conditions, the Nibelungs were slowly, slowly created. ... The majestic and monumental style is sustained throughout the film and this is the main merit of the director Fritz Lang” (Nibelungs, 1925: 9-10).

The Joyless Lane (Die freudlose Gasse, 1925) by G. Pabst: “It excites ... a topic, scarcely – though, used to expose the social face of the city after the war. Separate acute moments excite, giving plentiful and bitter food to memories ... The plot is fragmented into numerous small jumping pieces. It is rather an artistic report showing a number of everyday phenomena from the life of a crushed Vienna, Vienna under the knife of inflation and blatant poverty” (Krasnov, 1926: 5).

The Last Man (Der letzte Mann, 1924) by F. Murnau: “The picture is recognized by critics as the most outstanding production of recent times. ... The ensemble cast is top notch. Of course, first of all, Janings, who, by playing the main role, managed to give a strong, amazing image of the “last” person, conveying with great skill that subtle play of shades that this role required” (Irinin, 1925: 10). “Murnau is calm and slow, like Balzac, like Dickens, and that is his strength. The story of the porter, who was reduced to a lower position for decrepitude, is told admirably. It is told in magnificent cinematic language, so convincing that no captions were needed” (Gecht, 1926: 5).

Faust (Faust – eine deutsche Volkssage, 1926) by F. Murnau, who “set himself the difficult task of turning the sentimental “costume drama” into which the old German legend about Dr. Faust has turned into a cinematic philosophical work. And Murnau very successfully did not fulfill his task. Luckily, because the film turned out to be excellent both in terms of the acting and the subtle resolution of a number of technical tricks that obscured the “world questions” that tormented Murnau” (Faust, 1927: 10).

Far less fortunate in the *Soviet Screen* was Abel Gance’s film *Napoléon (1927)*, which noted large-scale historical scenes, although “all of them are presented with inexpressible pathos, turning into vulgarity, into a purely operatic spectacle. ... It is difficult to say who is more to blame for the failure of the picture: Abel Gance, who interprets it as a narrowly patriotic, reactionary national epic, or Dieudonné, who plays an operetta irresistible victorious hero” (Tatarova, 1927: 8-9).

But the same reviewer highly appreciated the famous *Metropolis (1927)* by Fritz Lang...

Reviews of Western national cinematographies

The primacy in the reviews of Western national cinematographies in the *Soviet Screen* of 1925-1927 undoubtedly belonged to Hollywood productions.

It is clear that, despite a certain kind of “liberties” available to Soviet journalists during this period, at the request of “above” such materials had to practically necessarily contain elements of strict “Bolshevik” criticism based on class anti-bourgeois approaches.

It has been argued, for example, that in Hollywood comes out “a huge number of new paintings, caused by the greedy demand of an undemanding foreign market, the fierce competition of different firms, – all this gives an incentive to release more pictures, equipped with good advertising, often without caring about quality. ... The titles of some of them that were very successful in America: *Her Night of Love*, *Teacher of Love*, *The Man She Bought* are clear enough. They are designed for a bourgeois viewer... Of course, they are not suitable for our audience” (America..., 1925: 11).

“The fascists from the Ku Klux Klan protect one hundred percent “morality” of Americans. ... A plan has been developed for ten new films about 100 % Americanism. ... specifically against the labor movement and blacks. ... Special oversight groups should monitor the sessions, set fire to theaters that do not obey. Disobedient actors, directors and mechanics “disable”! (Zilpert, 1926: 13).

N. Kaufman, in general, hastened to declare the total crisis of American cinema: “Having mastered the grandiose technical capabilities, America, like any capitalist country, subordinated them to the service of its bourgeois ideological interests, the justification of bourgeois morality, the tastes of the American crowd and issues of American exports. At the beginning, when these technical achievements were still accompanied by artistic searches and achievements, Hollywood acquired that halo of the “heart of world cinematography”, which turned the eyes of film workers from all over the world to it. But now it's over. ... there is a natural impoverishment of the spiritual baggage of American film, which is already being felt in America, among the masses, in criticism, in the general press” (Kaufman, 1927: 8-9).

In a similar vein, L. Koltsova also assessed American film production: “In Hollywood, there is a scenario hunger. The golden script fund is drying up. The world's classic literature, thrown under the lens of a Hollywood camera, is gutted and swallowed by a multimillion-dollar spectator. ... Hollywood in a panic is compiling and trying out new household film recipes” (Koltsova, 1926: 4-5).

To all other criticism of the bourgeois mores of Hollywood, the *Soviet Screen* also added anti-religious passages: “American cinema has so far been a brilliant propaganda of capitalist ideas. Day after day, in hundreds of ateliers, scenes “spun” in which millionaire “stars” played out false stories about poor girls who were rewarded with a cruel at first, but fair in the end ... fate – a happy (which means rich in America) marriage. From evening to evening, tens of thousands of cinemas showed pictures of poor and honest young people who became rich as a reward for their modest valor: “honest work” and obedience to “senior”, “superior”. Screens are constantly shouting to the American worker and clerk: be the same as our heroes, endure, work, and you will suffer ... happy end, wealth and family happiness. And suddenly, the American film propaganda decided to step sideways to achievements “new” to it, it decided to reinforce the Christianity ideas” (Failed..., 1927: 7).

An interesting discussion on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* arose about the problem of happy endings in cinema.

A. Tatarova reacted to this ironically: “Let the directors of all American film factories argue, the viewer, having come tired from the factories and from the offices to the cinema for an hour and a half, will rest in it. There is no need to remind unfortunate people of the bad sides of life; let them know that virtue will always prevail... And long live the happy ending – Happy end!” (Tatarova, 1927: 8-9).

But the poet and journalist S. Neldikhen (1891-1942) expressed a different point of view: “Our grin about foreign scenario requirements – “the end must certainly be happy” – is connected with the “slightly ideological content” of foreign films, where the happy ending is “love” and often, simply, attached. However, even with a more serious ideology and in our conditions, such a requirement is also characteristic of us” (Neldikhen, 1926: 14).

On the pages of the *Soviet Screen* of the 1920s, there were also generalizing characteristics of Western cinema in general. At the same time, very negative: “Cinema is not fun, not a game, not entertainment, but a powerful long-range weapon. Cinema is a struggle for a person, for thought, for will, for action. ... Films are the distributors of imperialism in the colonies” (Zilpert, 1926: 5).

And more: “We don’t see a lot of pictures that are very characteristic of bourgeois cinematography, because they are not bought by our purchasing authorities or do not pass the Soviet censorship. And we lose little from this ... Their content, their “core” can be described in a nutshell: this is a piece of pornography around which either tragedy or comedy is built. ... It’s good that this stream of dirt does not reach us!” (Cinema..., 1925: 10).

One of the favorite amusements of the *Soviet Screen* of the 1920s was a caustic mockery of the attempts of Western filmmakers to make films about Russia and Russians (Attasheva, 1927: 4; Berlinskii..., 1927: 4; Gul, 1926: 10; 1927: 4; Tverich, 1926:14):

“Since there is a demand for Russian movies, there is also a demand for experts on Russian issues. Profitable, bread profession, especially for retired generals out of work. ... The “flower” of Russian emigration cinema is gradually gathering under the hospitable wing of Uncle Sam” (Attasheva, 1927: 4).

“Americans are especially distinguished by their absolute ignorance of Russia. ... the fashion for Russian movies has reappeared, and a whole series of films about Russians’ everyday life has been and is thrown into the world market” (Tverich, 1926: 14).

“Russian themes are more interested than any other, namely, German directors, and the great German director Pabst is now working on a large Russian film based on Erenburg’s novel *The Love of Jeanne Ney*. Another director, Fejer, has now released ... a picture from “Russian life”: *Mata Hari – a red dancer*, and, despite the continuous “spreading cranberries” of the pre-war period, the picture has a certain success” (Berlin..., 1927: 4).

This kind of criticism of Western filmmakers moved from issue to issue and was “caused by the emphasized exoticism of the images they modeled. The critical pathos of journal notes fixes, first of all, that they take ‘us for others’, they want to see ‘others in us’. Exoticism as a sign of otherness is manifested in estranged redundancy and exaggeration. Redundancy and exaggeration, especially in the depiction of peasant life, exaggerated situations that are used as a technique for creating a comic effect – all this did not go unnoticed by the authors of the magazine” (Bogatyreva, 2017).

Even the writer and editor Roman Gul (1896-1986), an émigré who fought in the civil war against the Bolsheviks, laughed with pleasure at the “Russian” Western films. Here is what he wrote, for example, about the German movie *Incendiaries of Europe* (*Die Brandstifter Europas*, 1926): “To be clearer, let’s call it *Rasputin in German*... Eternal spreading cranberries of European philistine vulgarity – and here it is. ... It is impossible to comment on this film. From its attendance, only conclusions can be drawn: 1) the interest in everything Russian in Europe is enormous, 2) this is what is presented here as “Russian”, 3) in order to put an end to all this petty-bourgeois “Russian” rubbish, our Soviet paintings must persistently make their way to Europe” (Gul, 1926: 10).

And here we can agree with E. Bogatyreva: the intrigue of how Russia, the USSR, and the Russians were represented in the West, “was added by the fact that immigrants from Russia often acted as an intermediary in creating images of Russian life in Western cinema. The underlying reason for doubts about the authenticity of the film images they created was not only and not so much ideological as cultural. The authors of the journal complained about the image, which, using the terminology of M. Bakhtin, can be described as ‘I-for-the-other’. Bakhtin’s concepts of ‘I-for-myself’ and ‘I-for-other’ convey different aspects of self-perception” (Bogatyreva, 2017).

Indeed, “variations of the film image a la russe were identified at the intersection of two perspectives, two differently directed intentions: on the one hand, this is the representation expressed by Bakhtin’s concept of ‘other-for-me’, and on the other hand, the representation of ‘I-for- another’, in which, indeed, there is a moment of self-presentation. There is nothing surprising in the fact that in the first decades of the 20th century, representatives of emigration acted as mediators, that is, the subject of the ‘I-for-other’ representation as carriers of a certain national culture, living compactly in a different cultural environment” (Bogatyreva, 2013).

The journalist Boris Zilpert (1891-1938) (Zilpert, 1926; 1927), who was shot in the late 1930s on charges of espionage and terrorist activities in favor of Japan, specialized in caustic feuilletons on the topic of bourgeois cinema in the Soviet Screen.

In second place in terms of the number of publications in the *Soviet Screen* of 1925-1927 was German cinematography.

Here, sharp, sometimes feuilleton criticism was combined with quite positive articles.

Here are just two vivid examples of the negative attitude towards German cinema on the pages of the magazine:

“The overwhelming success of *Battleship Potemkin* revolutionized the policy of using films in Germany for propaganda purposes. From the moment the German filmmakers came to know the “truth”, “that politics on the screen makes money at the box office”, we have been witnessing a phenomenon as curious as it is instructive, however, very characteristic of “democratic” Germany. In this country, ruled by the Menshevik Social Democrats, the capitalist film-makers are beginning to mass-produce films, the meaning of which lies in the most shameless agitation of monarchist tendencies” (Borisov, 1926: 3).

“The military theme runs like a red thread through all the new [German] movies. Over the past six months, about ten films from military life have been released. It is interesting that the characters are only officers, and that the action takes place before the world war. Despite the fact that the best actors often play in such films ... they are nevertheless imbued with the spirit of chauvinism to such an extent that they cannot be considered as works of art” (What ..., 1925: 3).

However, in other articles about German cinema, the position of the magazine was different, more objective: “The German film has something in common with the Swedish one, although it differs from it in some features. Similarity: the same seriousness and thoughtfulness, excellent technique and some touch of mysticism and philistinism. A special specific, unhealthy bias of German cinematography is “Dostoevsky” style, a kind of “psychological” self-picking, a disease that pre-revolutionary Russian film production suffered from. ... An exceptional contingent of directors and actors contributes greatly to the artistic value of German film production. In view of the fact that almost all German actors and directors came to the cinema from the theater, a certain bias towards the “theatricalization” of productions and individual shots is noticed in German film production. German film technology, photography, laboratory are impeccable. The editing is calm, even, somewhat slowed down, with all sorts of minor details – ‘facial expressions’... this always results in a certain stretch... Still, despite its unhealthy “psychological” bias, German film production is much more acceptable to the Soviet screen than French and especially Italian” (Everyday..., 1925: 3).

It was further stated with regret that in the USSR “Behind the *Nibelungs*, *Caligari*, *The Last Man*... average German films are not noticed. Meanwhile, they have a special social, technical and artistic orientation, which differs sharply from the “hit movies” of the German film industry. ... The average German film closely follows any change in public taste and mood ... Its path goes: from mysticism and historical plots of the times of inflation, which served as a way to turn away from formidable reality, to the present, following that passion for military films, to ... nationalist films that amused an infringed national feeling and unleashing the national passions of the bourgeois and, finally, a film of the last time in a kind of everyday life, corresponding to the new “stabilization”, showing the life of a big city, attracting the city bourgeois and petty bourgeois to the enticing lights of cinema, where the life of the world and the half world is shown, where, like a modern reworking of the fairy tale about the magic prince, a love affair is conveyed between the inhabitant of the “parterre” – from the golden youth and the poor milliner from the attic. In these movies there is a share of a kind of democracy ... The bourgeois and the petty bourgeois in these pictures are reflected in all their ideological emptiness, with all the ugliness of his life, with their insignificant interests and passions” (Alf, 1926: 5).

French cinematography was also ambiguously evaluated in the *Soviet Screen*. On the one hand, readers were informed that “French film production is imbued with a kind of frivolous approach. Very favorite themes of ordinary French films are all sorts of tabloid love stories, with emphasis and savoring of unhealthy erotica. In more serious films, however, a certain pseudo-classical bias towards outward theatricality and sugary “prettiness” is noticed, both in the nature of the productions themselves and in the choice of actors. ... In addition, both ordinary films and action films are imbued with petty-bourgeois ‘rentier’ psychology. ... General conclusion: France was once the cradle of cinematography, but from this cradle a real enfant terrible has grown up there, who ... behaves more than suspiciously. And we need to approach the purchase of French films very carefully” (Everyday..., 1925: 3). But “the French public has become so accustomed to these ridiculously sentimental stories about Anglo-Saxon beauties escaping the trap of some notorious scoundrel and being saved by a generous bandit that the appearance on the screen of a film that has any real interest is bewildering” (Polyak, 1927: 13).

On the other side, French cinematography in recent years, even in the last one year, has

made great strides – really good films are appearing more and more (Schagena, 1925: 10), the French screen of recent years has been enriched by several interesting films, a whole galaxy of young and talented directors (Abel Gance, L'Herbier, G. Dulac, Rene Clair, etc.) are applying new shooting techniques to cinematography: foregrounds, etc. (Polyak, 1927: 13).

But the Polish cinema of the 1920s, journalists from the *Soviet Screen* did not complain at all, arguing that the “Polish film industry does not yet have its own face. Or rather, there is no Polish cinematography yet. ... Watching any Polish film, you quickly get tired of the noiseless hustle and bustle on the screen. ... Actors kiss incessantly, wringing their hands, look into the auditorium for a long time and go out the door to enter another door or ride a horse. The Poles do not like car chases” (Koltsova, 1927: 4-5).

Italian cinema, often referred to as fascist at that time by the *Soviet Screen*, was written much sharper: “An ordinary Italian film is a hopeless miserable hack, imbued with the same religious and ultra-petty-bourgeois spirit, and there is no need to talk about the technique of the production itself and the actors; complete confusion, helplessness and ignorance of elementary cinematic truths and laws. ... In historical films, the adventures of all kinds of Roman emperors and generals are endlessly shown. People’s experiences are usually not shown, and if they are shown, then in a very dubious light. From an ideological (and purely artistic and cinematographic) point of view, all ordinary Italian film production is almost absolutely hopeless, and we must definitely refrain from buying it” (Italian..., 1925: 8).

It was emphasized that in Italy “fascism monopolized cinema. The screen kindles passions. The Mediterranean Sea floats in front of the viewer under the fascist flag. ... Recently, an order was issued – to view all the acting films. They were looking for sedition. The scissors cut hundreds of meters without any regret. Campaign for one hundred percent integrity on the film front. “But you can follow everything.” And so it happened. In one film, where the biography of the leader of fascism is given in heroic colors, annoying lines from the distant past crept in. Mussolini once called himself a socialist. ... It is clear that the cinema was smashed and the moviegoers were beaten. An ultimatum was made. Forget what you saw. For fascists, even the laws of vision are retroactive” (Zilpert, 1927: 14).

The *Soviet Screen* of the 1920s had a much more positive attitude towards the cinema of the Scandinavian countries.

Thus, in the pages of the magazine it was noted that “Swedish film production is very original and has some specific features. First of all, I am pleased with the almost complete absence of “salon” themes in general. We are so tired of “nobly” suffering dress-coat gentlemen and languid ladies, whose entire costume sometimes consists of several ribbons and rests “only on parole” ... and it is so gratifying to see simple, healthy, strong people on the screen – and in general the whole uncomplicated life northerners, more kindred to us in spirit. From the ideological point of view, there is, unfortunately, a tendency towards the fetishism of petty-bourgeois property-ownership, predominantly of a farmer-petty-bourgeois fold, and some aspirations of a mystical nature are noticed. Otherwise, Swedish production is ideologically one of the most acceptable for the Soviet screen” (On..., 1925: 9).

Another article commended Danish film adaptations of literary classics, although the main “field of achievement for the Danish film industry is comedy films. One has only to name the names of Pat and Patashon, as the whole of Europe laughs. Both of them have become favorites of half the world... They are an example of real Danish humor – healthy, strong” (Grossman, 1925: 11).

So, the articles of the *Soviet Screen* about Western cinematographies were much more imbued with ideological approaches than reviews of individual films or portraits of foreign actors and directors.

However, there were also articles of a different nature in the journal. For example, the reflections of the young at that time director G. Roshal (1898-1983) about the typology of films on a historical topic.

Grigory Roshal believed that the comprehensive and vague concept of historical film can be easily divided into four main, typical groups according to the method of using and processing historical material:

1. Reproduction-restoration of a historical episode, era, or way of life. A film that requires a lot of scientific study and authenticity.
2. The film is mainly entertaining.

3. Adaptation or use of the historical situation for the approximate solution of certain artistic and psychological tasks and some social problems set before us by modernity.

4. A form of targeted distortion of historical material to exacerbate parody, grotesque, irony and satire...

It is clear that these types of film do not occur in their pure form, but the emphasis on one or another of them determines the general line of the picture (Roshal, 1926: 5).

Articles on Western Newsreel

As in relation to feature films, the position of the *Soviet Screen* in relation to Western newsreels was significantly dependent on ideological approaches.

Of course, it was argued that in the West, "cinema is a powerful tool in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Hence, the newsreel should be something that captures only the outward brilliance of life. ... The worker on the screen is an extremely unpleasant sight for bourgeois eyes. ... Brilliant in appearance and wretchedly one-sided in content: this is how all Western newsreels have to be characterized" (Foreign ..., 1925: 7). "The themes of foreign newsreels are clearly specific. "How they live and work" uncrowned kings of capital. Their life, accessories, environment, background. Fashion, casinos, resorts, yachts, horse racing, running. Weddings, divorces, incidents in the "society", scandals, bankruptcy, careerism" (Two..., 1925: 4). "The bourgeoisie tells in the newsreel its million-meter life, its way of life... Newsreel is 100 % film advertising. The screen was taken over by manufacturers, shopkeepers, and even rag merchants. ... The chronicle is also full of criminal tricks" (Zilpert, 1926: 14).

At the same time, it was noted that in the West there are dozens of movies that are very interesting for people of science, beautiful as scientific aids, but so uncomplicated in terms of artistry and entertainment, so unpopular that it was not possible for an ordinary, wide audience to show them outside of universities no possibility. ... And finally, the third, most brilliant period in the development of culture-film came, when they began to enjoy the same success as world action films" (German..., 1927: 6-7).

And in N. Spiridovsky's articles about newsreels in America there was no politics at all, but there was a detailed story about the technologies for creating such films (Spiridovsky, 1927. 9: 5; 18: 5).

In an article by G. Boltyansky (1885-1953), one of the pioneers of Soviet newsreels, who in 1926-1931 held the post of chairman of the amateur film section of the Central Council of the Society of Friends of Soviet Cinema, it was generally about the lessons of overseas newsreels useful for Soviet filmmakers: "American firms have a large staff in the center, their own special laboratories, airplanes, trains, cars. Operators of the firm receive high salaries. Big money is paid for some sensational shootings. ... it is clear that their costs are paying off. What explains this? First, the widespread operation and network of operators around the world. Secondly, by organizing the marketing of the chronicle in a large number of copies and in different countries. ... In addition to the variety of material and good organization of the case. The main importance in the work of the foreign chronicle is the speed of delivery of the filmed material and the speed of the release of the chronicle. ... We must also, like American firms, become the world giant of the chronicle, but the chronicle of the Soviet, the chronicle of the proletariat" (Boltyansky, 1926: 6).

Articles about foreign film technology, studios and cinemas

Articles on the topic of foreign film technology, the functioning of film studios and cinemas in the *Soviet Screen* were practically apolitical.

Moreover, magazine stories about Western experience in this area were sometimes simply enthusiastic: "Hollywood, an amazing, fabulous city, has grown spontaneously in a few years, thanks to the extraordinary development of the film industry. ... Rumor has surrounded Hollywood with bad fame. Several high-profile scandals caused by the blackmailing tricks of some capitalists who stuck to cinematography contributed to the creation of an opinion about Hollywood as a hotbed of vices, revelry and orgies. Reality, however, refutes this. There are no theaters, no nightclubs or dance halls in Hollywood, but instead there are countless movie theaters. The whole mass of film workers, as soon as they have a free minute, hurries to these cinemas to look at the latest films from other films" (Hollywood..., 1926: 14).

"Hollywood is the first movie city in the world. Hollywood is a place of complete mixing of races, peoples and languages" (Attasheva, 1925: 10).

"The motto of their film industry: no accidents. Everything must be provided for, the work

of directors, actors and editors proceeds in a strict rhythm according to an iron script. Not a single minute can be lost, money is paid for every minute, and therefore every minute must be used. It is not allowed to damage a single button in an established mechanized device. Everything must be foreseen and verified in advance, like moves in a chess game” (Leonidov, 1926: 6-7).

Similar opinions were expressed on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* of 1925-1927 about Western cinemas (Alf, 1927: 8; Moore, 1927: 10; Tchaikovsky, 1927: 5), and about the technology of filming sound films in the USA (Talking ..., 1926: 14).

Such approaches proceeded from the traditional tasks cultivated in the USSR of the 1920s: to criticize Western ideology, but to adopt successful Western practical experience in the field of technology and production.

However if in 1925-1926 the articles of this thematic field in the *Soviet Screen* rather focused on “learning from the experience of Western cinema, then in the following 1927, the topic of cultural interactions in the field of cinema begins to sound like a call to overcome dependence on foreign film production. The trend is changing, but the theme of “they” and “we”, that is, the consideration of Soviet film production in a broad global context, remains one of the main intrigues of film journalism” (Bogatyreva, 2017).

Short informational materials about (sensational) events in foreign cinema and everyday details of the life of movie stars

Actually, it was precisely for the sake of these materials, coupled with photographs of Hollywood movie stars, that the ‘New Economic Policy’ public read the *Soviet Screen*, thanks to which the circulation of the magazine in 1926-1927 was maintained at an average of 70-80 thousand copies and brought profit to the publishing house.

In these illustrated materials, at first, as a rule, the luxurious life of Hollywood stars was colorfully described. Or, for example, such a vivid text was published: “A vampire woman, a predator, overwhelming and conquering, a spider woman tightening her victim in love with her web of webs, a demon woman, seductive and terrible ... how many of these “Vamps” work in the studio of Hollywood, Los Angeles, New York, etc.” (Vampire..., 1925: 12). But then the authors reminded the readers of the magazine that this is an atmosphere full of not only brilliance and glory, but also the most greedy capitalist revelry, the atmosphere of the dictatorship of the big over the small, the atmosphere of crushing, humiliation, the most shameless exploitation of a small fry, an employee, an extra, a beginner (Attasheva, 1925: 13-14; Their..., 1925: 7; Zilpert, 1927: 14).

Plus, of course, the magazine could not resist the temptation of feuilletonism when it was reported that the court of the state of Ohio, standing guard over Lincoln's legality and freedom of the individual, ruled that every citizen of the state has the right to get drunk and go to the movies in this form (Zilpert, 1927: 6), and Hollywood went so far as to film the scene of a real suicide man (Zilpert, 1927: 10).

Scoured the *Soviet Screen* and Western film advertising:

“Advertising is condiment. A means of stimulating the appetite for the spectacle... The technique of advertising is the most complex science of how to overcome human apathy and distrust. ... What does every cunning person do, wanting to achieve his own? Depending on their temperament, they can use various tricks: firstly, to stun, psychologically stun, stun, and then deal with the stunned as he wants. Secondly, you can stubbornly and methodically drum something into a person that he may not agree with ... Then you can play on any strings-passions of a person (curiosity, greed, stinginess, etc.)” (Psychology..., 1925: 10).

“Advertising plays a huge role in the life of cinema abroad. In essence, 75 % of the success of any film is built on advertising. ... In our pathetic attempts at publicity, we are still children. Any American movie maker will laugh at our way of advertising in the form of tiny ads and colorless posters. In this we are definitely, undoubtedly and colossally lagging behind. And this is good. ... That unhealthy type of advertising that has formed in the capitalist states corresponds as well as possible to their external and internal appearance. He is alien to us. We are building our cinema under different conditions, and we do not need those methods of advertising that are created by the bourgeois-capitalist economy” (Advertising, 1925: 12).

Materials on censorship and perception of Western films by the Soviet public

Of course, *Soviet Screen* cannot ignore the topic of perception of Western films by the Soviet public and censorship.

In particular, there was concern about the negative impact of Western cinema on the increase in crime rates among Soviet youth:

“In the campaign against hooliganism, no one has yet remembered the role that cinema plays in the development of criminal acts and the role that it plays and can play as a fight against anti-social manifestations. Criminologists in Europe and America have long been studying the question of the influence of cinema on crime. More than once, the influence of detective films, in which the criminal is portrayed as an attractive romantic hero, has been established on juvenile beginners in the craft of hooliganism and other types of crime. There is no doubt that the movies that idealize the heroism of crime give appropriate impetus to the unstable psyche of young people, of course, prepared for a criminal action by a number of other everyday conditions. At the same time, it should be assumed that such impetus can be given not only by pictures directly and openly romanticizing crime, but also by those that excite the viewer with the appearance of bourgeois luxury and depravity, even if this is offered under the guise of exposing “bourgeois decay”. We will find such grateful material in a significant number of foreign films, the effect of which is not only neutralized, but aggravated by the eye-catching redrawing of our witty editors and editors. The dispute about the harmfulness of a certain part of foreign paintings could be transferred to the rails of objective study if our criminologists collected material on the degree of their influence on hooligans and juvenile delinquents who passed through the judicial authorities” (*Cinema...*, 1926: 3).

As is well known, in the USSR of the 1920s, for the purpose of censorship, the method was widely practiced not only of cutting out “unwanted episodes”, but also of re-editing foreign films, supplying them with “ideologically correct” titles. In this regard, the *Soviet Screen* published an article on its pages, where the censors were urged to show a kind of tolerance for Western film production: “There is no more thankless and painful work than rewiring a finished tape. There is no more difficult work in the cinema than extracting plot fasteners from a finished plot, when the entire plot structure collapses with a bang and you have to make props for the plot with the help of inscriptions and randomly suitable shots. ... They don’t buy films that are obviously harmful and hostile to us. Buy generally harmless. If they have provisions that can be developed in such a way that they make the viewer think and move their brains, then often, with the help of scissors and inscriptions, the film is given a burdensome weight that drags it to the bottom. ... So – be careful with scissors, comrades” (*Nikulin*, 1926: 5).

It is clear that such “liberal” statements were no longer possible in the next, ideologically stricter period of the journal’s existence...

Conclusion. So, our research has shown that the subject of Western cinema on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine in 1925-1927 was extensive and varied. Due to rather significant creative freedoms in the *Soviet Screen* in 1925-1927, photographs of Western movie stars (including photos on the covers of magazines), rather neutral or even positive biographies of Hollywood and European actors and directors, notes on filming and film distribution, reviews of Western films, etc. were widely published in 1925-1927 (all these materials were written in a lively, non-scientific language, designed for a mass audience). Although, of course, there were also ideologically biased materials on the pages of the magazine.

Based on the analysis (in the context of the historical, socio-cultural and political situation, etc.) of the first years of the existence of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1925-1927), we came to the conclusion that materials on Western cinema during this period can be divided into the following types:

- ideologized articles emphasizing criticism of bourgeois cinema and its harmful influence on the audience (this included materials on the perception of Western films by the Soviet public and censorship);
- biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors (often neutrally or positively evaluating these filmmakers);
- reviews of Western films (often positive);
- reviews of Western national cinematographies (here, as a rule, criticism of bourgeois cinematography was combined with a positive assessment of works and trends ideologically acceptable to the USSR);
- articles about Western newsreels (with approaches similar to reviews of national cinemas);
- articles about foreign film technology, studios and cinemas (as a rule, ideologically

neutral, containing calls to adopt technically advanced Western experience, in particular, sound cinema);

- short informational materials (with photographs) about events in foreign cinema, about everyday details of the life of movie stars; which became the main bait for a significant part of the magazine's readers.

Western Cinematography on the Pages of the *Soviet Screen* Magazine: 1928-1930

In this chapter, we analyze the second stage in the history of the *Soviet Screen* magazine: from 1928 to 1930. It was a period of fairly prompt reaction of the journal to the results of First All-Union Conference of Film and Photo Workers (December 12-17, 1927), First All-Union Party Conference on Cinema (convened by the Central Committee of the Communist Party in March 15-21, 1928 and approved the Resolution “Results of the construction of cinema in the USSR and the tasks of Soviet cinematography”); meeting in the Glavrepertkom to revise the fund of films and clear the screen of “ideologically harmful” films (April 7, 1928), after which foreign topics in the magazine were gradually reduced to a minimum.

Here we take into account that at the end of 1929 the *Soviet Screen* was transformed into *Cinema and Life*, and at the beginning of 1931 it was merged with the *Cinema & Culture* magazine under the name *Proletarian Cinema*, and from that year it began to count *Cinema Art* journal (Fedorov, 2022; Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022; Levitskaya, 2022).

We will focus on the analysis of materials about foreign cinema published in the *Soviet Screen* magazine from 1928 to 1930, when its managing editors were: Nikolai Yakovlev (we, alas, could not find his dates of life either in the archives or in other publications), Vasily Russo (1881-1942), Vyacheslav Uspensky (1880-1929) and Yakov Rudoy (1894-1978).

In Table 2 statistics are presented reflecting the changes (from 1928 to 1930) of the titles of the journal, organizations, the organ of which the journal was, its circulation, periodicity. The names of the editors in charge of the journal and the time periods of their leading work in the publication are indicated.

Tab. 2. *Soviet Screen* / *Cinema & Life* magazine (1928-1930): statistical data

Year of issue	Magazine title	Publisher	Magazine circulation (in thousands of copies)	Magazine periodicity (issues per year)	Editors the magazine
1928	<i>Soviet Screen</i>	Theater & Cinema Printing	60 – 80	52	Nikolai Yakovlev №№ 1-17. Vasily Russo №№ 18-27. Vyacheslav Uspensky №№ 28-52.
1929	<i>Soviet Screen</i>	Theater & Cinema Printing	25 – 80	45	Vyacheslav Uspensky №№ 1-15. Jacob Rudoy №№ 16-45.
1930	<i>Cinema and Life</i>	Theater & Cinema Printing, Earth and Factory	45 – 50	36	Jacob Rudoy №№ 1-36.

Based on the content analysis of the texts published in the *Soviet Screen* magazine in the period from 1928 to 1930, we identified the following main genres:

- articles sharply criticizing the policy in the field of distribution of foreign films and the harmful influence of Western cinema on Soviet viewers;
- biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors;
- reviews of Western films;
- reviews of Western national cinematographies;
- articles about Western newsreels;
- articles about foreign film technology, studios and cinemas;
- short informational materials about events in foreign cinema.

Opinion articles sharply criticizing the foreign film distribution policy and the harmful influence of Western cinema on Soviet viewers

On First All-Union Conference of Film and Photo Workers (December 12-17, 1927) and in the article of critic, future editor of *Soviet Cinema* / *Cinema Art* journal Konstantin Yukov

(1902-1938) (who was the executive Secretary of the Association of Revolutionary Filmmakers, a member of the Association of Proletarian Writers), published in December 1927 with the eloquent title “The Ideological Center of Burgers” (Yukov, 1927: 71- 78), was applied with a significant blow to the Tea-cinema-print publishing house (and, consequently, to the *Soviet Screen* as the product of this publishing house).

The sharp criticism of Tea-cinema-print was continued in during the debate of the Association of Revolutionary Filmmakers on film criticism in February 1928 (In..., 1928: 2), where the Association of Proletarian Writers’ activist, journalist, poet and playwright V. Kirshon (1902-1938) accused the heads of the publishing house (primarily – V. Uspensky) in the “trade in ideology”, in propaganda of bourgeois cinema and vulgarity. Specifically about the *Soviet Screen* (of which N. Yakovlev was the editor-in-chief in 1928), Vladimir Kirshon wrote that “this journal is dominated by an ideology hostile to us, dominated by a petty bourgeois who contributes to the petty-bourgeois indoctrination of our Soviet viewers. First of all, absolutely shameless advertising of foreign movie stars” (Kirshon, 1928: 144). Similar were the accusations contained in the article of the same V. Kirshon in *Komsomolskaya Pravda* dated February 17, 1928.

Next took place First All-Union Party Conference on Cinema (convened by the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party in March 15-21, 1928 and approved the Resolution “Results of the construction of cinema in the USSR and the tasks of Soviet cinematography”), where many Soviet publications on cinema were also sharply criticized for promoting foreign films and Hollywood movie stars, for omissions in the field of ideological work.

In response to this, the *Soviet Screen* magazine hastened to publish the “perestroika” editorial appeal “To all readers”: “In order to further comprehensively update and improve our journal and satisfy the reader’s requests, we appeal to all our regular and occasional readers with a request to communicate their wishes about the necessary improvements, increase, decrease or change of those or other departments of our journal, as well as wishes for the introduction of new departments. We are convinced that with the help of our readers we will be able to create a film magazine that will fully meet the current needs put forward by an urgent need. Edition” (To..., 1928).

But the flywheel of criticism, directed, among other things, against the *Soviet Screen*, such appeals could no longer be stopped. After meeting in the Glavrepertkom to revise the fund of films and clean the screen from “ideologically harmful” films, which took place on April 7, 1928, the executive editor of the *Soviet Screen* Nikolai Yakovlev could no longer stay in his chair, and from May 1 of the same year he was replaced in as temporary managing editor Vasily Russo (1881-1942), who fully justified his temporary status by the fact that he was known more as an artist, sculptor and organizer of the chess and checkers movement in the USSR (he was repressed in 1938, died in a camp in 1942).

V. Russo actively hastened to completely restructure the work of the journal. So it was him, under temporary editorship, that almost the entire number 26 of the *Soviet Screen* (26.06.1928) was devoted to criticism of foreign cinema and foreign film repertoire in the USSR.

Already on the cover of the magazine, readers were met with a photo collage of foreign films and the inscription: “Down with foreign rubbish!”

And at the very beginning of the issue it was strictly stated that “The All-Union Party Conference on Film Affairs, the press, and the broad circles of the Soviet public drew attention to the significant clogging of the screens of the USSR with poor-quality film products. Based on this, and also taking into account the increased demands of the worker-peasant audience and the especially important role of cinema in the cultural revolution, the Glavrepertkom began to review all artistic film production, both foreign and Soviet production. First of all, the products of 1925-26 and 27 are viewed. The published first list of feature films is compiled by the Glavrepertkom from releases of different years selectively and is subject to immediate removal from the screens of the RSFSR for the following reasons: idealization of the pathological and decadent moods of the decaying bourgeoisie; popularization of hidden prostitution and debauchery; romance of naked trickery and criminality; display of unjustified cruelty and sadism, designed to fray the nerves and unhealthy interest of the philistine audience; preaching bourgeois morality, mysticism, etc.” (Finally!, 1928: 2).

Among the films “subject to immediate removal from the screens of the RSFSR” were the following Western films: *Black Envelope*, *Noble Foreigner*, *House of Hatred*, *Bella Donna*,

Bandida, White Moth, Priestess Leah, The Messenger of the Gods, Pietro the Corsair, The Ghost, The Fatal Letter, At Seven P.M., Her Fly's Trademark (Finally!, 1928: 2).

The details of the fight against the harmful ideological influence of Western cinema were explained further in the editorial of the Soviet Screen under the title “Down!”: “Cinema is a sharpened weapon of our class enemy. And here, as on other fronts of our social life, the bourgeoisie does not sleep for a moment and supports a fierce war against us. In order to better achieve the goal, she divided her paintings into two parts: one for her own consumption, the other for the workers. She again divided her own paintings into two groups. The first group is designed to strengthen and develop the basic laws of bourgeois morality, helping them to maintain their dominance. The second group is for entertainment and admiring the presence of their power and strength. Movies for workers, in turn, she also divided into two groups. The first of them she specifically designed to obscure the class consciousness of the workers. To this end, she eloquently and convincingly proves how, through mutual compromises, and more often, by the “noble” acquiescence of the enlightened bourgeois entrepreneur to the ignorant “of course” worker, it is possible to achieve between them a peaceful agreement and amicable, happy cooperation under its own bourgeois rule. The second group, already with the aim of lulling and diverting the attention of the workers from public interests, is a picture of the empty and stupid adventures and adventures of heroes overcoming unnecessary obstacles to anyone with puzzling tricks and manifestations of strength and dexterity. ... We can and must fight against this poisonous movie stuff. Along with the strengthening of domestic production, it is necessary to decisively reduce the import of foreign products, if it is not possible to completely abandon them. We need to concentrate our struggle against foreign junk, which is always harmful to us, always poisonous. We need foreign products to declare an implacable boycott. There should be no agreements here – a merciless war! Down with foreign rubbish!” (Down!, 1928: 3).

What can and should be taken from foreign products was further explained to the readers of the magazine by N. Kaufman, who tried to partially justify the series of publications of the *Soviet Screen* of past years, thereby diverting (at least partially) state criticism from him: “Looking back, we can state that among the legion of average film production that flooded our screens, there were films that can be considered milestones in the history of cinematography, because the formal principle that prevailed in them established the canons and thus the foundation of artistic film production. The best examples of American stunt film, with its movement, Griffith and James Kruse, Chaplin, some French have had a huge impact on the development of the cinematography of our production workers. The art of real cinematic language, genuine cinematic speech is now being born in our country through the efforts of our best directors, – however, in the fact that they immediately established the independence of cinema, its complete isolation from the theater, its own laws in a number of other arts, etc. ... In Western production, the area of comedy and satire is of great interest to us. ... classic American comedies ... – ideologically harmless films – possess, however, the finest cinematic style, in the sense of showing the mechanics of movements and the mechanics of sensations; unfortunately, Western satire always stops halfway, with a magnificently unfinished gesture, as, for example, in René Clair’s film *Paris Asleep*. ... Chaplin raises great controversy around his name. Violently rejected by some and extolled by others, it harbors in itself a revolutionary ferment of great power for the Western bourgeoisie. His films, about which the whole world dreams, are a protest against the laws of bourgeois society. For us, it is interesting from a purely formal point of view, because its romantic irony stands far behind the pathos of our revolutionary themes” (Kaufman, 1928: 4).

However, along with such a “lawyer’s” passage, N. Kaufman hastened to emphasize that, on the whole, the magazine agrees with the sharp criticism of the policy of distributing foreign films in the USSR: exert a sinister influence on the consciousness and taste of our layman and even the worker-peasant spectator. “Aligning with the greatest care the ideological line of our Soviet picture, we completely thoughtlessly allowed the cultivation of tabloid romance, massacre on the screens ... In the field of Western film drama, individual grandiose things cannot atone for the ideological unacceptability of most films in which bourgeois-individualist or anarchist morality prevails” (Kaufman, 1928: 4).

In the same issue, the actor and director V. Zhemchuzhny (1898-1966) proposed a method for showing foreign films: “What should we do with this average, standard film of German-French-American production, which has been safely walking on our screens for many years?

After all, paintings of this type are codes of high-and-petty-bourgeois morality. Mass self-instruction manuals of everyday behavior. ... How to stop this frank, open mass propaganda of an ideology hostile to us, if, as before, the average foreign film will be imported to us? The answer is clear: you need to neutralize, disinfect this film before it is released. ... It is necessary to force the viewer to take the material of foreign films lightly. It needs to be parodied. Irony is the best immunity from ideological contagion. ... One should not be afraid to emphasize the ironic attitude to the material in all average foreign films in distribution by inscriptions and remounting” (Zhemchuzhny, 1928: 5).

As a result, after the release of issue 26 for 1928, photos of foreign stars practically disappeared from the covers of the *Soviet Screen*, now portraits of Soviet actors and actresses and their characters were placed on the photo covers from issue to issue (often next to a tractor, machine tool and other production tools).

The line of “correcting ideological miscalculations” was continued in the journal by the head of the Teakinopechat (Tea-Cinema-Print) V. Uspensky (1880-1929), who again headed the *Soviet Screen* from July 1928 (from No. 28).

However, even the minimization of foreign topics in the *Soviet Screen* in 1928 did not save the magazine and its editor from continued sharp criticism: on February 19, 1929, an article was published in *Izvestia* under the ominous title “Teakinopechat publishing house sells ideology” (Tea..., 1929: 4).

In this editorial, the attitude towards the activities of Teakinopechat and V. Uspensky personally was extremely negative: “As early as the 1927 meeting spoke of the exceptional weakness of books on theater and cinema, the ideological intemperance of criticism, and the dependence of critical evaluations on the policies of competing theater enterprises. However, unscrupulous “merchants” who work both in magazines and in the publishing house have turned the main theater and film magazines *Modern Theater* and *Soviet Screen* into advertising publications aimed at increasing the income of the publishing house. It has been established that these magazines not only published portraits and photographs of actors for a special fee, but also sold editorial material – whole pages – to individual organizations and individuals, copying the commercial methods of the bourgeois press. ... *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, pointing out that the activities of the Teakinopechat publishing house are ideological sabotage, discrediting our press and our line in matters of art in the eyes of the mass reader and film workers, asks if it is not time to head the publishing house that has monopolized literature on theater and cinema, to imprison seasoned communists instead of ideology dealers? (Tea..., 1929: 4).

In March 1929, a public trial took place over Uspensky, initiated by the Workers’ and Peasants’ Inspectorate and a collegium of workers’ assessors. “In connection with articles that appeared in *Komsomolskaya Pravda* accusing the board of Teakinopechat of “dealing in ideology”, selling articles on individual films and cinema organizations, and receiving money for them as for advertising, the united bureau of complaints of the Workers’ and Peasants’ Inspectorat together with a collegium of working assessors examined this accusation and confirmed its existence” (Case..., 1929: 11). As a result, the meeting of working assessors decided to dismiss a number of senior employees of Teakinopechat (including the recent temporary editor of *Soviet Screen*, V. Russo). Also on the agenda was the question of expelling V. Uspensky from the ranks of the Communist Party.

Newspaper materials were immediately published about this public trial, approving punitive measures against the Teakinopechat (Businessmen..., 1929: 4).

Unable to withstand these accusations and harassment, V. Uspensky committed suicide on March 28, 1929.

In his letter (dated March 30, 1929) A. Lunacharsky wrote that V. Uspensky “did not find the strength to fight further against the vile persecution, the victim of which he fell” (Lunacharsky, 1929). Apparently, the causes of V. Uspensky’s death and the level of official reaction to it were discussed for a long time at the “very top”, therefore, obituaries appeared in the professional press very late (April 7-16), already after the sympathetic material in *Pravda* (Cinema, 1929: 1; Minkin, 1929: 3; Rokotov et al., 1929: 3). In the *Soviet Screen* itself, the obituary was published only on April 16, 1929 (No. 16).

From April No. 16, 1929, the *Soviet Screen* magazine was headed by the historian and journalist Yakov Rudoy (1894-1978), under which in 1930 it was renamed *Screen & Life*. Under

the editorship of Y. Rudy, less and less was written about foreign cinema in the *Soviet Screen*, and if they did, it was mostly a negative assessment of the so-called “bourgeois cinema”.

Soon after the appointment of Y. Rudy to the post of editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen*, an editorial was published on its pages, where the “party” self-criticism of the publication was combined with a kind of program to correct shortcomings: “*Soviet Screen* is a magazine of its own type. Until now, its pages have combined coverage of topical and acute issues of Soviet cinematography with purely “entertaining” material, which was not always ideologically consistent and of good quality. ... And finally, in practice, the magazine often served as a place for advertising various “movie stars”, both of Soviet and foreign origin. ... As a result, without the correct ideological and literary orientation, the *Soviet Screen* did not have a definite literary face and often slipped into the service of a tradesman who was looking for pure entertainment, spicy piquancy, etc. in literature, theater and cinema. All these troubles of the journal stemmed from the eclecticism of its attitude, the monstrous hodgepodge of reader groups and their demands, which he tried to satisfy. It’s time to finally put a cross on it. The situation on the ideological front and the unfolding of the cultural revolution demand from us a clear class line, a correct literary attitude, and not indulging the petty-bourgeois tastes of the layman. ... Accordingly, it is necessary to cover Soviet and foreign production in such a way that it helps the viewer to understand the social, class and artistic aspects ... The magazine here can be a consultant and ideological assistant to the working viewer. ... We must acquaint the reader with the technical achievements of capitalist cinematography, and [expose the rotten ideology]. ... Expelling bohemian customs, the slightest hint of yellowness, the journal must beware of the danger of becoming dry, protocol, stereotyped” (*Soviet...*, 1929: 3).

In connection with the campaign to overcome the above drawbacks of the magazine, a questionnaire survey of the *Soviet Screen* readers was conducted: it was supposed that the results of such a survey would help “the editors to identify the face of their readers. The answers to the questionnaire would reflect the reader’s cultural level and clearly indicate his or her interests. At our staff meetings there are heated debates about proposed measures to improve the magazine and develop its program. The results of the survey will help our editors to grasp the main demands of the readership and, thanks to that, to find the right setting for the magazine. ... Readers must answer our questions with all the seriousness of people interested in the successful development of our cinema” (*A Look...*, 1929: 4).

In the period 1929-1930, the editors of the *Soviet Screen* magazine emphasized their irreconcilable class positions from issue to issue: “Bourgeois tastes, bourgeois consciousness have ... their roots, although drying up, but still connected with some kind of soil ... Therefore, any attempt to lubricate the sharpness of the struggle against hostile influences in art and, in particular, in cinema is highly frivolous and dangerous. A great and naive simplification should be considered the restriction of class vigilance in relation to bourgeois attacks in art only within the framework of themes and mechanical regulation” (*About...*, 1929: 3).

Of course, the magazine sometimes had to admit that “the purely material riches of Western cinema are superior to ours”. But on the other hand, it was emphasized that “a whole series of organizational vices sometimes reduces these advantages to artistic zero. ... If we now move from technology to ideology, then everything seems to be clear: who does not know that tasteless philistines and petty bourgeois dictate their tastes to Western cinema, that it is a prisoner of bourgeois “non-principledness”, that it has closed its thematic circle with variations, true countless, but variations of a very small number of love, adventure and detective motifs. Our superiority seems undeniable. Traditions of deceitful morality of hypocrisy do not weigh on our cinematography, ... our cinema knows no limits to its thematic searches ... But it seems to us that the matter is not so simple. And we have a lot to learn from Western cinema in the ideological field. What? Firstly, the ability to sensitively catch and perfectly fulfill the social order. Western cinema is bourgeois cinema, but it serves its class with the methods of extraordinarily skillful propaganda, propaganda so flexible, so hidden under innocent unbiasedness, so artistically impressive that we should learn from Western cinema this “ideological technique”. ... It can be said that in the field of ideology, we must learn from Western cinema in the same way as we learn from the enemy: to master his techniques, but direct them to the opposite goals. Secondly, Western cinema feels its audience better than ours. Western cinema knows how to please the tradesman. Our cinema often lags behind the demands of the advanced audience” (*Ours...*, 1929: 7).

Returning to the discussion about foreign films in the Soviet box office, *Soviet Screen* admitted that “it is difficult to dispute the need to import foreign film production to us. Our film production is not yet able to satisfy all the needs of the market for motion pictures. Under such conditions, refusing to import foreign films would mean dooming our cinema network to curtailment and, ultimately, paralyzing the production of Soviet films, which need a widely developed cinema network” (On..., 1929: 3).

However, the editorial continued, “If for many years to come we will be forced to import foreign film production, then a number of very important considerations make us have our own firmly established import policy. ... In fact, chaos and frivolity reign in this area, turning into some kind of system of planting with the help of foreign products of bad petty-bourgeois taste and the most disgusting bourgeois ideas. We are far from accusing anyone of deliberate sabotage. Here the old scourge of Soviet cinematography is at work - narrow businessism and poorly understood interests of commercial gain” (On..., 1929: 3).

At the same time, *Soviet Screen* recognized that “the foreign market provides some opportunity for selecting healthy, interesting and useful film production. In foreign countries, we find, first of all, a number of brilliant scientific and educational paintings. ... Enriching the viewer's knowledge with useful information, these paintings are at the same time full-blooded works of art and, as such, are an excellent variety of highly entertaining production. In foreign countries, they attract a million-strong audience and make a brilliant “commercial career”. ... If we turn to the production of foreign feature films, then here we will find interesting and excellent samples. True, any foreign plot picture is obviously sick for us in an ideological sense. But this means that we have to import only those of them which can at least bring up in our viewer a good artistic taste” (On..., 1929: 3).

Biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors

In contrast to the period of 1925-1927, *Soviet Screen* wrote very little about the work of Western filmmakers in 1928-1930.

One of the few exceptions in the general atmosphere of exposing the harmful influence of foreign cinema were articles by director L. Kuleshov (1899-1970) and critic K. Feldman (1887-1967) with a positive characterization of the work of D. Griffith and Ch. Chaplin.

According to L. Kuleshov, “Griffith worked either on pure cinema dynamics, or on the pure experience of the sitters, forcing them to convey the psychological state with the most complex movements of his mechanism. ... Chaplin reduced to almost nothing the elementary display of emotions on his face. It demonstrates the behavior of a person in various cases of his life through communication with things, with objects. From their state, the way the hero treats the environment and people changes, his behavior changes” (Kuleshov, 1928: 5).

And K. Feldman believed that “Chaplin builds comedies, where the development of the characters comes from certain positions in which they find themselves. This situation, first of all, should be unexpected: hence the sure effect of irresistible laughter. ... Using these formal methods, Chaplin managed to create socio-psychological images that were brilliant in their depth. ... Chaplin shows us the whole picture of the social relations of modern society, where among the cops, pastors, owners, manufacturers, fat gentlemen wanders offended by this world, forever hungry, homeless Chaplin's “Man” – a runaway convict, a tramp, a proletarian, a circus performer, etc. He should be sorry. Satire is replaced by irony, with the help of which Chaplin raises his comedy to tragic heights” (Feldman, 1928: 7).

The *Soviet Screen* (Mogilevsky, 1929: 6) also wrote quite positively about the documentary filmmaker Joris Ivens (1898-1989).

But A. Lunacharsky (1875-1933) in relation to the work of the famous German director F. Murnau (1889-1931) expressed an ambiguous position: “The worst and least cultured part of the European philistinism is extremely illegible both in terms of ideological and artistic form. But the same cannot be said of the upper stratum of philistinism. True, she, too, not without pleasure swallows the usual stencil film food, but she immediately responds, and sometimes arranges a big success when she meets a film to her liking. ... When you have such a director as Murnau, with his amazing depth of capture, with his elegant external simplicity and powerful ability to suddenly spin you around in a whole whirlwind of deftly moved masses of people and objects, then you say to yourself – what could such an exceptional talent do if he got a really big one in his hands, an exciting topic, one of those human themes that, shocking, can not only help digestion or a sweet dream after shedding a delicious tear, but move forward those who have

become infected with its pathos!" (Lunacharsky, 1928: 4).

Western film reviews

There were just as few reviews of Western films in the *Soviet Screen* magazine of 1928-1930 as there were creative portraits of foreign filmmakers.

In particular, the writer L. Nikulin (1891-1967) reflected quite positively on some foreign films on the pages of the magazine: "Let me tell you about several excellent films that I saw. In the first place, you can put the work of ... American director Niblo ... *The Temptress* (*La Tentatrice*, 1926). ... Cinematography couldn't get past the World War. It is relatively reflected in two wonderful films – *The Big Parade* and *In the Service of Glory*. They are remarkable because, despite all the efforts of the masters, they came out as anti-militarist tragedies, and not spectacular battle extravaganzas" (Nikulin, 1928: 12-13).

Screenwriter N. Ravich (1899-1976), at first quite rightly scolded Sovkino for the fact that it preferred to import a lot of completely insignificant foreign films, refusing to import such masterpieces as Chaplin's *Gold Rush* and *Circus*, noted further that such, "for example, interesting films *Chicago*, *Chang* and *Moulin Rouge* came out in the Soviet film distribution. *Chicago* is a peculiar film, if only because if we wanted to ridicule the life of capitalist America, then, perhaps, we would not be able to do it with such brilliance, with such scourging satirical poignancy, with which it is done in *Chicago*. ... *Chang* is what is called a cultural film. ... Never before has a movie camera penetrated so deeply into the primitive world of man and animal" (Ravich, 1929: 14).

However, the critic H. Khersonsky (1897-1968) reacted to *Chicago* based on much more "class-correct" positions. He began by reminding readers that "bourgeois cinema does not at all show the "reverse" ... side of American capitalism. The life and work of the workers and their relationship with the "masters", the class struggle – were carefully hidden in American cinema and hung with a pink veil. The cinema of America did not reveal the whole inner life of its country, did not give its social analysis and true illumination. ... Griffith and many others like him lie, tell naive tales, propagate" (Khersonsky, 1929: 8).

Turning to *Chicago*, Khersonsky wrote that this film, "exposing modern America, cuts wide layers of bourgeois society with a knife of satire: the family, the venality of "law", the hypocrisy and emptiness of the court, the pursuit of the press and the crowd for savoring a vulgar sensation ... Urson's film grows into a vivid generalization for the whole of America, ridicules and caustically castigates the entire bourgeois society. How did it happen? Why such a revolution? No, there is no revolutionism yet! The film *Chicago* says only that the development of "civilization", so "flourishing" on the soil of growing American capitalism, has already reached such a stage that the phenomena characteristic of this new civilization are beginning to meet some opposition from the most established and conservative part of the bourgeoisie. ... The authors of the film *Chicago* acutely see life behind and around them only in their bourgeois society, but they do not take into account the class struggle at all, their social analysis is therefore very superficial, and they cannot see anything ahead. The film, with all its visual acuity – but essentially narrow-minded, blind – is "salon" (Khersonsky, 1929: 8).

Even director V. Meyerhold (1874-1940) expressed his opinion about Western cinema in 1928. French production, with the exception of the work of Abel Gance and a few innovators, disappointed him. In Hollywood films, V. Meyerhold was struck by their ideological side: "people who exploit are given as negative characters, and those who are exploited are positive". Further, V. Meyerhold noted that the film *Joan of Arc* (*La passion de Jeanne d'Arc*, 1928) had a great success in Paris: "This film was made excellently, unlike almost all modern French productions. Interestingly, the trial of *Joan of Arc* was filmed in terms of an evil mockery of religion and representatives of the church. The whole picture was shot on the same close-ups, on the same facial expressions of the actors. *Joan of Arc* is a great innovation. They don't shoot like that either in the West or in our country" (Meyerhold, 1928: 14).

The *Soviet Screen* responded very negatively about the film *Cagliostro*: "*Cagliostro* is a typical example of a pompous pseudo-historical film ... There was Casanova – now Cagliostro. There is almost no difference" (Cry..., 1929: 15).

Approximately the same assessment was given to the sound film *The Singing Fool* (1928) on the pages of the magazine: "The synchronization of sound and movement in the film is perfect, but ... there are no sound influxes or double exposures... The editing is also the most primitive – operatic. The result was not a movie, but a potpourri of trendy songs and motifs

forcibly squeezed into a stereotyped plot” (Erofeev, 1929: 11).

Reviews of Western national cinematographies

The position of the *Soviet Screen* magazine of 1928-1930 regarding mass Western film production was mostly negative (Attasheva, 1928: 10; 1929: 14; Elvin, 1928: 5; Fefer, 1929: 10; Gervinus, 1928; 1929; Glebov, 1928: 7; Kaufman, 1929: 10; Koltsova, 1928: 10; Shutko, 1928: 4; Tees, 1929: 3; Zilpert, 1928, etc.).

For example, continuing her series of articles on American cinema, P. Attasheva (1900-1965), in her note with the indicative title “SOS from Hollywood,” wrote that “the decline of the creative forces of American cinematography is not the fruit of an invention of competing Europe, but a fact ... Quality production is drastically reduced. Even buying up all the sensational literary novelties of Europe does not help to resolve the damned scenario issue. Talking cinema inspired tireless “money makers” with its appearance. Countless operettas and plays, lavishly stocked with mystical horrors, gangsters and murders, flood the screens of America with a muddy stream of cheap and unkempt sensation. The films of the last issue, in their bulk, easily fit into the following five headings: light comedies, often of a rather dubious nature, exotica with all kinds of nudity, cabaret films, also with all kinds of nudity, and finally, a kind of “guignol” – sound films with murder, ghosts, screams, groans and spiritistic séances” (Attasheva, 1929: 14).

At the same time, the same P. Attasheva noted, “talking and sounding cinema is, for America, already a fait accompli. ... A discovery capable of giving humanity a powerful new means of artistic culture is used by the Americans in most cases to stage operetta *Songs of Love*, *The Desert Songs*, etc. tasks” (Attasheva, 1928: 6).

S. Glebov also presented the Hollywood topic in a negative way to the readers of the *Soviet Screen*: “There are only a couple of dozen movie stars in Hollywood. There are 20,000 extras. With a few exceptions, they all drag out a miserable beggarly existence. All day long, they stand by the hundreds at the gates of countless studios in the hope of getting a job in crowd scenes. But the supply is many times greater than the demand, and only a few find work. ... The scriptwriters only vary the old hackneyed theme: the strong, but moral love of the characters meets a number of obstacles on its way from the scoundrels and intriguers, but in the last part everything ends as happily as possible. If poor people are shown in films, they are always submissive and well-behaved, for which they are rewarded at the end of the picture with unexpected wealth – a symbol of happiness. The content of Hollywood films does not reflect real life, but is always cloyingly sugary and, most importantly, typified. ... Not here, not in the conditions of the capitalist system, can genuine art arise!” (Glebov, 1928: 7).

A similar point of view was expressed by the director V. Nemirovich-Danchenko (1858-1943): “Advertising and speculation in talents are the pulse of the life of cinema-America. The ugly staging of *Anna Karenina* was released under the title *Love*. ... America is experiencing an unusually acute scenario crisis. Everything that is possible and impossible is remade for the screen” (Nemirovich-Danchenko, 1928: 10).

In addition, *Soviet Screen* emphasized that in the West cinematography is being armed against the USSR, that abroad “there have never been so many militaristic films in production and distribution. ... One listing of these countries ... already reveals the political goals of the war film: the preparation of an attack on the USSR. Here one can observe the “international” solidarity of the bourgeois governments. American, English and French movies” (How..., 1929: 14).

The pages of the magazine noted that a huge number of military, militaristic films are now being shown on the screens of Western American countries (Fefer, 1929: 9). At the same time, “patriotic war films (no need to hide this) enjoy a certain, stable success among bourgeois viewers. ... the most common can be considered those films where the war is taken only as a background for the deployment of a dramatic or comedic intrigue. Poison, sprinkled not with horse doses, but gradually. The poison is hardly noticeable and therefore the most dangerous. ... And the film systematically produced by the bourgeoisie, which arouses the patriotism of foreign philistines, we must oppose the same systematic neutralization of pictures that often seem harmless, and, to be honest, even penetrate our screens” (Fefer, 1929: 10).

He continued the *Soviet Screen* and his favorite theme of ridiculing Western films on the Russian topic.

E. Koltsova (1901-1964) wrote that “Americans movies, taking into account the

requirements of the viewer, are currently throwing various exotic works on Russian themes onto the market in whole bundles, already counting profits and savings from these new components of Hollywood art in advance: *Michael Strogoff*, *Sunday*, *Love*, *Hurricane*, *Cossacks*, *In the Vise* and, finally, *The Path to Glory* or *The General*. ... Living ghostly shadows of emigrants wander in Hollywood hospitable studios, receive money, play to the full anguish and resurrect the past days of their struggle for their beloved homeland, stunning with naked horror" (Koltsova, 1928: 10).

The journalist, who hid under the pseudonym Gervinus, completely agreed with her: "The scriptwriters of the cinematic West are diligently chasing the "topic of the day", a one-day sensation, what is written in the evening edition of the tabloid newspaper, which interests the layman today. ... And now the Americans are growing in Hollywood spreading cranberries with the Volga barge haulers and grand dukes in an opera-sham "Russian" film. The French prefer "Russian atrocities" in the style of Breshko-Breshkovsky, except without fried babies" (Gervinus, 1928: 14), and "films devoted to various eras of Russian history continue to pour like from a cornucopia. ... Cinematography of the West ... modestly speaking, "allows itself to be stupid". Until recently, this was most often abused by French cinema. Especially when the film depicts Russian life. Nowadays the world record in the cultivation of the cranberry must be held by Italy" (Gervinus, 1929: 14).

In 1930 this theme was continued in an article entitled "Bourgeois Propaganda ": "There are no neutral bourgeois films. In the hands of the bourgeoisie, the press, radio and, especially, cinema become instruments of grandiose political and chauvinistic propaganda. ... "Ufa" played a very unambiguous role in this anti-Soviet propaganda by getting its hands on the most shameful picture, *Spies*...

During the last ten years in America in general there is a certain vogue for Russian topic, in which Americans are attracted mainly by the exoticism of the material and the strangeness of the situations. It is clear that all these *Dubrovsky*, *Resurrection*, *Anna Karenina*, etc. are completely distorted into sweet and sentimental love stories, with an incredible piling up of fictional situations and a perversion of the flavor of Russian life.

Together with these films, the Americans have made over 20 crudely anti-Soviet films which have had some success in different countries and which obscure in the minds of the average man the character of our revolution and the true state of the Soviet Union. Many of these films are still on the screens of European cinemas. For example, *The Volga Burlaks*, where the Commissar-Burlak himself rebels against the "atrocities" of the Bolsheviks, *The Red Dancer*, *The Lady from Moscow*, *Son of Taiga*, *Fire on the Frontier*, etc. The plot of most of these films is extremely primitive. There is usually a Russian spy who goes over to the side of the Whites; or she may be a suffering countess or princess who is in the clutches of her former lackey commissar, or a commissar remarkable for extraordinary atrocities, and so on. In short, this nonsense and nonsense is played out with the aim of arousing absolute sympathy in the audience for the Whites who are oppressed by the Reds. ... The question of anti-Soviet film propaganda, in connection with the grandiose activities of Catholics and Social-Democrats being deployed, must be the subject of careful study in the depths of proletarian film organizations, for anti-Soviet films can only be combated in terms of countering them with real Communist films produced by workers and proletarian international film organizations" (Kaun, 1930: 14-15).

The magazine was also far from praising French cinema, asserting that French cinematography has been brought to a dead end (Fefer, 1929: 12). For example, "a group of the left avant-garde ... made a heroic attempt to revive this dead swamp. Unable to overcome the inertia of French entrepreneurs, this group of young, talented directors began to work on their own, outside the big factory organisms of the French film industry. ... Forced to do so by circumstances, this group learned to create serious artistic value with the help of small means. She abandoned the pompous historical productions, began to choose her material among the life of a big city, she learned to use accessible urban nature... All this saturated the movies of the left avant-garde with a great sense of modernity and made them close to the viewer of today... However, the directors of the left avant-garde were carried away only by the formal themes of modernity. They discovered a whole range of new formal film techniques, they developed a new theory of light, they found new means of expressing things on the screen. ... However, bare formalism alone will not get you far... in order to get broad, strong support from the working masses of France, the left avant-garde had to resolutely break with naked aestheticism and go

towards the demands of the social order of the working spectator. The avant-garde failed to do this" (Feldman, 1928: 8).

Soviet Screen assessed Polish cinema even more critically: "Poland is intensively filmed. ... releases action movie after action movie. Justice forces us to note that these militants look like third-rate French films from among those that are produced by France for the needs of the provinces and bureaucracy bored in the colonies. The standard by which the "young" cinematography of Poland works is salon drama with seductive heroines kissing and crying in close-up, and heroes in tailcoats or artistic blouses with a magnificent bow around their necks" (Gervinus, 1928: 13). B. Zilpert's next feuilleton about "Polish film-fascist patriots" (Zilpert, 1928: 13) also adjoined here.

The *Soviet Screen* did not forget about the struggle against religious influence in cinema, emphasizing, for example, that "the French press no longer considers it necessary to hide the fact that its "national" cinematography is closely involved in serving the state and the church. Capitalist, military and religious propaganda is the undisguised goal of the films coming out now. A number of chauvinistic and military paintings. A series of films about "Bolshevik atrocities". And, finally, the open action of the church, which takes over a significant area of production and hire, and becomes the official body of censorship" (Day..., 1929).

Journalist B. Zilpert (1891-1938) agreed with this assessment of the situation in Western cinema, talking about similar phenomena in "fascist Italy and no less fascist Poland" and in the Vatican (Zilpert, 1928: 10).

N. Kaumann, in general, stated that a kind of "Catholic film international" had formed in the West: "At the Second International Catholic Film Congress, the Munich delegate Dr. Nusser argued that the role of an entertaining film was over, and the viewer of today is turning to an ideological film. ... The governments, mainly of Catholic countries, support the cinematographic activities of Catholics in every possible way ... The Second Catholic Film Congress has tremendous political significance. The environment in which it proceeded and the attitude shown towards it by governments and film organizations indicates that Catholics are gaining solid ground for the implementation of their great-power plans in cinematography. ... However, behind these "angelic" speeches one can sense an iron desire to take control of film production in order to make it a direct mouthpiece for an egregious fascist and clerical ideology" (Kaufman, 1929: 10).

However, there was cinematography in the West, to which the *Soviet Screen* had a much more benevolent attitude. So the European correspondent of the magazine claimed that "the best of the films I have seen here are German; they are meaningful and not as tendentiously moralistic as the American ones" (Romashka, 1929: 14).

And in his article "Ways of Cooperation with the West" journalist and theatrical figure I. Turkeltaub (1890-1938) wrote that "according to the head of one of our Goskino institutions, the Germans, with whom joint work has begun, directly declare: your ideology does not interfere with us; let only the picture be directed by good directors, and let it be profitable" (Turkeltaub, 1929: 6).

However, this, of course, did not mean that German cinema always received a positive assessment on the pages of the magazine. It was noted, for example, that the German film industry "pays increased attention to the release of films depicting the life and life of the "lower classes". These movies arouse great interest in the broad masses of the Berlin population in terms of their themes. However, all these pictures are specific; directing, sometimes revealing great technical perfection, is primarily concerned with giving the most touching, sentimental and pitiful picture of human misfortune, but without the slightest attempt to reveal the socio-political and economic causes of evil. ... All these movies have in common a careful veiling of elements of the class struggle, class contradictions" (Elvin, 1928: 5). "Sometimes the German cinematographic youth breaks down and begins to rebel against the oppression of ordinary film vulgarity. The uprising, to tell the truth, is insignificant and very much resembles a storm in a teacup" (Neradov, 1929: 12).

Of course, as another *Soviet Screen* article on German cinema stated, "the producer of bourgeois cinema sets himself purely entertaining tasks and is most afraid of tiring the viewer's attention by resolving any problems. The post-war bourgeoisie seeks to escape from recent social storms and upheavals into the realm of personal experiences" (Panov, 1929: 7).

However, "the labor movement still lives, expands and grows", and these workers, of

course, cannot be satisfied with the interpretation of the theme of the working class and the social theme in *Metropolis* (1927) by F. Lang (1890-1976): "Fritz Lang paints conflict between the bourgeoisie and the working class. "Metropolis" – the city of the future – is an image of rationalized capitalist production brought to its logical conclusion. The workers here have become animated appendages of machines. ... The workers are driven into the dungeons; overseers of work turned into policemen; the capitalist is turned into a prince, who owns the life, muscles, body, freedom and thought of the slave workers. But if the boldness of critical thought compels the artist to paint with frankness this bleak picture of a rationalized capitalist society, the next question is where is the way out? – leads him to the most miserable and worn out thoughts. Salvation ... in humility, and therefore in religion. ... The cross maintains the balance of society. Having once slipped into the realm of false and flat bourgeois hypocrisy, Fritz Lang can no longer resist his final fall" (Panov, 1929: 7).

Articles on Western Newsreel

As in previous years, the *Soviet Screen* sometimes wrote about foreign newsreels and documentaries without much ideological pressure (Kaufman, 1928: 4-5; Tseitlin, 1929: 14). However, he was no longer weary of reminding that "the perfectly organized newsreel in America is a powerful instrument of the class struggle in the hands of the American capitalists and the bourgeoisie. The newsreel educates the viewer in the spirit of patriotism, diverting his attention from all the events that, one way or another, may lead him to thoughts that are undesirable for the bourgeoisie" (Spiridovsky, 1928: 7). And films in the West are, first of all, a profitable commodity. Kulturfilm is a less profitable commodity, but on the other hand it is a more frank and more organized instrument of bourgeois propaganda" (Kaufman, 1929: 12; Fefer, 1929: 14).

Articles about foreign film technology, studios and cinemas

As in 1925-1927, the topic of Western cinematography was the least ideologized on the pages of the magazine (Anoshchenko, 1930; Garov, 1929; Kaufman, 1928; Shutko, 1928, etc.).

The *Soviet Screen*, for example, unconditionally recognized the primacy of the West in the field of the then technical novelty – sound cinema – and called for the production of sound films in the USSR to be set up as soon as possible:

"In America, there is a real revolution in the field of cinematography. Sound and word break into the tape. ... We must expect an unprecedented flowering in the field of sound cinema in the coming years. ... The word and sound, having entered the film, should give it a new development" (Kaufman, 1928: 12).

In Hollywood, "for the year 1928-1929, it is planned to create about 400 sounding films of the most diverse genre: sketches, dances, songs, film stories. ... Eloquent is the seriousness with which American cinematography, after long experiments, is feverishly retooling itself, creating a new kind of entertaining spectacle" (Shutko, 1928: 6).

"The sound of the film in America made a complete revolution in the acting world, forcing them to reconsider and make a "cleansing" of the entire available cast army. Only those actors and actresses who can "speak" or sing can hope to get a job, the rest are out of order" (Garov, 1929: 10-11).

The first television experiments looked just as positive and promising for the *Soviet Screen*: "A number of inventors working on the principle of pointwise image transmission (i.e., by decomposing the image into its smallest parts and gradually transmitting it), have achieved successful results. Perhaps the first demonstration of the invention was the transfer of an image of Hoover from New York to Washington. It was last year. Since that time ... they have managed to greatly reduce the cost of their equipment and adapt it to transmit not only images of objects placed in special conditions ... but also to transmit images directly of events taking place on the street. ... In the future, inventors face the problem of transmitting moving images over a distance" (Gervinus, 1929: 12).

Short informational materials about events in foreign cinema

This thematic block in the *Soviet Screen* of 1925-1927 was the most attractive for the new economic policy's audience, as it included not only ideologically neutral short notes about the shooting of new Western films and the luxurious life of movie stars, but also offered readers photographs of these same movie stars.

All this completely disappeared from the *Soviet Screen* of 1928-1930.

Of course, there were short notes on Western cinema (Foreign..., 1930), but no longer

neutral, but sharply criticizing bourgeois cinema, often in a feuilleton style (Gervinus, 1928: 14; Gervinus, 1929; Zilpert, 1928, etc.).

In general, the distribution of texts about Western cinema published in *Soviet Screen* magazine in the 1920s by year, genre, and number of articles is as follows (Table 3):

Table 3. Distribution of texts about Western cinematography published in *Soviet Screen* from 1925 to 1930 by genre and number of articles

Year / genre of text	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	Total
Reviews	7	9	7	11	5	0	39
Analytical articles	19	27	19	16	11	3	95
Articles on the history of Western cinema	43	25	29	21	21	3	142
Reviews of Western films as part of articles on international film festivals	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
Creative portraits of Western filmmakers	39	36	19	5	4	1	104
Interviews with Western filmmakers	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Articles about foreign film technology, studios, and cinemas	3	4	5	4	3	4	23
ИТОГО:	116	103	79	57	45	10	410

Analysis of the data in the Table 3 shows that from 1925 to 1930 there was a gradual and consistent decrease in the number of articles about Western cinema in the *Soviet Screen* magazine, which eventually led to an almost tenfold decrease in such texts in 1930 relative to 1925. The reasons for this decline in the volume of magazine articles on Western cinema are mainly related to the ideological and administrative struggle of the Soviets against Western influence in all spheres of culture, which intensified sharply by the end of the 1920s.

Conclusion. So, despite the ongoing struggle for power in the “top” of the USSR throughout 1928-1930 (this time the so-called “right deviation” in the Communist party was being liquidated), the situation in the cinema and in the press became the subject of close attention. Former “formalistic” liberties and relative creative freedom gradually began to disappear under the pressure of ideological censorship. In particular, cinema, film distribution and the press became the field of the communist struggle against bourgeois propaganda, entertainment, formalism. And here, a severe ideological and administrative blow was dealt to the Teakinopechat publishing house, headed by V. Uspensky (1880-1929), who in the second half of 1928 – early 1929 was also the editor of the *Soviet Screen*. A number of meetings were also held

All these events could not but affect the general situation in the *Soviet Screen*.

Based on the content analysis of texts published in the *Soviet Screen* magazine in the period from 1928 to 1930, we have identified the following main genres and trends within the framework of topics related to Western cinema:

- articles sharply criticizing the policy in the field of distribution of foreign films and the harmful influence of Western cinema on Soviet viewers;
- biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors, which were already published in much smaller volumes compared to the period of 1925-1927 and were more ideologized;
- reviews of Western films (also kept to a minimum and with a greater critical focus);
- reviews of Western national cinematographies, which on the whole give a very negative assessment of the film process in leading Western countries;
- articles about Western newsreels, where criticism of the bourgeois system and cinema in general was also intensified;
- articles about foreign film technology, studios and cinemas (perhaps the only section of the magazine that still retained an ideologically neutral presentation of facts and calls to adopt foreign technical experience, for example, in the field of sound films);
- short informational materials about events in foreign cinema (which, in contrast to 1925-1927, were already deprived of neutrality and photos of Hollywood stars, but were presented in a feuilleton and revealing manner).

Western Cinematography on the Pages of the *Soviet Cinema Screen Magazine: 1939-1941*

In this chapter, we analyze the short stage in the history of the magazine *Soviet Screen* (it was published then under the name *Soviet Cinema Screen*) – from 1939 to 1941.

From 1931 to 1938, a rather long break occurred in the history of the *Soviet Screen* (which had been published since 1925), but by the beginning of 1939 it was decided to resume the publication of this magazine, designed for a mass audience, now under the name *Soviet Cinema Screen* (justice for the sake of it, we note that at that time the magazine did not become truly mass-produced, since its circulation was only from 7 to 15 thousand copies, while the circulation of the *Soviet Screen* in the 1920s was mainly at the level of 70-80 thousand copies).

In 1939, the scale of mass repressions in the USSR (which reached its peak – even in the highest echelons of power – in 1937-1938), significantly decreased, although it was at this time that such prominent cultural figures as I. Babel (1894-1940) and V. Meyerhold (1874-1940) were arrested and later shot. Moreover, on April 10, 1939, one of the most active figures in the repressive apparatus was sent to jail (and destroyed in February 1940): former People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR N. Yezhov (1895-1940).

Well aware of the ideological significance of cinema, the Soviet government did everything to expand the network of cinemas and film installations in general. Hence it is clear why on March 10, 1939, J. Stalin, in a report at the XVIII Congress of the Communist Party, informed the audience about the successes in this direction: if in 1933/1934 there were only 24 technical devices for showing movies in the villages of the USSR, then in 1938/1939 – 6670 (that is, 278 times more). And on March 20, the XVIII Congress of the Communist Party adopted a resolution indicating the need to develop a network of cinemas and a six fold increase in stationary and other sound installations.

On June 3, 1939, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party adopted a resolution appointing Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR I. Bolshakov (1902-1980), who eventually led Soviet cinematography until March 1953 (and further, already in the rank of First Deputy Minister of Culture of the USSR, until 1954).

And although by the end of the 1930s there were no culture and artistic "groups" in the USSR, and for many years a single "method of socialist realism" was prescribed for all cultural figures, the authorities still tried to tighten the screws on ideological pressure even more, reducing, for example, to minimize the import of foreign film production. That's why July 19, 1939 Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR approved the "Regulations on the Directorate for Controlling the Film Repertoire" and the "Instructions on the Procedure for Controlling the Release, Distribution and Demonstration of Films", where everything was subject to the strictest regulations.

The general situation in the Soviet film distribution from the end of August 1939 to June 1941 was seriously affected by the non-aggression pact between the USSR and Germany, signed on August 23-24, 1939. As a result, the constant anti-fascist policy of the USSR, which manifested itself especially clearly during the war in Spain (July 17, 1936 – April 1, 1939), was brought to naught; negative references to fascism virtually disappeared from all Soviet media, including cinema. Anti-fascist and "defense" films (*The Oppenheim Family*, *Professor Mamlock*, *If Tomorrow War*, etc.) were removed from the screens along with Soviet historical films containing negative images of characters of German origin (*Alexander Nevsky* by S. Eisenstein and etc.). This situation in film distribution persisted throughout the initial period of the Second World War (from September 1, 1939 to June 22, 1941).

However, already on June 22, 1941 in connection with the start of the Great Patriotic War, the chairman of the Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR I. Bolshakov was instructed to urgently change the repertoire of Soviet cinema halls: not only once again widely release (from June 23, 1941) on the screens military-patriotic films (*Chapaev*, *Minin and Pozharsky*, *Shchors*, *Suvorov*), but also to supplement this list with anti-fascist films *The Oppenheim Family*, *Professor Mamlok*, etc. put on the shelf at the end of August 1939. At the end of June 1941, the film "Alexander Nevsky" was again released on the screens of the USSR ...

A high level of ideological control over film production was maintained throughout the

pre-war years. So on October 8, 1940, at a meeting of the Organizing Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, a speech was made by the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, the head of the Propaganda and Agitation Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party A. Zhdanov with a report “On improving the production of feature films”, where it was stated that “the absence of a real ideological control in cinematography itself, control over the ideological direction of the pictures” (RGASPI, 77, 3; 23: 1-5).

It is clear that in such a situation, the *Soviet Cinema Screen* magazine, as an organ of the Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR, had to obey strict party requirements. The share of materials about foreign cinema in the journal has become minimal. Moreover, the vast majority of the issues of the *Soviet Cinema Screen* magazine of 1939-1941 were generally devoid of articles about foreign films... However, there was little information about Western cinema at that time in the *Cinema Art* journal (Fedorov, 2022; Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022; Levitskaya, 2022).

We will focus on the analysis of materials about foreign cinema published in *Soviet Screen* magazine (it was then published under the name *Soviet Cinema Screen*): from 1939 to 1941, when its managing editors were cinema manager Yakov Bineman and journalist, writer and screenwriter Ivan Gorelov (1910-1970).

In Table 4 presents statistical data on the *Soviet Cinema Screen* magazine from 1939 to 1941 (organization of which the magazine was, circulation, periodicity, the name of the editor).

Table 4. *Soviet Cinema Screen* magazine (1939-1941): statistical data

Year of issue	Magazine title	Publisher	Magazine circulation (in thousands of copies)	Magazine periodicity (issues per year)	Editors the magazine
1939	<i>Soviet Cinema Screen</i>	Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR	6-7	12	Yakov Bineman
1940	<i>Soviet Cinema Screen</i>	Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR	7	24	Editorial Board
1941	<i>Soviet Cinema Screen</i>	Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR	15	7	Ivan Gorelov (1910-1970)

In 1925-1930 (and especially in 1925-1927) *Soviet Screen* wrote about Western cinema often and generously. These were not only journalistic articles sharply criticizing the policy in the field of distribution of foreign films and the harmful influence of Western cinema on Soviet viewers, but often quite neutral biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors; reviews of foreign films; reviews of Western national cinematographies; articles about foreign newsreel, film technology, studios and cinemas; short informational materials about events in foreign cinema.

The situation in the *Soviet Cinema Screen* magazine of 1939-1941 was exactly the opposite: reviews of foreign films and specific films, creative portraits of Western actors and directors practically disappeared from the pages of this edition. The number of authors writing about foreign cinema has dropped sharply.

And those few materials of the *Soviet Cinema Screen*, which nevertheless told readers about Western cinema, were devoted to criticism of “bourgeois ideology” and “mores alien to Soviet people”.

So the film critic G. Avenarius (1903-1958) could, of course, slightly praise the performance of this or that Hollywood actor, but in general he always accused Western films of any genre of “primitive plots”, “vulgarity”, a superficial depiction of historical events, in “the unceremonious intrusion of Hollywood scriptwriters and directors into the private lives of historical figures” (Avenarius, 1940: 15; 18).

Of course, as G. Avenarius noted, “sometimes the authors of [Hollywood] film comedies

touch on very serious topics in their plots (presidential elections and even unemployment), but, as a rule, one or two satirical episodes of the film are drowned in the standardized vulgarity of the plot, invariably ending the triumph of petty-bourgeois virtue and the wedding" (Avenarius, 1940: 18).

In his article devoted to the "harmless" for the USSR movies of director Walt Disney, Georgy Avenarius at first could afford to mention the inexhaustible inventiveness and wit of this director, the excellent quality of the drawings that worked in his studio "first-class animators" (Avenarius, 1941: 12 -13).

But then everything again returned to the usual ideological tracks, since Georgy Avenarius saw the main reason for the success of Disney cartoons "in the thoughtlessness, lightness, amusingness of diverse adventures ... Disney animations wonderfully perform their entertaining and distracting functions. Cleverly thought up amusing short film... distracts the foreign viewer from everyday unattractive reality" (Avenarius, 1941: 12-13).

The topics chosen by the *Soviet Cinema Screen* in 1939-1941 to tell readers about bourgeois cinema are given in an article by the journalist V. Fefer (1901-1971), about how "friendly" Germany created "a number of films about individual psychiatric and nervous diseases, depicting patients in everyday situations with all the smallest details of their behavior. ... The invention of sound cinema made it possible to transmit on the screen the speech of the mentally ill. Reproduction of utterances, delirium, voice, breathing, indistinct whisper, magnified many times – everything became accessible and visual" (Fefer, 1940: 14-15).

In 1941, one of the few materials of the *Soviet Cinema Screen* magazine that at least somehow related to foreign events was the article "The Mannerheim Line on foreign screens" (Fradkin, 1941: 13): "More than a year has passed since the heroic parts The Red Army, in the struggle for the security of the northwestern borders of the Soviet Union, defeated one of the most powerful modern fortifications equipped with the latest military technology – the Mannerheim Line. During all the days of the battles with the White Finns, the bourgeois press shamelessly slandered the Red Army. But facts are stubborn things. The fact of the defeat of the Mannerheim Line was the best way to refute the false fabrications of the enemies of the USSR. The appearance on foreign screens of the Soviet documentary film *The Mannerheim Line* turned out to be a mouthpiece of convincing truth. Film in person documented the heroism of the Soviet people and the combat technical power of the Red Army. Through censorship slingshots, through other "fortifications" of the capitalist states, the film broke through on the screens and made an unforgettable impression on the audience. The film was a huge success on US screens in New York and Chicago. Even the bourgeois press could not hide the great impression that this film made on the audience. *The New York Post* newspaper in its issue of December 19, 1940 wrote: "...*The Mannerheim Line* film, a Soviet military documentary about the war in Finland, which is now being shown at the Miami cinema, is an exceptional film both from a military point of view both from the point of view of photographic technique" (Fradkin, 1941: 13).

This was the last article in the *Soviet Cinema Screen* on foreign material. The issue was signed for printing on June 9, 1941. And since July 1941, the publication of the magazine was stopped due to the beginning of the Great Patriotic War...

Conclusion. By 1939, the struggle for power in the "top" of the USSR was almost finished, with the "opposition" was over. The flywheel of repression began to noticeably decrease. Under these conditions, in 1939-1941, the Soviet government supported in high level of ideological control over cinema.

And although by the end of the 1930s there were no cultural and artistic "groups" in the USSR, and for many years a single "method of socialist realism" was prescribed for all cultural figures, the authorities still tried to tighten the screws on ideological pressure even more, reducing, for example, to minimize the import of foreign film production. That's why July 19, 1939 Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR approved the "Regulations on the Directorate for Controlling the Film Repertoire" and the "Instructions on the Procedure for Controlling the Release, Distribution and Demonstration of Films", where everything was subject to the strictest regulations.

It is clear that in such a situation, the *Soviet Cinema Screen* magazine, as an organ of the Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, had to obey strict party requirements. The share of materials about foreign cinema in the magazine has become almost negligible. Moreover, the vast majority of the issues of the magazine *Soviet*

Cinema Screen of 1939-1941 were, in general, devoid of articles about Western films...

Therefore, based on the content analysis of texts published in the *Soviet Cinema Screen* magazine from 1939 to 1941, we came to the conclusion that practically the only genre of materials about Western cinema of this period was journalistic articles about (mainly) Hollywood cinema, ingenerally very negatively evaluating it and its ideological orientation.

Western Cinema on the Pages of the Magazine *Soviet Screen*: 1957-1968

The subject of Western cinematography was presented in a rather limited volume on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine in 1957-1960. However, with the appointment of film critic Dmitry Pisarevsky (1912-1990) to the post of editor-in-chief the "thaw" tendencies in the *Soviet screen* led to a gradual increase in the number of materials about foreign cinema on the pages of the magazine (sometimes they took up to a third of the total volume of the issue). Increasingly, photographs of Western movie stars were published (in rare cases, even on color covers), neutrally or positively presented biographies of Hollywood and European actors and directors, articles about Western film weeks and international film festivals, reviews of Western films, etc. Although, no doubt, there were also ideologically biased materials in this magazine.

We will focus on the analysis of materials about Western cinema published in the *Soviet Screen* magazine from 1957 to 1968, when its editors-in-chief were: Nikolai Kastelin (1904-1968), Elizaveta Smirnova (1908-1999) and Dmitry Pisarevsky (1912-1990).

In [Table 5](#) presents statistical data reflecting the changes (from 1957 to 1968) organizations, the organ of which the journal was, its circulation, periodicity. The names of the editors of the journal and the time intervals of their leading work in the publication are indicated.

Table 5. Magazine *Soviet Screen* (1957-1968): statistical data

Year of issue of the magazine	Organizations whose authority was a magazine	Magazine circulation (in million copies)	Periodicity of the magazine (numbers in year)	Editors of the magazine
1957	Ministry of Culture of the USSR	0.2	24	Nikolai Kastelin
1958	Ministry of Culture of the USSR	0.2	24	Nikolai Kastelin (№№ 1-15) Elizaveta Smirnova (№№ 16-24)
1959	Ministry of Culture of the USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR *	0.25	24	Elizaveta Smirnova
1960	Ministry of Culture of the USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	0.25-0.3	24	Elizaveta Smirnova
1961	Ministry of Culture of the USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	0.4	24	Elizaveta Smirnova (№№ 1-11) Dmitry Pisarevsky (№№ 12-24)
1962	Ministry of Culture of the USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	0.4	24	Dmitry Pisarevsky
1963	Ministry of Culture of the USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR (№№ 1-10); State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR (№№ 11-24)	0.4-0.5	24	Dmitry Pisarevsky
1964	State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	0.5-0.7	24	Dmitry Pisarevsky
1965	State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.6-1.7	24	Dmitry Pisarevsky
1966	Cinematography Committee under the Council of Ministers	2.6-2.61	24	Dmitry Pisarevsky

	USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR			
1967	Cinematography Committee under the Council of Ministers USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	2.6-2.9	24	Dmitry Pisarevsky
1968	Cinematography Committee under the Council of Ministers USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	2.0-2.3	24	Dmitry Pisarevsky

* The Union of Cinematographers of the USSR is listed in the imprint of the journal (along with the Ministry of Culture of the USSR) from No. 12 for 1959.

The authors of texts about Western cinema in the *Soviet Screen* in most cases were well-known film critics and film historians, many of whom held leading positions in the editorial offices of magazines and newspapers of that period:

Table 6. The main authors of the publications of the magazine "Soviet screen" (1957–1968) on the subject of Western cinema

No.	Surnames of film critics, who most often published articles on Western cinema in the <i>Soviet Screen</i> magazine	The number of articles published by these film experts, film critics in the <i>Soviet Screen</i> magazine on the subject of Western cinema
1-2	Dolinsky M.Z. and Chertok S.M. (1931-2006)	9
3	Bozhovich V.I. (1931-2021)	8
4	Kartseva E.N. (1928-2002)	8
5	Sher Y.L. (1909-?)	7
6	Orlov V.V. (1929-1972)	5
7	Rubanova I.I. (1933-2024)	5
8	Khanyutin Y.M. (1929-1978)	5
9	Bachelis T.I. (1918-1999)	4
10	Braginsky A.V. (1920-2016)	4
11	Galanov B.E. (1914-2000)	4
12	Kuznetsov M.M. (1914-1980)	4
13	Lishchinsky, I.	4

1. M.Z. Dolinsky (born 1930) – journalist, film critic, editor. Member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR. From 1964 to 1969 he was the compiler of the yearbook *Screen* (together with S.M. Chertok). Published in the magazine *Soviet Screen*, in the yearbooks *Screen*. Author of a number of books on the subject of cinematography: *From Idea to Film*. Moscow, 1969; *Connection of Times*. Moscow, 1976; *Music Celebration*. Moscow, 1979.

2. S.M. Chertok (1931-2006) – journalist, film critic, editor. Graduated from the Moscow State Law Institute (1953). He was a member of the Union of Journalists of the USSR and the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR. From 1962 he was a correspondent, and from 1966 to 1975 – a head of the information department in the *Soviet Screen* magazine; from 1976 to 1978 he was an employee of the Research Institute of Theory and History of Cinema. From 1964 to 1973, he compiled the yearbook *Screen* (from 1964 to 1969, in collaboration with M.Z. Dolinsky). Since 1979 he lived in Israel, where he successfully continued his journalistic activities. Published in newspapers: *Soviet Latvia*, *Soviet Culture*, *Literary Newspaper*, *Evening Moscow*, in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Spark*, *Youth*, *October*, *Moscow*, *Questions of Literature*, *Soviet Photo*, *Art*, *Theatrical Life*, *Theatre*, etc. Author of books: *Stars meet in Moscow*. Moscow, 1967; *Foreign screen: interview*. Moscow, 1973; *Start: Cinema of Black Africa*. Moscow, 1973; *Tashkent festival*. Tashkent, 1975; *There-there of the XX century*. Moscow, 1977; *Festival of the Three Continents*. Tashkent, 1978; *About cinema and about myself*. Sofia, 1979; *Freeze frames. Essays on Soviet cinema*. London, 1988 and others.

3. V.I. Bozhovich (1931-2021) – film critic. Graduated from Leningrad State University (1955), Ph.D. (1962). He was a member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. He published his articles in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, etc. Author of

books: *Jacques Feyder*. Moscow, 1965; *Contemporary Western Filmmakers*. Moscow, 1972; *Jean Gabin*. Moscow, 1982; *René Clair*. Moscow, 1985; *Jean-Louis Trintignant*. Moscow, 1987; *Kira Muratova*. Moscow, 1988, etc.

4. E.N. Kartseva (1928-2002). Graduated from Moscow State University (1950), Ph.D. (1991). She was a member of the Soviet Communist Party, the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. She worked at the State Film Fund, at the Institute of Philosophy. From 1979 to 2002 she was a researcher and head of Department of the Research Institute of Cinematography. She published her articles in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, etc. Author of books: *Made in Hollywood*. Moscow, 1964; *Bette Davis*. Moscow, 1967; *Spencer Tracy*. Moscow, 1970; *Mass culture in the USA and the problem of personality*. Moscow, 1974; *Ideological and aesthetic foundations of bourgeois "mass culture"*. Moscow, 1976; *Western: the evolution of the genre*. Moscow, 1976; *Kitsch, or the triumph of vulgarity*. Moscow, 1977; *Burt Lancaster*. Moscow, 1983; *Hollywood: contrasts of the 70s*. Moscow, 1987; *Legends and realities. History of the American Crime Film*. Moscow, 2004.

5. Y.L. Sher (1909-?) – journalist, film critic. He published his articles in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, etc.

6. V.V. Orlov (1929-1972) – journalist, film critic, poet. Graduated from Moscow State Institute of International Relations (1950). He published his articles in the newspapers *Izvestia*, *Soviet Culture*, in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Crocodile*, etc. Often published under the pseudonym B. Sukharevsky.

7. I.I. Rubanova (1933-2024). Graduated from Moscow State University (1956), Ph.D. (1966). Member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Since 1962, she has been a researcher at the Institute of Art History (now – the State Institute of Art Studies). In 1964-1967 she hosted TV programs about Polish cinematography on Soviet TV. She published her articles in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Seance*, *Film Studies Notes*, in the newspapers *Izvestia*, *Kommersant-daily*, etc. Author of books: *Cinematography of the countries of socialism*. Moscow, 1963; *Polish cinema. Films about war and occupation*. 1945-1965. Moscow, 1966; *Conrad Wolf*. Moscow, 1973; *Vladimir Vysotsky*. Moscow, 1983. Laureate of the Russian Guild of Film Critics and Historians.

8. Y.M. Khanyutin (1929-1978) – film critic, screenwriter. Graduated from State Institute of Theater Art (1951), Ph.D. (1965). He was a member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR. Since 1955, he worked in the editorial office of the *Literary Newspaper* (literary collaborator, head of the theater department). He was the head of the cinema sector of the socialist countries at the Research Institute of Theory and History of Cinema. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, etc. Author of books: *Sergey Bondarchuk*. Moscow, 1962; *A warning from the past*. Moscow, 1968; *Sergey Yutkevich* (1968, together with M.I. Turovskaya); *Modern documentary film*. Moscow, 1970; *The reality of a fantasy world*. Moscow, 1977. Author of scripts for documentaries: *Ordinary Fascism* (1965, together with M.I. Romm, M.I. Turovskaya), *About Our Theater* (1975, together with M.I. Turovskaya), *Pyotr Martynovich and the years of great life* (1976, together with M.I. Turovskaya), etc.

9. T.I. Bachelis (1918-1999) – film and theater critic. Graduated from State Institute of Theater Art (1946), Ph.D. (1985). She worked at the Research Institute of Art History. She was a member of the Union of Writers of the USSR, a member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. She published her articles in the newspapers *Izvestia*, *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, etc., in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *New World*, etc. Author of books: *Theater abroad*. Moscow, 1961; *Fellini*. Moscow, 1972; *Shakespeare and Craig*. Moscow, 1983; *Hamlet and Harlequin*. Moscow, 2007 and others.

10. A.V. Braginsky (1920-2016) – film critic, translator. Graduated from the Moscow Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages (1941). Was a member of the Soviet Communist Party, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Laureate of the Prize of the Russian Guild of Film Critics and Historians (for a series of books about French film masters) (1999). Author of many articles and books on French cinema. He published his articles in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, etc. Author of books: *Le Chanois*. Moscow, 1972; *Christian Jacques*. Moscow, 1981; *Jean-Paul Belmondo. In cinema and in life*. Moscow, 1997; *Gerard Depardieu. Stolen letters*. Rostov-on-Don, 1998; *Alain Delon. In love and life*. Rostov-on-Don, 1999; *Catherine Deneuve*. Moscow, 2000 and others.

11. B.E. Galanov (1914-2000) – literary and film critic, writer. Graduated from Institute of

Philosophy, Literature and Art (1939). He was a member of the Soviet Communist party, the Union of Writers of the USSR, the Union of Journalists of the USSR, the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Member of the Great Patriotic War, he was the war correspondent for the *Pravda* newspaper. He worked as the editor of the prose department of the *Znamya* magazine (1958-1960), deputy editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1960-1963), art department editor and member of the editorial board of the *Literary Newspaper* (1963-1991). Published in the newspapers *Evening Moscow*, *Pravda*, *Literary Newspaper* and others. Author of books: *Boris Plevoy*. Moscow, 1953; *S.Y. Marshak: Essay on life and work*. Moscow, 1956; *Ilya Ilf and Evgeny Petrov: Life. Creation*. Moscow, 1961; *Sergei Mikhalkov: essay on creativity*. Moscow, 1966; *Painting with a word: a person, a landscape, a thing*. Moscow, 1972; *Valentin Kataev: essay on creativity*. Moscow, 1982; *Dress for Alice: artist and writer. Dialogues*. Moscow, 1990, etc.

12. M.M. Kuznetsov (1914-1980) – literary and film critic. Graduated from Institute of Philosophy, Literature and Art (1939). Member of the Great Patriotic War. He was a member of the Soviet Communist party, the Union of Writers of the USSR and the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR. He published his articles in the magazine *Soviet Screen*, in *Komsomolskaya Pravda* and other. Author of books: *Soviet prose of our days*. Moscow, 1961; *Soviet novel*. Moscow, 1963; *Main topic*. Moscow, 1964; *The Hero of our films*. Moscow, 1965; *Contemporary and screen*. Moscow, 1966; *Artistic prose of our days*. Moscow, 1968; *Ways of development of the Soviet novel*. Moscow, 1971; *Novels by Konstantin Fedin*. Moscow, 1973; *Literature and anti-literature*. Moscow, 1977; *Books and films*. Moscow, 1978; *My life, cinema...* Moscow, 1984, etc.

13. I. Lishchinsky (born 1933) – film critic and journalist. Graduated from VGIK. Worked and published in the magazine *Soviet Screen*. In 1973 he emigrated to Israel, where he continued his journalistic activities, but without specializing in cinematography.

Shortly after the "thaw" XX Congress of the Soviet Communist Party (1956), in January 1957, the first issue of the renewed *Soviet Screen* (as an organ of the Ministry of Culture of the USSR) was published: with a clear focus on the balance between communist ideology (articles and notes on important from this point of view events and Soviet films) and attracting the widest audience, which was interested in a panorama of cinema, including foreign.

Nikolai Kastelin (1904-1968), who was the editor of the *Soviet Screen* for a little over a year and a half (from January 1957 to August 1958), apparently viewed the magazine as some kind of ideologically seasoned advertising and information publication, which twice a month told readers mainly about the current repertoire of Soviet cinemas.

The editorial board of the *Soviet Screen* included: actors S. Bondarchuk (1920-1994) and S. Lukyanov (1910-1965), directors M. Kalatozov (1903-1973), V. Shneiderov (1900-1973) and M. Pashchenko (1901-1958), cameramen V. Golovnya (1909-1983) and M. Kirillov (1908-1975), production designer A. Parkhomenko (1911-1987) and others. A. Ershtram was the executive secretary (a few years later he headed the press-service of the USSR State Cinematography).

Photos on color covers of Soviet actors (the only foreign woman awarded this honor was Indian actress Nargis (1929-1981): in No. 16 for 1957) or shots from Soviet films, the estimated component on the pages of the publication was minimal, mainly anonymous information, a brief retelling of the plots of films, photographs. Foreign cinema was usually allocated two pages per issue, but mostly it was about the films of the socialist countries (including China, which was friendly at that time), plus notes on Indian cinema.

From August 1958 to June 1961, the editor of the *Soviet Screen* was the film critic Elizaveta Smirnova (1908-1999), under which the circulation of the magazine increased from 200 thousand to 400 thousand copies.

With the advent of E. Smirnova, more and more "author's" materials began to appear on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*: articles lost their anonymity, leading film critics of that period did not hesitate to sign their materials, which gradually became more and more analytic.

Since 1959, the *Soviet Screen* began to cover in detail (in several issues) the work and films of the Moscow International Film Festival, which began to be held every two years. At the same time, not only information materials with lists of competitive films and prize-winners were published, but also interviews with foreign guests of the festival, their photographs (and among them in 1959 were Giulietta Masina, Marina Vlady, Nicole Courcelle, etc.).

In June 1961, film critic Dmitry Pisarevsky (1912-1990) was appointed editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen*, who managed to hold this post for a record period – until February 1975, that is, almost 14 years! No other editor, before or since, managed to lead the magazine for so long.

Under D. Pisarevsky, the "thaw" tendencies in the *Soviet Screen* at first not only continued, but also strengthened. Not only the Moscow International Film Festival of 1961, 1963, 1965, 1967 was widely covered. Increasingly, large materials about Cannes, Venice and other major Western film festivals began to appear, extensive reviews of weeks of foreign cinema in the USSR, and voluminous reviews of Western films that ended up in Soviet distribution.

On the covers of the magazine, albeit rarely, photographs of Western movie stars began to appear: Marina Vlady and Sophia Loren (1965), Catherine Deneuve (1967).

In some issues of the *Soviet Screen* of the mid-1960s up to 30% of the total text was devoted to foreign cinema (mainly Western).

Apparently, to a large extent due to such trends (the main reason, of course, was the growth of cinema attendance in the USSR: from 17.7 cinema visits per inhabitant of the country in 1961 to 19.8 visits in 1968), the circulation of *Soviet Screen* in the 1960s increased quite significantly: from 400 thousand copies in 1961 to almost three million copies in 1967.

However, it was the "thaw" of the materials of the *Soviet Screen* of the 1960s in general and the increase in the volume of articles on Western cinema in particular that caused an extremely negative reaction from the Soviet authorities in 1968.

The catalyst for this was the events in Czechoslovakia and the entry of Soviet troops into this country in August 1968. It became clear to Soviet ideologists that "socialism with a human face," which already threatened the fortress of the ideological foundations of the USSR with its very proclamation, was largely supported by the Czechoslovak cinema and press.

Hence, it is not surprising that, in the wake of the "Prague Spring", Prof. Dr., member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and the Soviet Communist Party V.A. Razumny (1924-2011), known at that time for his strict party views, wrote a kind of policy article "Position, but what?" (Razumny, 1968: 26-27), which already on October 1, 1968 was handed over to the set, and on October 19, 1968 was published in one of the leading mouthpieces of the Soviet Power – the magazine *Ogonyok* (editor-in-chief – playwright A. Safronov (1911-1990), published at that time with a circulation of two million copies.

And although the article by V. Razumny was about the journal *Cinema Art*, it was clear that such lines should be understood in the broader context of the Soviet film press: "The criterion for determining the creative height of new films here is most often not success with the audience, but how on the contrary, it is a "fashion" inspired by Western "models" with their modernist incomprehension, pessimism and despair, with their inability to see in the surrounding life a Man with a capital letter, a hero inextricably linked with his people, a fighter for the happiness and well-being of people. It is precisely such "fashionable" – albeit not accepted by the audience – films that are in the center of attention of the *Cinema Art* magazine. They are considered here as the true spokesmen of modernity, its requirements. Moreover, such a point of view has been literally imposed on the readers of the journal in articles and reviews for many years. ... The editors are very diligently implanting in Soviet cinematography a "fashion" for plotless movies. It imposes in every possible way: either by praising the refusal of the filmmakers from the plot, or by directly declaring the plot, the very adherence to the principle of plotting is a kind of anachronism. ... Isn't it time for the Committee on Cinematography under the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR to pay serious attention to the position of the magazine *Cinema Art*?" (Razumny, 1968: 26-27).

V.A. Razumny also criticized articles by the well-known film critic J.L. Warszawsky (1911-2000), who was deputy editor-in-chief of *Soviet Screen* magazine in 1968.

Further, on November 23, 1968, in the *Ogonyok* magazine, following the article by V.A. Razumny, an open letter by the People's Artist of the USSR Nikolai Kryuchkov (1911-1994) was published, in which he sharply scolded not only the *Cinema Art* journal, but also the *Soviet Screen* for promoting Western cinema and hushing up Soviet cinema: "It is a great pity that V. Razumny's article does not mention another film magazine, the *Soviet Screen*, which comes out in fantastically large print runs – more than four million copies a month! About fifty million copies a year! That's hundreds of tons of precious paper! This is the work of a large army of people! And what? What is the purpose of the *Soviet Screen* magazine? This question can be

firmly answered: mainly advertising of foreign films, foreign directors and actors, and sometimes, only sometimes, rather vague notes about Soviet cinematography appear on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine with the definition mainly "like" or "dislike" this or that critic this or that Soviet film. One gets the impression that the *Soviet Screen* magazine writes about Soviet films under compulsion. It is absolutely necessary to strengthen the editorial boards of both magazines... with people who will be able to put these press organs at the service of Soviet cinematography and Soviet audiences" (Kryuchkov 1968: 17).

And it must be said that the attack of the magazine *Ogonyok* on the magazines *Cinema Art* and *Soviet Screen* had significant consequences: in early 1969, film critic Lyudmila Pogozheva (1913-1989) was dismissed from the post of editor-in-chief of the magazine *Cinema Art*. She was replaced in this position for a long time by Evgeny Surkov (1915-1988).

And here is the editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen* – Dmitry Pisarevsky – withstood this blow and held out in office until 1975. Was not fired from the magazine and his deputy J. Warszawsky. Apparently, D. Pisarevsky "at the top" turned out to have much more connections than L. Pogozheva, and the Soviet authorities believed in his ability, under the influence of "party criticism", to completely change the content of the *Soviet Screen*. Which, in principle, was done: for this, it is enough to compare the contents of the magazine in 1968 and 1969...

The non-randomness of the appearance of articles by V. Razumny and N. Kryuchkov in *Ogonyok* was soon confirmed: on January 7, 1969, the Resolution of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio, television, cinema, cultural and art institutions for the ideological and political level of published materials and repertoire" (Postanovlenie..., 1969) was issued, which did not become property mass audience, but was distributed through "party" channels for responsible persons.

This decision noted that "individual authors, directors and stage directors deviate from class criteria in evaluating and covering complex socio-political problems, facts and events, and sometimes become carriers of views that are alien to the ideology of socialist society. There are attempts to one-sidedly, subjectively assess important periods in the history of the party and the state, in criticizing shortcomings to act not from the standpoint of party and civic interest, but as outside observers, which is alien to the principles of socialist realism and party journalism ... Some heads of publishing houses, press organs, radio, television, institutions of culture and art do not take proper measures to prevent the publication of ideologically erroneous works, work poorly with authors, show concessionality and political unprincipledness in dealing with the publication of ideologically flawed materials" (Postanovlenie..., 1969).

In this regard, it was decided: "To oblige the Ministry of Culture of the USSR, the Press Committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the Committee for Radio Broadcasting and Television under the Council of Ministers of the USSR and their local bodies, creative unions and other organizations and departments involved in publishing and creative activities, to adopt specific measures to improve the management of the press and publishing houses, theaters, film studios and other institutions of culture and art, meaning raising the ideological, political and professional level of their activities, a significant improvement in the selection, placement and education of personnel in the spirit of party spirit, adherence to principles, high responsibility to the party and the people. To draw the attention of the leaders of the press, publishing houses, television, institutions of culture and art on their personal responsibility for the ideological and political content of materials intended for printing, demonstration and public performance. Take measures to strengthen the editorial teams of magazines, especially literary and artistic, newspapers, radio and television, editorial and arts councils of publishing houses, cultural and art institutions, intensifying their activities in the selection and preparation of all basic materials, scripts, plays and other works intended for publications" (Postanovlenie..., 1969).

And here it should be noted that Dmitry Pisarevsky, starting from 1969, tried to strictly follow all the directives of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, because of which the information about foreign cinema in the magazine underwent significant ideological changes.

Based on the content analysis (in the context of the historical, socio-cultural and political situation, etc.) of the texts published during the "thaw" period of the magazine *Soviet screen*

(1957-1968), we came to the conclusion that materials on the subject of Western cinema on this stage can be divided into the following genres:

- ideologized articles emphasizing criticism of bourgeois cinema and its harmful influence on the mass audience;
- articles on the history of Western cinema;
- biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors (often neutrally or positively evaluating these filmmakers);
- interviews with Western filmmakers;
- reviews of Western films (often positive);
- articles about international film festivals and weeks of foreign cinema in the USSR;
- reviews of the current repertoire of Western national cinematographies (here, as a rule, criticism of bourgeois cinema was combined with a positive assessment of works and trends ideologically acceptable to the USSR);
- short informational materials about events in Western cinema.

Ideologized articles emphasizing the criticism of bourgeois cinema and its harmful influence on the mass audience

Of course, in the "thaw" times, the struggle against bourgeois cinematography on the pages of the "Soviet Screen" differed significantly in its intensity from the previous stage of the magazine's publication in 1939-1941. The style of such materials and articles has become less rough and sharp. However, the general anti-bourgeois orientation of this kind of materials was stable.

For example, the magazine consistently negatively treated such an "ideologically harmful" genre of foreign cinema as the "horror film". Here is a negative review published in the *Soviet Screen* about the films *Curse of Frankenstein* (UK, 1957) and *Revenge of Frankenstein / The Blood of Frankenstein* (UK, 1958): "these films is supported exclusively by shots with disgusting physiological details. These films are characterized by details that quite accurately reproduce the atrocities of the concentration camps ... For the purpose of advertising, English film companies slip into the pages of newspapers and magazines such statements by "film specialists" as the statement of an anonymous psychiatrist: "These films are generally harmless. They are a fairy tale for young people, far from real life. A commentary on this touching remark can serve as figures about the growth among the younger generation of Englishmen of the so-called "unmotivated crimes", that is, crimes committed on the basis of hysteria and psychosis" (Mikhailov, 1959: 11).

It has also been argued that in Hollywood's "entertaining trinkets about kings and princesses, behind the screen of melodramatic sentimentality there is always contempt for the masses" (Kukarkin, 1963: 18), and the "malicious" stuffing "characteristic of "Tarzaniada" is contained in most other Western adventure films, no matter how varied the material they are based on. Only sometimes the reactionary ideological tendentiousness is skillfully hidden behind the external amusingness of the plot and the romanticized images of the characters, while in other cases it is presented quite frankly" (Kukarkin, 1964: 18-19).

The *Soviet Screen* also reacted extremely negatively to the famous franchise about 007 James Bond (Kukarkin, 1964: 18-19): "Of course, all these are films of the lowest kind, film waste. ... Films of this kind ... of a malicious, anti-humanistic orientation ... are among the worst examples of the adventurous-adventure genre. But their annual production reaches an impressive figure! ... So, shamelessly speculating on the audience's natural love for action-packed narration, the creators of Western adventure films "in passing" drag bourgeois morality, individualistic ideas about happiness and success, the crown of which is money, money and again money!" (Kukarkin, 1964: 18-19).

In this regard, the then Deputy Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR (and from 1965 to 1986 – Secretary of the Board of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR) A.V. Karaganov (1915-2007) recalled that "bourgeois" commercial film encourages in the audience not curiosity, but idle curiosity; he opposes the truth of life with clever writing, shamelessly exploiting and inflating the viewer's interest in the most intimate manifestations of love, in mysterious crimes and ingenious detectives looking for a criminal, in rare facts and strange events that amaze the imagination. It would seem that the producers and owners of the rental, financing such films, care only about profits. But commercial interests and calculations here are easily combined, closely intertwined with

ideological interests: a "commercial" film distracts the viewer from the problems born of his everyday experience, from the acute social issues of our time; amusing, entertaining, he spiritually and morally robs the viewer – lulls his searching thought, inspires false ideas about life; showing the bourgeois way of life as the only possible state of society, he affirms the bourgeois way of thinking (Karaganov, 1964: 18-19).

However, the editor of the *Soviet Screen* D. Pisarevsky (1912-1990), in fact, entered into a debate with A. Karaganov, quite optimistically stating that although the screens of the Cannes Film Festival in 1965 were "pictures that lead away from life, all kinds of aesthetic exercises and films of a frankly commercial spirit, savoring the problems of sex, crime. But they were in the minority not only in the literal, quantitative sense of the word, but also in the moral minority – in terms of audience success, press sympathy, public outcry. And this is significant. More and more artists are seriously thinking about the requirements of the times. And among filmmakers and distributors, a sober, realistic view of things is becoming stronger: the mass audience cannot be won or kept by mere entertaining trifles or "supercolosses". People are looking for in the cinema not only thoughtless relaxation or a colorful spectacle, but also food for thought, an answer to the most burning questions put forward by reality. ... The film review ... showed the strengthening of fruitful and progressive trends in the development of world cinema. ... The review showed that art is developing, growing, strengthening, addressed to the true interests of the audience, that its successes are inseparable from the cinematic study of life. And the fact that the needle of the cinematographic barometer is moving in this direction is an indication of the objective trend in the development of cinema as a mass art, the trend of strengthening its citizenship" (Pisarevsky, 1965: 16-19).

It is curious that before 1968 even articles could appear on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* that almost completely departed from the ideological communist clichés. So the film critic and screenwriter Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978) wrote in 1966 about how "for five days within the framework of the Karlovy Vary Festival there was a discussion of the "Free Tribune" on the topic "Cinematography: art and entertainment". Many directors and critics who spoke expressed their concern that in modern cinematography these concepts are often torn apart, that filmmakers who count on mass success do not always set significant social goals, and, conversely, artists who develop serious problems sometimes turn out to be incomprehensible and uninteresting to a wide audience. In fact, almost all speakers agreed that that serious art should at the same time provide entertainment, and entertainment should rise to the level of art. But the most interesting, the most characteristic, is in the very fact that this problem was raised at the Free Tribune. On the one hand, they complain that the moviegoer seems to be conservative in his tastes, on the other hand, they say that he is too picky. On the one hand, he has new entertainment – television, sports, booming tourism. And on the other hand, Bond adaptations make record fees. In any case, even such serious but never striving for mass success artists as Antonioni and Godard are preoccupied with the problem of the spectator; the most snobbish critics in the past talk about this problem for hours" (Khanyutin, 1966: 14).

However, very soon the position of the *Soviet Screen* left the "thaw" illusions about "progress in Western cinema".

For example, already in 1966 it was emphasized that "speaking of the crisis in English cinema, one cannot fail to note the most important thing – its spiritual decline, the enormous changes that have taken place in recent years in the subject matter and ideological orientation of English films. Not so long ago ... on English screens it was often possible to see films raising serious social and domestic problems in a realistic manner. ... In recent years, even talented directors, trying to adapt to the current situation on the film market, avoid sharp questions in their films and make empty, purely entertaining films at best" (Yakovlev, 1966: 18).

And A. Karaganov, who promptly responded to the political conjuncture of the "Paris May" and "Prague Spring", published a program article in 1968, where he noted that "themes, ideas, words that rightfully belong to our revolutionary cinema, now often fall into the wrong hands and are misinterpreted and distorted for the benefit of Trotskyists, Maoists and other enemies of the communist movement. We still produce few films in which, at a high level of art, the most important themes and problems of our time would be developed. In today's most complex international situation, the question of the political orientation of our cinema is becoming particularly acute. In order to work fruitfully in the cinema, we need to be at the level of modern Party thought, to wage an ideological struggle not defensively, but offensively. It is

impossible only to respond to someone's attacks – it is necessary that we pose problems, that we put forward questions, the discussion of which is in the interests of our communist cause. It is necessary to strengthen friendly ties with the progressive cinematographers of the capitalist countries in every possible way, and thereby help the party in every possible way in rallying all the revolutionary forces of the modern world” (Karaganov, 1968: 2).

In a similar vein, the article of the then chairman of the Committee on Cinematography under the Council of Ministers of the USSR A. Romanov (1908-1998) was sustained: “We need not only to expose bourgeois propaganda, to show the doom of imperialism, we must comprehensively reveal the great truth of communist ideas, the successes of communist construction. High ideological content, offensiveness, efficiency, and intelligibility of works of art for hundreds of millions of people, including those abroad of our Motherland – this is what should become the main motto of our creative life” (Romanov, 1968: 2-3).

Thus, in the “official” materials of the *Soviet Screen* of 1968, the state course towards the abolition of the “thaw” and tightening the “ideological screws” was clearly indicated.

Articles on the history of Western cinema

From the first year of its resumption (1957), the *Soviet Screen* began publishing articles on the history of cinematography, including foreign ones, quite regularly.

At the same time, the initial stage of the development of cinema in the West (1895-1910), as a rule, was covered in an ideologically neutral way. Such were, for example, notes about the brothers Lumiere (V pervyi..., 1957: 21) and Georges Méliès (Dolinsky, Chertok, 1965: 18-19; Sadul, 1961), about the first acting experiments of M. Linder and Ch. Chaplin (Film ..., 1965).

As for the history of cinema art of the 1920s, here the *Soviet Screen* tried to emphasize the positive influence of Soviet cinema on the world process of development of the “tenth muse”: “The era of differentiation of directions and personalities in cinema, which brought such phenomena as the Swedish school, German expressionism and chamber drama, impressionism and the French avant-garde, and above all the revolutionary realism of the Soviet Union, the work of Chaplin and Stroheim, even before the advent of sound in cinema, created a whole series of masterpieces that remain classic to this day. This great flowering of cinema in the mid-twenties had two immediate causes. Firstly, the artists generally became aware of the expressive means at their disposal, learned how to use them and anticipate the results of their searches. On the other hand, we finally found masters who are not looking for cheap applause from onlookers, but for depth and human truth. The third reason acted indirectly, determining the direction of development, both the form and the content of films. Cinema, which broke with the fair stage of development, however, did not cease to be the art of the masses. Films should have been made for millions, not for millionaires. Only the public spectator could become a patron of the cinematographer, otherwise the production costs would not be reimbursed” (Velikie..., 1965: 18).

However, the film critic G. Avenarius (1903-1958) wrote about Chaplin’s early directorial works in a completely “ideologically consistent” way, insisting that these films “expose assertions about the imaginary perfection of the capitalist world” (Avenarius, 1958: 11).

A rather detailed (by the standards of the *Soviet Screen*, of course) and distinctly Marxist biased analysis of Western film classics was given by film critic R. Yurenev (1912-2002) in his article “The Best Films of the World” (Yurenev, 1959: 12-13), published in links with a survey of film critics from different countries, conducted by the Belgian Cinematheque.

Here R. Yurenev wrote that *Intolerance* (USA, 1916) by Griffith was rightfully included in the top dozen, but still the main idea of this film is expressed rather vaguely, the composition is immensely complex, many techniques are now hopelessly outdated. On the other hand, in *Greed* (USA, 1924), Erich von Stroheim “passionately exposes... the vice that destroys human destinies – greed, the passion for money, for gain” (Yurenev, 1959: 12).

Recalling Carl Dreyer's drama *The Passion of Joan of Arc* (*La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*. France, 1928), R. Yurenev first noted that in this film the actress strikes with sincerity, truth and depth, but then exclaimed pathetically: “But isn’t this hymn to suffering too gloomy? Isn’t the mystical spirit too palpable in him, isn’t his pathos reduced to affirming the frailty of everything human?”. And then he made a “party” conclusion: “Being a great work of art, the film *The Passion of Joan of Arc* expresses ideas that are alien to very many people of our time” (Yurenev, 1959: 12).

Further, R. Yurenev reminded the readers of the magazine that *The Cabinet of Dr.*

Caligari (*Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari*. Germany, 1920) by Robert Wiene absorbed the spirit of despair and confusion, the desire to escape from life into the world morbid fantasy, into a world of bizarre ghosts and has become a source of anti-realistic, reactionary currents in Western cinema (Yurenev, 1959: 12).

Much warmer R. Yurenev appreciated the drama *The Last Man* (*The Last Laugh / Der Letzte Mann*. Germany, 1924) by Friedrich Murnau, arguing that in it one can hear a protest against the lack of rights of a person in a capitalist society, it has a life truth, deep psychologism, although this film with its bourgeois liberalism, with its cautious criticism and ironic happy ending, forcibly imposed on the director, cannot claim to be the best film of all time (Yurenev, 1959: 12).

R. Yurenev also approached Orson Welles's drama *Citizen Kane* (USA, 1941) rather sternly, as the directorial techniques in it are "varied, but somewhat mannered, deliberate, pretentious. *Citizen Kane* is a good, strong film, but undoubtedly not the best" (Yurenev, 1959: 13).

R. Yurenev's favorites turned out to be three masterpieces of Western film classics: *Gold Rush* (USA, 1925) by Ch. Chaplin, *The Grand Illusion* (*La Grande illusion*. France, 1937) by Jean Renoir and *Bicycle Thieves* (*Ladri di biciclette*. Italy, 1948) Vittorio De Sica.

According to R. Yurenev, in the *Gold Rush*, Chaplin "ridicules the pursuit of profit, and the romance of gold digging, and the notorious American enterprise, and presumptuous egoism. In a magnificent film, comedy is intertwined with melodrama, the struggle of a small tramp, strong only in his humanity, is crowned with victory. ... movie is both sensitive and infinitely funny, has cheerfulness, and anger, and subtle lyricism, and reckless eccentricia" (Yurenev, 1959: 12).

The Great Illusion "conquers with its humanism, bold anti-war orientation, richness and diversity of its cinematic language" (Yurenev, 1959: 13), and *Bicycle Thieves* is "the most striking work of the so-called "Italian neo-realism", a movement of progressive artists that arose after the liberation of the country from fascism" (Yurenev, 1959: 13).

Here it should be noted that, as in the 1920s, the *Soviet Screen* still treated Ch. Chaplin's films with maximum reverence.

Thus, in her retrospective article, film critic V. Kolodyazhnaya (1911-2003) called Ch. Chaplin a great comedian who, in *A Woman of Paris* (USA, 1923), with the extraordinary flair of a great realist artist, a subtle and intelligent innovator, creates in this film he is a new psychological drama for his time, reflecting in clear and convincing images all the injustice of bourgeois society, hostile to the human person (Kolodyazhnaya, 1959: 13).

From other materials of the *Soviet Screen* of the "thaw" period on the topic of the history of cinema, one can note rather benevolent, but with "politically correct" accents, articles about G. Garbo (1905-1990), D. Durbin (1921-2013), D. Coogan (1914-1984), M. Pickford (1892-1979).

In particular, it was noted that in relation to D. Durbin in Hollywood, "predatory exploitation of a successfully found and already successful image" was used, and G. Garbo "was forced to play insidious seductresses in vulgar Hollywood melodramas. Only after breaking out of the framework of the bondage contract, Garbo managed to play really interesting dramatic roles" (Kartseva, 1962).

Biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors

Creative portraits of American and British filmmakers

An indisputable favorite of the genre of creative portraits of Western actors and directors in the Thaw period of the *Soviet Screen* was Chaplin (1889-1977): the magazine published four articles of this kind (Alexandrov 1964: 8; Bleiman 1966: 17-18; Ershtrem, 1957: 12-13; Kukarkin, 1959: 12-13).

In particular, A. Ershtem wrote that Ch. Chaplin's film *A King in New York* (UK, 1957) "turned into a great event not only in the cultural but also in the political life of Western Europe. ... this is an interesting result of the long and fruitful work of the "king of laughter", who, at sixty-seven, is full of strength, energy, bold creative searches... Chaplin spent more than thirty years in the USA, he has the right to talk about those who corrupt for the sake of the dollar ordinary Americans who want to win world domination. *A King in New York* is a burning satire on the reaction prevailing in the USA, on the violation of the freedom of the individual" (Ershtrem, 1957: 12-13).

Film critic and culturologist A. Kukarkin (1916-1996) was more strict with Ch. Chaplin, because, in his opinion, he "did not always succeed ... with equal success to realize his plans, in

some cases the well-known limitations of his ideological positions made themselves felt". However, further A. Kukarkin emphasized that, despite this, in the *New Times* sprouts of social protest break through and the formation of its class consciousness takes place. *The Great Dictator...* is already an angry political pamphlet directed against fascism. Chaplin's latest films represent one of the greatest achievements of critical realism in the post-war cinema of the West" (Kukarkin, 1959: 13).

And the finale of A. Kukarkin's article did resemble a celebratory toast: "Looking back at the creative path that Charlie Chaplin traveled, when his 70th birthday is solemnly celebrated, you clearly imagine the origins of the great love that he won from ordinary people all over the world, as well as and the origins of the hatred that his wonderful works aroused in reactionary circles of various stripes and shades. The most talented cinema artist of our time, the singer of Man, the fighter for peace, the angry denunciator of capitalism, Charles Spencer Chaplin is bound by inseparable ties with all progressive mankind" (Kukarkin, 1959: 12-13).

Film critic M. Bleiman (1904-1973) was, in fact, in solidarity with the opinion of A. Kukarkin: "Chaplin's political statements are sometimes naive", however, "the constant theme of Chaplin's films, the theme of human grief and loneliness, loss and humiliation in the city of "yellow devil"... is based on the biography of the artist, on his sharpest, most powerful impressions" (Bleiman, 1966: 17-18).

But a connoisseur of the work of actress Vivien Leigh (1913-1967), film critic V. Utilov (1937-2011), rejecting any ideological passages, wrote that she is "an actress of an exceptionally wide range, equally bright and interesting in comedic, dramatic and tragic roles, Vivien Leigh has created many remarkable, dissimilar images in the cinema" (Utilov, 1960: 16).

In a purely positive way, but with "Marxist accents", film critic E. Kartseva (1928-2002) talked about the work of an outstanding actor Spencer Tracy (1900-1967): "He participated in more than 60 films, starting in the thirtieth year, and throughout his artistic life he never betrayed his principles, never took part in films that degrade human dignity, trample justice or built on lies masquerading as truth. ... Soviet viewers saw Spencer Tracy in films of different periods ... They could be convinced of the versatility of his talent and his loyalty to a certain, very accurately defined type of American – a restrained, incorruptibly honest and independently thinking person with an organic sense of humor and a heightened sense of justice, or, in other words, the best representative of his nation" (Kartseva, 1966: 18-19).

In approximately the same spirit, E. Kartseva wrote about another famous American actor, Henry Fonda (1905-1982). Here she praised Henry Fonda's "extremely realistic" performance in *Twelve Angry Men* (USA, 1957) and noted as great success the roles he played in the *Young Mr. Lincoln* (USA, 1939), *The Grapes of Wrath* (USA, 1940) (Kartseva, 1961: 16-17).

Theater and film critic V. Shitova (1927-2002) highly appreciated the work of Anthony Quinn (1915-2001): "He has a strangely rough, powerful face, excised with large, scar-like folds ... The face of a man, not that gloomy, but like something very different from the rest, was on the screen the face of a pirate, a savage, a gangster, an immigrant. But most often it was the face of a stranger, a person who is somehow torn out of his own environment ... Gradually, the constant theme of Quinn crystallized out – the very motive of the strength and loneliness of his heroes, which is so clearly felt in many films" (Shitova, 1962: 14).

And, of course, the *Soviet Screen* could not ignore the work of one of the few Hollywood black actors at that time – S. Poitier (1927-2022): "No matter what features Poitier endows his characters, no matter what contradictions or complex spiritual world no matter how their images were filled, each hero is based on a truly national character. Behind the imaginary, purely external constraint, the versatility of the character is visible, in which such storms and passions lurk that the viewer intuitively expects their explosion. And when the temperament breaks out, it conquers so much that those around it completely obey its power. Sidney Poitier has become prominent in American theater and cinema. He belongs to those truly talented artists who find inspiration only in new socially significant themes" (Krylova, 1960: 19).

In 1962, in connection with the triumphant release of the western *The Magnificent Seven* (USA, 1960) on the Soviet screens, a biographical note about the actor Yule Brynner (1920-1985) was published in the *Soviet Screen*. In general, it was also positive, although with an indication of the "star disease" of the actor (Pravda ..., 1962).

Unbelievable, but true: the magazine *Soviet Screen* did not always scold *Psycho* by A. Hitchcock. So in an article about the work of an actor Anthony Perkins (1932-1992), film

critic E. Kartseva informed readers that almost simultaneously with the film *On the Beach* (USA, 1959) Perkins starred in Alfred Hitchcock's film *Psycho* (USA, 1960), "and completely new sides of his talent were opened here. Using the traditional theme of Perkins, Hitchcock showed what a tragic aspect a strong human feeling can take (this time – love for a mother). The charm of the actor, his still charming smile and carefree gait hid an ominous pathology. A handsome young man turned out to be a mentally ill killer. *Psycho* brought Perkins worldwide fame (although the great humanistic theme that he developed in all his previous work turned out to be turned inside out)" (Kartseva, 1966: 19).

But the outstanding British actor Sean Connery (1930-2020) in the "thaw" *Soviet Screen* was not lucky. A very critical article was published about his work under the eloquent title "Prisoner of James Bond" (Shirokov, 1965). Here, the actor was blamed for his participation in Bond: "We are talking about cleverly crafted film detectives, in which a certain James Bond occupies a central place – a cynical and cruel, unscrupulous, but outwardly charming "secret agent of the intelligence service of Her Majesty the Queen of England". It should also be said that over the past two or three years this movie character has taken an important place in the system of militaristic bourgeois propaganda. Its creators have worked hard to ensure that this "hero" in spite of his inhumane nature becomes popular among a not too picky public" (Shirokov, 1965).

Creative portraits of French and Italian filmmakers

For obvious reasons, the magazine *Soviet Screen* willingly published materials about Western "progressive filmmakers" who had already passed away, who could no longer be involved in anything hostile to the USSR.

So the work of Gerard Philip (1922-1959) was devoted to two very positive articles (Gulyanitskaya, 1961; Obratsova, 1960: 17-18). Assessing the work of this outstanding actor from a Marxist-Leninist position, the theater critic A. Obratsova (1922-2003) wrote as follows: "The work of Gerard Philippe is dear to us, this wonderful artist is close to us. ... The smile of Fanfan la Tulipe lit up with its light, the joy of the hearts of viewers in many countries ... His work took a special place in the post-war artistic life of France, because it actively resisted the pessimism that emerged in a number of works, and empty entertainment and, vulgarity, bad taste, flourishing in commercial film production. The light, transparent, graceful art of Gerard Philip claimed life, struggle, freedom, courage. It proceeded from the folk foundations of French culture and was progressive, international in ideological aspirations" (Obratsova, 1960: 17-18).

As for other French and Italian stars of the middle and older generation, the *Soviet Screen* wrote very positively about J. Gabin (Bozhovich, 1966: 18-19), A. Magnani (Rubanova, 1965: 23), Bourvil (Dolinsky, Chertok, 1967), Fernandel (Chernenko, 1965: 18-19), M. Morgan (Lishchinsky, 1968: 18-19), L. Ventura (Markov, 1968), Y. Montand (Semenov, 1967), M. Mastroianni (Bachelis, 1964: 16-17) and others.

So film critic V. Bozhovich (1932-2001) rightly noted that Jean Gabin (1904-1976) is characterized by "an almost hypnotic ability to influence the audience, which the French call "the power of presence", is characteristic, of course, not only of Gabin. But experience shows that actors who have nothing but "presence" quickly lose their power. And if for decades Gabin remained the hero of the public consciousness, then the psychological reasons that were at work here cannot be separated from the historical reasons. This is what happens when an actor, by the very structure of his feelings, temperament, mentality and character, manages to respond to the deep and essential needs of the time. ... Gabin brought to the screen the spirit of true democracy, merged with a strong-willed, effective principle and deep respect for the human person. ... The bad complexity of the world around Gabin opposed his need for clarity, a high desire for simplicity. It is as if he forges his images with a heavy hammer among fiery splashes and flashes of flame. He does not have that ease of sliding transitions, that emotional mobility and nervous responsiveness to the slightest irritation – all that so often bribes us in the actors of the modern French school. But from him comes a feeling of great inner strength: we have a nature that does not want to be exchanged for trifles. Gabin is a strong-willed and passionate actor. He does not kindle, but restrains his passion. That is why his emotional explosion is so devastating: the actor does not flare up, he is heated from the inside. The growing pressure of passion is interspersed with moments of pre-storm calm. And finally, a long-contained outburst of rage" (Bozhovich, 1966: 18-19).

The magazine also noted the importance of the work of another charismatic actor of the

European screen – L. Ventura (1919-1987): “With a strong-willed face, a cold look, quick, decisive actions, dismissive of conventions. Lino Ventura created his own type of heroes. His gangsters, as a rule, are courageous people, who do not lose their calmness or camaraderie, no matter how difficult it is for them. The acting style of the actor is restrained, he carefully selects expressive means, knows how to convey calmness, inner strength, confidence of his characters” (Markov, 1968).

Film critic I. Rubanova (1933-2024) wrote about the work of Anna Magnani (1908-1973) just as reasonably and stylistically vividly: “Even long before the world recognized the actress from *Rome – the Open City*, the audience of the Italian capital fell in love with her in everyday comedies, where she played next to the favorite of the Romans, the comedian Toto. Anna Magnani was also known from cabarets, in which she sang mocking songs ... And she herself, with a tousled mop of hair, with quick and dexterous hands, was not an actress, it seems, but simply one of those who sit in the hall. Roman, in a word. This absolute involvement with the audience played a decisive role for Italian cinema in its time. ... Magnani not only worked well with the directors of the new Italian cinema, but together with them, in essence, can be called its creator. She gave the screen its democracy, its temperament, not only ardent, but also multifaceted; your optimism, which instilled hope in the hearts of the audience even in those cases when sad things happened on the screen. She gave the screen her heart. And she became a symbol of truth in art, became his bellissima – the most beautiful. Because it was a generous gift” (Rubanova, 1965: 23).

Film critics M. Dolinsky and S. Chertok (1931-2006) spoke similarly about Anna Magnani, using the epithets "great", "actress of tragic power" (Dolinsky, Chertok, 1966: 9-10).

Film critic I. Lishchinsky praised the work of Michelle Morgan (1920-2016) on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*: “The heroine of Michelle Morgan, as a rule, is a thin and vulnerable person. Her strength is pride and dignity. This is Michelle Morgan's desire to conquer fate, to prove stronger than circumstances, to prove, at least by her own example, that this world is reasonable, logical, clear. But in fact, the world around is not like that. Circumstances will assert their strength, destroying her happiness, and the characters of the actress will not give up. ... Michelle Morgan is not only a professional actress, but also trained in French. In her interpretation, the lessons of both cinema and theater are felt. It moves easily, freely, and this freedom is restrainedly noble. There is a certain roundness in her gesture. ... Morgan's acting colors are muted: her smile is a half-smile, her joy is a little sad from the start” (Lishchinsky, 1968: 18-19).

Film critic T. Bachelis (1918-1999) wrote about the work of M. Mastroianni (1924-1996), a favorite of the Soviet public of the 1960s, with traditionally placed “necessary” ideological accents for those times: “Some spiritual uncertainty and softness of character, instability of desires and moods are hidden behind the charming appearance and plasticity of Mastroianni's hero, as he appeared in *The Sweet Life* (*La Dolce vita* / *La Douceur de vivre*. Italy-France, 1960). There is no pride or ambition in him. This is by no means an "intellectual hero" and not a man of will; what attracts in him is not purposefulness, but impressionability, emotional susceptibility (both to beauty and to any vulgarity and falsehood). The contemplative Marcello glances around, his thoughtfulness and absent-mindedness are colored with slight irony; therefore, his smile is a smile as if to himself, not specially addressed to anyone, not addressed. Unlike, say, Giulietta Masina's smile, which was entirely turned to other people, addressed to the world around. In the very deep bitterness that *The Sweet Life* is saturated with, both the passionate power of exposing bourgeois society and the position of protecting a person from the dirt and foam of this society that overwhelmed the screen were expressed, from his satiated and false "love", from his spiritual flabbiness and impotent, confused intellectualism. The film speaks bluntly: society is to blame for the fact that the individual is leveled. ... Naturalness, behind which one can guess the possibility of improvisation, plasticity that can give grace to any characterization – in a farce, in an epic, in a lyrical monodrama. Smoothness, lightness, ease, some kind of free manner to live on the screen in the circumstances of any plot – this is Mastroianni's style – the style of the person he portrays, and of himself as an artist. And finally, the last one: looking at the game of this master, you feel that he trusts the viewer, knowing that he will perfectly understand the joke, the humor, and any conventions of the plot. Marcello Mastroianni's performance is similar to his smile: shy and frank, modest and slightly ironic, this is a smile of confidence” (Bachelis, 1964: 16-17).

Starting from 1968 and for many years (up to the “perestroika” times), the Soviet press tried not to mention the famous chansonnier and actor Yves Montand (1921-1991), who was “fined” in connection with his speeches in defense of the “Prague Spring”. However, in 1967, it was not only possible, but also necessary, to write positively about a singer and actor popular at that time in the USSR: “Yves Montand entered the age of maturity. He is full of energy – manages to play theatre, acting in cinema, singing from the stage. ... And most recently, Montand starred in the film by Alain Resnais *The War is Over* (*La Guerre est finie*. France-Sweden, 1966). The hero of Montand is a Spanish revolutionary underground, a man who sees the meaning of life in the struggle. ... We see on the screen a very smart, courageous, let's say more, talented person, played by Montand with restraint and simplicity” (Semenov, 1967).

Who knows, perhaps, if it were not for the events of 1968, then the “progressive” film *The War is Over* would have hit the Soviet box office. But in the end, he remained out of sight of the mass audience in the USSR...

Of course, in the late 1950s and 1960s, the *Soviet Screen* also wrote about young Western actors and actresses at that time. In particular, the work of S. Lauren (*Goncharova*, 1968: 15), S. Sandrelli (*Ivanova*, 1967: 14), C. Deneuve (*Gosti...*, 1966. 11: 13), A. Karina (*Chernenko*, 1966: 24), A. Delon (*Lishchinsky*, 1967: 7).

In fairness, it was emphasized that Anna Karina (1940-2019) “finally found her type of modern woman, rushing about in search of the authentic, natural, real, and every time she loses in a world where a person becomes a toy of circumstances. It is no coincidence that the fate of almost all of her heroines is tragic: their purity, on which the dirt of life leaves no trace, is doomed to death. ... She found her character and played her “from all sides.” Perhaps, in the future, a different fate awaits her heroine, and she will finally understand that death is not the only way out that one can win in life” (*Chernenko*, 1966: 24).

Yes and A. Delon “is not one of those who pursue easy success. Knowing full well that he does not have a real acting school, he seeks to improve his skills” (*Poznakomtes...*, 1962). And although “Alain Delon seems to have been created for the covers of newsreels – young, slender, frankly handsome”, he is “a professional, a hard worker, for whom his acting business has both meaning and purpose in life. Such devotion to art, of course, impresses, but also a little bit alarming. Especially when it comes to an artist, who studies a person in all the complexity of his nature, a thinking and acting person. In art, a whole picture of the world is recreated, and it is especially dangerous for an artist to become isolated in his craft ... Alain Delon can act in a variety of roles. And even more: the multiplicity, the multi-character of one and the same person is the most important leitmotif of his work” (*Lishchinsky*, 1967: 7).

But the most popular Western young actress at the *Soviet Screen* (*Sher*, 1962: 18-19; *Valentinova*, 1959; *Znakomtes...*, 1966: 18-19) after the impressive success in the Soviet film distribution *The Blonde Witch* (*La Sorcière / Häxan*. France-Sweden, 1955) was, of course, Marina Vlady. This happened partly because of her Russian origin, but most importantly because of her openly expressed leftist views and sympathies for the USSR. Plus, in 1968, the shooting of the Soviet-French film *The Plot for a Short Story* with her participation began.

In particular, readers of the magazine were reminded that Soviet viewers first met M. Vlady when the film *The Blonde Witch* was released, where “Marina Vlady – Inga turned out to be the soul whole, trustingly sincere, pure and selfless – truly Kuprin. She is ours! That's what immediately made the audience fall in love with a completely unfamiliar performer. The simplicity and spontaneity of the game, plasticity and grace, the inner purity of most of the heroines did not allow this love to fade away” (*Znakomtes...*, 1966: 18-19). A few years later, the film critic Y. Sher wrote that M. Vlady over the years comes acting experience and creative maturity (*Sher*, 1962: 19).

In 1966, in the article “Meet the Polyakov Sisters” (*Znakomtes...*, 1966: 18-19) *Soviet Screen* briefly and very kindly told readers about the life and film / theater career of four sisters, French actresses of Russian origin – Marina Vlady, Odile Versois (1930-1980), Helene Vallier (1932-1988) and Olga Varen (1928-2009).

Among the French and Italian directors, *Soviet Screen* tried to single out, of course, “progressive artists” who were in no way noticed in public speeches against the USSR.

Film critic A. Braginsky (1920-1916), who specialized in French cinematography, was sure that the directorial style of René Clair (1898-1981) “is one in its essence and at the same time inexhaustibly inventive in form ... Dynamic editing, clear development of characters, an

abundance of tricks that always carry great semantic load, genuine musicality and – most importantly – excellent taste distinguish his films. ... Rene Clair is one of those French artists who managed to reveal the soul of the people of their country” (Braginsky, 1962: 17).

Assessing the work of Jean-Paul Le Chanois (1909-1985), film critic I. Lishchinsky wrote that his films “are different in topics, but in all the same call sounds, which he repeats with the passion of a preacher: “People, understand each other!”. These are works about solidarity and mutual assistance, about not skimping on good feelings "And two comedies – *Papa, Mama, the Maid and I* (*Papa, maman, la bonne et moi...* France, 1954) and *Papa, Mama, My Wife and Me* (*Papa, maman, ma femme et moi...* France, 1955) is a brilliant, laid-back story, repackaged with jokes, comic tricks. ... Such is the work of Le Chanois. This is a very French artist: smart and light, cheerful and humane. He loves his simple characters, and his sincere feeling awakens the same feelings in the audience. And that is why we love Le Chanois" (Lishchinsky, 1960: 14-15).

Creativity of another very popular among Soviet viewers of the era of the "thaw" director-Christian-Jacques (1904-1994) – *Soviet Screen* also presented on its pages in general positively. For example, film critic I. Rubanova (1933-2024) praised the adventure comedy *Fanfan la Tulipe* (France-Italy, 1951) and, insisting that the best of what Christian-Jacques created, he did in the spring of liberation, when hope was seething and the future smiled with the promise of democratic reforms, she regretted that in recent years, Christian-Jacques has become involved in the production of standard commercial products (Rubanova, 1965).

Referring to the multifaceted work of the outstanding director and actor Vittorio De Sica (1901-1974), film critic V. Bozhovich (1932-2001) also did not avoid critical notes: “While Rossellini, Fellini, Visconti paved new paths for Italian cinema, the thankless task fell to Zavattini and De Sica to exhaust all the possibilities of the method to the end and draw a line under the post-war development of neorealism. Such a work, "closing" a certain period, was the film *The Roof* (*Il Tetto / Le Toit*. Italy-France, 1956). It turned out to be a collection of commonplaces of neo-realist cinema, worldly authentic, but devoid of the former artistic power and persuasiveness. It was impossible to go further along the same path. The creators of the film themselves felt this too ... In De Sica's latest films, *Marriage Italian Style* (*Matrimonio all'italiana / Mariage à l'italienne*. Italy-France, 1964), *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow* (*Ieri, oggi, domani / Hier, aujourd'hui et demain*. Italy-France, 1963) in addition to being made by the hand of a master, there are many moments that attract attention Of course, the main goal ... is to entertain the viewer. But what is also important is where the author is looking for the possibility of entertainment, where he sees the fullness and boiling of life. ... Let's hope that Vittorio De Sica, this greatest master of neorealism, will make another new contribution to the development of Italian cinema" (Bozhovich, 1967).

Theater expert and film critic V. Shitova (1927-2002), analyzing the work of the director Luchino Visconti (1906-1976), staged his drama *Rocco and His Brothers* (*Rocco ei suoi fratelli / Rocco et ses frères*. Italy-France, 1960) in parallel with Fyodor Dostoevsky's novel *The Brothers Karamazov*, noting that the “great and strict artist” “peers with pain at the cruel patterns of human dehumanization. Even such a beautiful, mentally perfect being as Rocco cannot resist this process. ... The scale of the shown moral tragedy is so significant that the ending, in which there is only a faint ray of hope and the promise of renewal, cannot be its true resolution” (Shitova, 1962).

Film critic I. Rubanova (1933-2024) was in full solidarity with her, writing that the works of L. Visconti “they do not often appear on the screen, but each of them is a premonition of new themes, new concerns of Italian cinema, the discovery of its new expressive possibilities. ... Visconti worked all his life in such a way that each of his films is a stage in the development of national cinematography and, to some extent, world cinematography” (Rubanova, 1966: 19).

Of course, the magazine could not ignore the analysis of the work of one of the most prominent Italian directors of the “left flank”, a member of the Italian Communist Party Giuseppe De Santis (1917-1997), emphasizing that he needed to have great courage to “in the most difficult years reaction, "gagged" to stand firmly on the extreme left flank of Italian cinema, preaching with his work the art of great social and artistic generalizations. ... De Santis did not compromise his convictions one iota” (Lunyakova, 1966: 16).

But the work of the famous Italian director Michelangelo Antonioni (1912-2007) in the *Soviet Screen* of the first half of the 1960s received a very negative assessment. Film critic and screenwriter of the “old Soviet school” N. Kovarsky (1904-1974) considered that “Antonioni,

moving away from the principles of neorealism, changed both the characters and the social environment in which they live, and the themes, and the range of problems. Neorealism was revolutionary ... Antonioni replaced the rebellious pathos of neorealism with a bad predilection for dubious mental difficulties for characters extremely reminiscent of the heroes of decadent literature. ... In essence, both his characters and his films – one of the characteristic phenomena of conformism, which has no signs of ideological and artistic revolutionary and is marked by all the signs of bourgeois stagnation. For all his talent and fashionable "leftism", his films are sometimes reminiscent of the salon melodramas that were so characteristic of pre- First World War Italian cinema. Art is bread. It is our daily bread. And the art of Antonioni, an artist who is undoubtedly talented, whose characters and whose films are meaningless and empty, is not bread and not even ersatz. It is a stone instead of bread" (Kovarsky, 1962).

Interviews with Western filmmakers

It is clear that the *Soviet Screen* tried to publish interviews only with those Western filmmakers who fit into the ideological framework of "progressive artists" set by the authorities.

Thus, interviews with Ch. Chaplin often appeared on the pages of the magazine (Alexandrov, 1962; 1964; Belova et al., 1961).

A special role here was assigned to the director G. Alexandrov (1903-1983), who met Chaplin personally more than once. At the same time, G. Alexandrov did not tire of emphasizing that "Chaplin indignantly condemns the preparations for a nuclear war, calls on artists to fight against nuclear weapons with all their creativity, to do everything possible to strengthen peace" (Alexandrov, 1962), and "each new meeting with Chaplin – this is a meeting with youth, enthusiasm, humor and creative inspiration ... We didn't touch on any topics in our long conversations with Chaplin! They talked about the Stanislavsky method (Chaplin is his ardent supporter), and about Freud's psychoanalysis ("They replaced all creative methods in the USA," my interlocutor said), and about the problem of standardizing actors in Hollywood ("Most of them play the same, only in different costumes"), and about the production of *War and Peace* in the USSR ("Finally, you Russians will film your brilliant novel yourself"),

Interviews were also published with such famous directors as Joris Ivens (1898-1989) (Mastera..., 1957: 16-17), Federico Fellini (1920-1993) (Mikhan, 1967: 14-15), Yves Ciampi (1921-1982) (Senin, 1966: 18-19), Giuseppe De Santis (1917-1997) (Dolinsky, Chertok, 1965: 14-15); Nanni Loy (1925-1995) (Bogemsky, 1966: 18), Luigi Comencini (1916-2007) (Tokarevich, 1966: 20), etc.

Let us cite a fragment of an interview with L. Comencini, which is typical in this sense, where he emphasized that "a film, like every work of art, should raise issues that are important for a given country, should have its own national features and characteristics. Otherwise, it will lose the only form that is the only one capable of embodying the content that is urgently needed by the people of the country where the film was created. I do not always agree with our esthetic critics who call on filmmakers to create films that the audience does not accept. The position of such critics is understandable to me; often they are even right, especially when they are fighting against the vulgarization of art. Yet no one makes films for himself or for critics. Therefore, I firmly know that I must make films that are accessible to the audience and will be successful with them" (Quoted in: Tokarevich, 1966: 20).

As for Western actors and actresses, their interviews were in most cases less socially oriented. This applies, for example, to texts of interviews with Sophia Loren (*Soviet Screen*, 1965: 17-18), Claudia Cardinale (*Soviet Screen*, 1967) and others.

Perhaps only an interview with Marlene Dietrich (1901-1992) turned out to be openly biased by M. Dolinsky and S. Chertok, and as a result, the authors made the following conclusion: "We knew a lot about Marlene Dietrich the actress, but we did not fully imagine Dietrich the person. Now the acquaintance has taken place. It brought admiration for her young talent, respect for her position as a citizen and artist, for whom art is a weapon" (Dolinsky, Chertok, 1964: 19).

Evaluation of Western films that hit the USSR film distribution

Opinions of the reviewers of the "Soviet Screen" about American, British and Canadian films shown in the Soviet box office

In the era of the "thaw", the magazine first of all tried to review Western films that got into Soviet distribution. So in the late 1950s and early 1960s, a number of British dramas were generally highly appreciated in the materials of the *Soviet Screen*: as a rule, these were

adaptations of classic literary works: *The Million Pound Note* (UK, 1953), *Great Expectations* (UK, 1946), *Oliver Twist* (UK, 1948), *Richard III* (UK, 1955) (Nedelija..., 1959; Vilesov, 1960: 7-8; Utilov, 1961: 14-15).

In particular, film critic V. Utilov (1937-2011) wrote that *Great Expectations* (UK, 1946) "managed to create (especially at the beginning of the film) a truly Dickensian atmosphere of action", and in *Oliver Twist* (UK, 1948) David Lean's in much greater depth than in his previous film, shows the social environment that breeds poverty and crime. Confident acting, precise directing, a perfectly conveyed atmosphere of horror and impotence before the authorities ..., an original cameraman's decision ... all this gave Lean the opportunity to make a film that deservedly won fame as the best adaptation of Dickens' novel" (Utilov, 1961: 15).

True, in the film *The Million Pound Note* (UK, 1953), despite the fact that "the scriptwriter of the film approached the film adaptation of Twain's work with great tact, retaining all the main plot points of the story," and "the film retained the satirical nature of the story, aimed at condemning the power of money in a capitalist society" (Vilesov, 1960: 7), an overly sentimental interpretation of the plot was noticed.

Of course, the magazine could not but respond to such large-scale hits of the Soviet film distribution as *War and Peace* (*Guerra e pace*. USA-Italy, 1956) by King Vidor and *Spartacus* (USA, 1960) by Stanley Kubrick.

With regard to the film adaptation of *War and Peace*, it was rightly noted that "in this picture one can feel a relatively careful attitude to the text of L.N. Tolstoy, especially in family scenes. A number of episodes relating to the life of Natasha Rostova are distinguished by lyricism and psychological truthfulness. ... However, in comparison with the grandiose epic canvas of Tolstoy, the film loses significantly" (Voina ..., 1959).

A deep analysis of the historical drama *Spartacus* (USA, 1960) was given on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* by film critic Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978). He wrote that in *Spartacus* "directing, albeit without special insights, but confident and strong, the work is professional and clean. ... a brilliant cast quartet of Kirk Douglas, Laurence Olivier, Charles Lawton and Peter Ustinov. Yes, all this is a magnificent and exciting spectacle! But it's not just a spectacle. ... From the very concept of "gladiator" poetic veils are removed, and the authors show the school of gladiators as a prototype of modern slavery. The director and screenwriter discover the mechanism of violence, methods that turn a person into a slave, methods that have survived without much change from ancient times to the present day. ... Crassus, played by Laurence Olivier, is the most interesting figure in the film. There is clarity of purpose, inflexibility and intelligence in this man with thin lips and a heavy gaze. In him – the individuality is so large that even Spartacus loses next to him – Kirk Douglas, but not to mention Gracchus. ... But Spartacus is not inferior to Crassus. This is the only person for whom Crasse feels keen curiosity, fear and even envy. Fear, for he is a god as long as he is worshiped. Envy, because he, Crassus, can force you to obey, but he cannot command you to love yourself. ... The pathos of the film is in a clear sense of the connection of times. He not only restores history, but also learns from it. Therefore, the picture has become something more than just a picturesque spectacle from Roman life with indispensable and inevitable Hollywood clichés" (Khanyutin, 1967: 16-17).

Ideologically very important for the Soviet film distribution was the film by S. Kramer *Judgment at Nuremberg* (USA, 1961). And film critic T. Bachelis (1918-1999) rightly wrote that in this "movie shot without any directorial or camera effects, with calm, sober and tough realism" ... "veracity is elevated to the law and brought to the magic of documentary." ... It is known that fascism relies on the philistine environment, using for its demagoguery the everyday needs and interests of the masses. The novelty of the film *Judgment at Nuremberg* – in the study of the nature of fascism, its psychology, in the assertion that fascism exploited not only base and dirty, but sometimes high motives of people, relied not only on philistine instincts, but also speculated on such concepts as patriotic duty and law. He, this "ordinary fascism", hides in every atom of injustice; it nests wherever people deceive themselves into thinking that the political end justifies the means. Such a reminder is more than timely, and it somehow resonates with excitement, the exciting interest with which we watch the film *Judgment at Nuremberg*" (Bachelis, 1966: 16-17).

The unconditional support of the *Soviet Screen* was also received by Arthur Penn's socio-critical drama *The Chase* (USA, 1966): "Where is America going? Who will be next? Where are the origins of the cruelty and violence that has been cultivated for so long in the United States of

America and for which now one has to pay so tragically? These questions are now being asked by more and more people in the United States, and more and more often American cinematography is trying to find answers to them” (Fedorova, 1968: 15).

Positively viewed on the pages of the magazine and the anti-racist theme in the drama *One Potato, Two Potato* (UK-USA, 1964) (Karaganov, 1964: 18-19; Lishchinsky, 1965).

And in relation to the film *The Road Without End* (*The Shiralee*. Great Britain, 1957), it was noted with satisfaction that “the authors conceived the film as a psychological drama, the action and meaning of which are closed in a narrow circle of experiences of several people. But their desire to realistically show the fate of an ordinary person led to the fact that the film outgrew the idea, turning into a story about ... an unemployed tramp. Social motives burst into the chamber plot” (Skalova, 1959: 13).

The realism of the social theme was noted in the *Soviet Screen* and reviewers of dramas *The Luck of Ginger Coffey* (USA-Canada, 1964) (Karinskaya, 1966: 19), *Left, right and center* (UK, 1959) (Demin, 1965: 19-20), *This Sporting Life* (UK, 1963) (Galanov, 1963: 16-17).

The film *Hell Drivers* (Great Britain, 1957), popular with Soviet viewers, received an assessment in the magazine with a pronounced Marxist approach: “The film looks tense. In front of the camera lens, there was material that was fertile for an action movie: roaring trucks, various fights, distorted faces of villains ... All this was edited with great cinematic skill. ... But it is sincerely a pity that the rich arsenal of cinematic means was put into action without deep thought, without a serious analysis of life phenomena, and therefore without any benefit. ... the authors of the film came close to serious accusations. Revealing the methods of brutal exploitation and outright fraud, they could and should have taken the last step – to call it the essence of the capitalist system. And then the meaning of their work would become honest and revealing. But the machination ... turned out to be only an outline of an adventure plot that drowned out the social sharpness” (Loktev, 1960).

About entertaining American and British films, *Soviet Screen* wrote much less often. But to pass by the comedies *Roman Holiday* (USA, 1953) and *Only girls in jazz* (*Some Like It Hot*. USA, 1958) magazine, of course, could not.

Curiously, about *Roman Holiday* (USA, 1953) in the *Soviet Screen* a kind of discussion arose.

On the eve of the release of *Roman Holiday* in the Soviet film distribution, a warm review was published in the magazine, which stated that in this comedy “lyricism and subtle humor are intertwined ... with the motives of social satire. Realistic, lively scenes from the everyday life of the Romans, deeply humane images of ordinary people are opposed by the world of an arrogant and spiritually empty aristocracy, served in the techniques of the grotesque, caricature. ... *Roman Holiday* once again confirmed the great skill and talent of William Wyler” (Dobrokhotov, 1958).

But already after the release of *Roman Holiday* (USA, 1953) in the all-Union distribution, screenwriter and film critic M. Bleiman (1904-1973) caustically (but, based on the genre of this now classic film – completely unfounded) emphasized that in This “movie has one thing that makes it not only ridiculously old-fashioned, but falsely propagandistic. Wyler not only defends the right to love for his heroine, He also pities the poor representative of the royal family” (Bleiman, 1960: 14-15).

Five years later, film critic Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978) spoke rather sourly about the famous musical *My Fair Lady* (USA, 1964): recognizing that the film “has staged scope, brilliant colors, stereo sound”, he lamented that “Shaw's irony, Lowe's poetic music dissolved in the ponderous monumentality of the production” (Khanyutin, 1965: 14-15).

But play/screenwriter Victor Slavkin (1935-2014) took the comedy *Some Like It Hot* (USA, 1958) much more favorably, noting that the film was based “as old as the genre of comedy itself, the trick of dressing a man as a woman has been laid down. ... The film would have been sugary in American style if the authors hadn't added a rather strong dose of parody to it. They not only tell us a banal story, but also have a great laugh at it. That's what makes the movie really interesting. So, the plot itself is banal. But the way it is told makes us smile, giggle, laugh and cry with laughter for an hour and a half. With each frame, the stamped frame is overgrown with a tie of funny clutches and unexpected twists. ... By the way, about ... ambiguity. The filmmakers are constantly walking along the wire, risking every second to fall into the abyss, where bad taste and vulgarity await them. But the skillful, ironic acting of Tony Curtis, Jack Lemmon, Joe

Brown, the charm of Marilyn Monroe, the clarity of directing (Billy Wilder) and the wit of the script help to balance on a thin wire" (Slavkin, 1966: 19).

In connection with the re-release of the musical melodrama *The Great Waltz* (USA, 1938) in the Soviet film distribution, the reviewer of the *Soviet Screen* noted that in this picture talented cinematographers, artists "splendidly recreated the spirit of the composer's work, revealed the world of his images" (Skazki..., 1960). But melodramatic *Rhapsody* (USA, 1954) reproached that film's creators "sometimes begin to savor Louise's secular manners, her outfits, the life of a wealthy family... Here vulgarity comes into the picture" (Skazki..., 1960).

And the American film adaptation of Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (USA, 1960) received a completely negative assessment in the *Soviet Screen*, since "the reduction of the most important and key Twain scenes (for example, ridiculing the American aristocracy, scourging shameful relic of "blood feud") and the exorbitant expansion of others ... was by no means accidental. Everything revealing, which is the main value of the novel, is removed; everything purely entertaining, devoid of any social significance, is expanding" (Nikolaeva, 1962: 19).

On June 18, 1962, the Western of John Sturges *The Magnificent Seven* (USA, 1960), which was destined to become the highest grossing Western film on Soviet screens: 67.0 million viewers in the first year of film distribution alone. This movie eventually managed to get ahead of all other American and European hits, including *Spartacus* (63 million viewers), *Mackenna's Gold* (63 million viewers), and others. Only Mexican *Yesenia* managed to achieve the best attendance figures among foreign films in the USSR.

Soviet Screen responded to the rental triumph *The Magnificent Seven* (USA, 1960) article by film critic E. Kartseva (1928-2002), in which this movie received a mixed assessment.

On the one hand, E. Kartseva noted that "the film ... is distinguished by good directing, talented acting, excellent filming. The wide screen, color and huge depth of the frame recreate with our own eyes the pictures familiar to us from childhood from books. ... *The Magnificent Seven* differs in many ways from most empty and meaningless Westerns, where a brave, white-toothed cowboy will certainly emerge victorious from the most difficult and risky situations, receiving the title of an "honest" person and his beloved girl as a reward. The film almost does not feel that touch of well-being and optimism, which has always been characteristic not only for "westerns", but also for the entire bulk of Hollywood production. Therefore, it is no coincidence that the film lacks a traditional happy ending. ... The main conflict lies here not in the familiar primitive scheme of opposing "good" and "bad" bandits, but in the moral duel of the peasants with the "knights of fortune". And the fact that the peasants are the winners is very significant. Perhaps none of the "Westerns" known to us has risen to such a critical look at its bandit heroes (Kartseva, 1962).

But on the other hand, E. Kartseva "party" reminded the readers of the magazine that "elements of the standard for" Western "ideology are absolutely unacceptable for us. ... Works that voluntarily or unwittingly promote cruelty and murder are spiritual food alien to us. N.S. Khrushchev rightly said this in his conversation with American journalists. If we talk about the educational role of this film, then it can do more harm than good to young people" (Kartseva, 1962).

The opinions of the reviewers of the "Soviet Screen" about French and Italian films shown in the Soviet box office

The *Soviet Screen's* approach to French and Italian films that got into Soviet distribution was standard for those years: articles and reviews praised films for "criticism of bourgeois society", for "humanism and faith in humanity", for "a call to fight for workers' rights" and anti-war pathos (Bozhovich, 1960: 12-13; 1967: 14-15; Esli..., 1957: 7; Ilinskaya, 1959; Khanyutin, 1961; 1956; Kozintsev, 1959: 4-5; Kuznetsov, 1965: 2-3; Loktev, 1965; Lvov, 1960: 16; Novogrudsky, 1958: 4; Orlov, 1959; Roof, 1958: 5; Sher, 1960: 17; Tokarevich, 1960: 14-15; 1961, etc.) and scolded for "thoughtless entertainment", "bad taste", "propaganda of the bourgeois way of life" and so on (Orlov, 1966: 14-15; Vladimirov, 1960, etc.).

One of the first weeks of foreign cinema (in this case, French) was held in Moscow in 1959. Almost all the films presented on it were later released to Soviet distribution: *Marie-Octobre* (France, 1958), *The Lovers of Montparnasse* (*Montparnasse 19 / Les Amants de Montparnasse*. France -Italy, 1957), *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* (*Notre-Dame de Paris*. France-Italy, 1956).

In this regard, the film critic S. Komarov (1905-2002) published a review article in the *Soviet Screen*, where he spoke very positively about all these films (Komarov, 1959: 12-13).

This high appraisal of French films of the 1950s was also supported in further "thaw" publications of the *Soviet Screen*.

Thus, it was emphasized that in *Les Misérables (Die Elenden)* (France-Italy-GDR, 1958), the authors "carefully, with great love transferred the novel to the screen. They managed, without overloading the action with an abundance of details, to select all the most interesting and necessary to characterize the era, the main and secondary characters. The image of Jean Valjean was recreated with remarkable skill by one of the greatest French actors, Jean Gabin" (*Les Misérables*, 1960: 15).

And *Marie-Octobre* (France, 1958) by J. Duvivier is only at first glance, a filmed performance, but "in fact, the dialogue is extremely cinematic, the word is inseparable from plasticity. The action would be incomprehensible without close-ups, without details, without a duel of eyes, without that complex mini-film dramaturgy that is peculiar only to cinema. ... An interesting film created by talented masters of French cinema" (Manevich, 1960).

Soviet Screen reacted with great enthusiasm to the film *If All the Guys in the World... (Si tous les gars du monde)* (France, 1956), which "became a major event in world progressive cinema. ... Immediately after the screenings, viewers of six cities exchanged impressions of the film with each other over the radio. Muscovites who were sitting in the "Udarnik" cinema expressed their opinion and heard a voice from [Paris, New York and Oslo]. All the movie was highly rated...The director of the film, Christian-Jacques, also spoke on the radio call. ... The idea of international solidarity of the "steam room of the whole world", people of good will, who joined their efforts in the name of saving human lives, found an exceptionally vivid artistic embodiment in the film, convincing with its artless simplicity and truthfulness of life" (Eslin, 1957: 7).

The magazine emphasized with satisfaction that in *Rue des Prairies* (France-Italy, 1959), director Denis de la Patelière "managed to visually show those forces, those methods that the modern capitalist world uses to conquer and subjugate the morally unstable part of the working youth. ... Patelière has a fixed, observant look. He seeks and always finds the smallest and smallest touches that make his heroes alive, close and understandable people" (Lvov, 1960: 16).

Evaluating the film *Sky above (Le ciel sur la tête)* (France-Italy, 1964) film critic Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978) wrote that he is "about the responsibility of people who have received the most terrible weapon of destruction in their hands. The hero of *Sky Above* is an aircraft carrier – a perfect work of technical thought – stuffed with electronics, automation and... nuclear bombs. ... Technology is smarter than man. It is possible that among a number of correct and indisputable thoughts of Ciampi about the responsibility of people for the fate of the world, about the dangers of suspicion, there was also a bitter thought about the discrepancy between the pace of technical progress and the pace of spiritual aesthetic development" (Khanyutin, 1965: 14-15).

In the film *Tamango (La rivolta dell'esperanza)* (France-Italy, 1958), the reviewer of the *Soviet Screen* emphasized the anti-colonial theme: "The work was made by the hands of a master who has a clear worldview, who sees in film art a powerful means of fighting for a better future for peoples. *Tamango* will not leave our audience indifferent. This film makes more real, more tangible and understandable those events in the life of the African continent, which each of us learns from the telegrams of TASS correspondents and newspapers" (Sher, 1960: 17).

But film critic V. Bozhovich (1932-2021), even in the psychologically subtle autobiographical drama by François Truffaut *The 400 Blows (Les quatre cents coups)* (France, 1959) emphasized the "anti-bourgeois orientation": the linking of facts and events does not play a significant role in this film. The main thing is the subtle psychological elaboration of images, the accuracy of details, the richness of life observations and the agitation of the authors, which gives the work some special tender and painful penetration. Gradually, without intrusive frontal techniques, the authors of the film – director François Truffaut and screenwriter Marcel Moussy – reveal to the viewer a picture of a bourgeois society in which lies, hypocrisy and indifference have become the norm of human behavior. They reflect, but do not reason, ask, but do not teach. And they offer the viewer to take part in solving the question: Who is to blame? Who is to blame for the fact that, in general, a good boy, striving for people, for love, for human warmth, is torn out of society, turned into a criminal, doomed to loneliness? The film does not answer this. ...

But first of all, I would like to talk about the most important thing. And the main thing in this film is the idea, humanity, concern for the fate of people and society” (Bozhovich, 1960: 12-13).

Turning to the analysis of the works of Italian cinematography, the reviewers of the *Soviet Screen* during the "thaw period" supported neorealist films with great enthusiasm (Krysha, 1958: 5; Novogrudsky, 1958: 4; Orlov, 1959; Solovieva, 1960: 18; Tokarevich, 1961; Trombadori, 1960: 10-11 and others).

In particular, the films *Umberto D* (Italy, 1952) and *The Roof (Il Tetto)* (Italy-France, 1956) by Vittorio De Sica (Asarkan, 1965: 16; Krysha, 1958: 5), *The Year Long Road (La Strada lunga un anno)* (Italy-Yugoslavia, 1957) by Giuseppe De Santis (Orlov, 1959), *Generale Della Rovere (Il Generale della Rovere)* (Italy, France, 1959) Roberto Rossellini (Tokarevich, 1961), *The Machinist (Il Ferroviere)* (Italy, 1955) Pietro Germi (Novogrudsky, 1958: 4), *The Job (Il Posto)* (Italy, 1961) Ermanno Olmi (Rassadin, 1963), *Piece of the Sky (Un Ettaro di cielo / Un morceau de ciel)* (Italy-France, 1958) (Zorky, 1962: 20), *Rome at 11 o'clock (Roma ore 11)* (Italy-France, 1952) (Loktev, 1965), etc.

In particular, film critic and poet V. Orlov (1929-1972) argued that *The Year Long Road* "leads to the emergence of a new, powerful image – image of the people, the builder of the road ... [this] is a great, deep, true work" (Orlov, 1959). And the journalist A. Asarkan (1930-2004), reviewing *Umberto D*, wrote that "great art always brings joy, even when it comes to sad things", and this "film is truthful, hard, distinct" (Asarkan, 1965: 16).

The film critic A. Novogrudsky (1911-1996) noted that "at the same time, neorealist cinema is characterized by a certain limitation of ideological horizons: fixing individual pictures of life, noting certain facts of social injustice, the films of Italian directors usually do not indicate a way out of that kingdom of evil, which they so temperamentally and passionately condemn" (Novogrudsky, 1958: 4).

And the theater and film critic I. Solovieva (1927-2024) emphasized that the film by Luigi Zampa *The Judge (The All of Us Are Guilty / Magistrate)* (Italy-Spain, 1959) "is already academic neorealism. It seems as if the search and the crisis have passed by this calm and conscientious director. There is no piercing feeling of the truth being discovered for the first time, there is no passionate excitement of the artist who turned to this truth. Behind the characters and events of the film, it seems, is not so much life as the film school and its requirements. And truthfulness also exists here as a requirement of the school. ... The story, banal and tragic, is told in Zampa's film with enough freshness of observations, told with talent. ... This is a picture conscientiously made in the best traditions. Having said this, you will quite accurately determine its shortcomings and its advantages" (Solovieva, 1960: 18).

The film *The Man in Short Pants (L'Amore più bello / L'uomo dai calzoni corti / Tal vez mañana)* (Italy-Spain, 1958) also received an ambiguous assessment in the magazine. Noting that this picture was shot at the level of the best works of Italian cinema, the reviewer wrote, for all that, "the desire of the audience to find out whether Salvatore's mother is worthy of love is natural. However, the authors evade the ethical assessment of her crime against morality and do nothing to ensure that the spectator himself makes the verdict. And the belated repentance of the mother, and the sudden determination, and the break with her husband, and the lightning-fast reconciliation, all this is "compassionate", sugary, sentimental and in many ways spoils the overall good impression of the picture" (Dmitriev, 1960: 15).

Analyzing the films *Marriage Italian Style (Matrimonio all'italiana / Mariage à l'italienne)* (Italy-France, 1964), *Boom (Il Boom)* (Italy, 1963) and *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow (Ieri, oggi, domani / Hier, aujourd'hui et demain)* (Italy-France, 1963), film critic T. Bachelis (1918-1999) noted that "you can no longer call them neorealistic – they resemble rather a brisk sale of neo-realist jewels at not too high prices. Nevertheless, the first love of Italian cinematographers gave their art the strongest, tangible impetus for development to this day. Even today, Italian cinema enters into a sharp, internally dramatic relationship with reality, with the life of today's Italy. True, he no longer peers as intently as before into this life, into its details, into everyday life, in a fluid and changeable everyday life. On the other hand, he claims – sometimes quite justifiably, relying on a great experience of knowledge and on the energy of a generalizing thought – to comprehend the very meaning of modernity, to express in the most acute and distinct form that feeling of a painful crisis that permeates artists and which they would like to overcome" (Bachelis, 1966: 16-17).

But *Seduced and Abandoned (A Matter of Honor / Sedotta e abbandonata / Séduite et*

abandonee. Italy-France, 1964) by Pietro Germi, according to T. Bachelis, was “the closest thing to neo-realism, to its ideas and forms ... Comedy, witty and funny, a little bitter. The taste of bitterness, and also, perhaps, the place of action – Sicily, beloved and glorified by neorealists, the poorest and wildest land of Italy – makes one recall the former, now perceived as classics films by Germi ... But still, in the end, there remains a feeling of some kind of annoyance. Germi makes us laugh at the misfortune. He does it gracefully and deftly. But Stefania Sandrelli, who plays Agnese with a boisterous temperament and genuine pain, nowhere laughing at her character, seems to object to the director and reminds him of the times when neither grief nor the shame of Sicily were laughed at, when the tragedy of a wounded love did not become an occasion for funny comedy, even if made with skill and talent” (Bachelis, 1966: 16-17).

True, the literary critic and film critic M. Kuznetsov (1914-1980) *Boom* (Italy, 1963) received a much more positive assessment on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*: “In terms of its visual means, the film *Boom* is emphatically modest. And what the deepest tragedy of the individual in the modern Western world is revealed here, how brazenly, but at the same time, decently unrespectable inhumanity marches in the picture! Here is an example of how everyday squabbles are raised to tragic heights by the forces of real art, an example of how cinema can look deeply into the life of society” (Kuznetsov, 1965: 16-17).

The same M. Kuznetsov spoke highly of the drama *The Women at War Camp Followers* (*Le Soldatesse / Des filles pour l'armée*. Italy-France-Yugoslavia, 1965) by Valerio Zurlini, who received the Golden Prize of the Moscow International film festival: “This is a strong, direct, cruelly truthful picture, the fire of true art burns in it. Started almost in a frivolous spirit, a story about a “transport of love” moving in the days of the war with live goods for soldiers' brothels, this film story soon grows into a harsh story about trampled and monstrously perverted human relationships, about grossly mutilated destinies. ... That is why this film, full of deep truth, merciless denunciation, excellent direction and acting skills, was so warmly received at the festival” (Kuznetsov, 1965: 3).

Quite often, the “thaw” *Soviet Screen* wrote about French and Italian melodramas that do not pretend to the philosophical depth of film images: *The Blonde Witch* (*La Sorcière, La Häxan*, France-Sweden, 1955) (Warszawsky, 1959), *The Naked Maja* (*La Maja desnuda*. Italy-France-USA, 1958) (Kartseva, 1968: 16-17), *Anatomy of a Marriage* (*La Vie conjugale / La vita coniugale*. France-Italy, Germany, 1963) (Kuznetsov, 1965: 16-17), etc.

For example, film critic J. Warszawsky (1911-2000) spoke rather reservedly about the favorite of Soviet viewers of the late 1950s – *The Blonde Witch* (*La Sorcière, La Häxan*. France-Sweden, 1955), reproaching her for being too free interpretation of the prose of the classic of Russian literature: “The plot of the film is built in a lively, exciting way. ... The film was made skillfully and conscientiously. But what was it made for? ... How much richer in thoughts and feelings is Kuprin's story! ... The content of the film is only superficially similar to Kuprin's story – cordial, warm, touching readers “for the living” ... Marina Vlady draws the image of her heroine with spectacular, but cold colors. She is beautiful, capricious, but where is the power of love in her, which raises the well-known Kuprin Olesya to such a proud height! This is what we will not find in the film ... Kuprin was carried away by the poetry of love, the authors of the film – the unusual amusing position in which the hero found himself. Here is the boundary between Kuprin's idea and the imagination of the filmmakers. That is why we can accept André Michel's film only as a curious experience of film adaptation “on the theme of Kuprin” – an experience far from the poetic work of a great Russian writer” (Warszawsky, 1959).

But film critic Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978) treated the adventure melodrama *Angelica, Marquise of Angels* (*Angélique, marquise des anges*. France-Italy-Germany, 1964) with depressing seriousness: “The creators of *Angelica, Marquise of Angels*, having made an excursion into distant French history? Brave cavaliers, splendidly wielding swords, fatal passions, secret passages of the Louvre, gloomy intrigues of the court, and with all this – the demonic, seductive in his ugliness Count – Hossein and dazzling in her luxurious robes, and especially without them, young Angelique – Mercier. But ... nevertheless, this is a document of time, if not the past, then the present. ... that the desire to distract the viewer coincides at some point with his need to be entertained, is this not an important and disturbing message from the ship of modernity?” (Khanyutin, 1965: 14).

To the melodrama *Anatomy of a Marriage* (*La Vie conjugale / La vita coniugale*. France-Italy-Germany, 1963), the literary critic and film critic M. Kuznetsov (1914-1980) reacted

warmer, but with obvious sadness of nostalgia: "It attracts the artistic technique itself: first, the whole story appears as a story of a husband, and then all the same events are drawn through the eyes of a wife. From this it was possible to make a funny farce, an elegant comedy, but director André Cayatte created a psychological drama not without merit. There is humanity, warmth in the picture, there is a captivating authenticity of acting – Jacques Charrier and Marie- José Nat, there are many subtle and accurate observations. ... All this is true. But again, a feeling of slight disappointment does not leave you: the whole drama of married life revolves somewhere "around" deep life problems ... Yes, nice, yes, "talented in places", however – shake – does not shake. ... In it, in this film, there was a strangely predominant note of some kind of lethargy, timidity – in the approach to life, in artistic decisions, in daring, finally ... As if we were facing the art that we knew, the same a glorious tradition, a manner... And at the same time – something like a lower class, weaker, somehow faded" (Kuznetsov, 1965: 16-17).

But about the melodramatic musical *The Umbrellas of Cherbourg* (*Les Parapluies de Cherbourg*. France-Germany, 1964), crowned with the Palme d'Or at the Cannes Film Festival.

First, one of the leading ideologists of the then Soviet film criticism, A. Karaganov (1915-2007), having visited the Cannes Film Festival, lamented that the jury had awarded the main prize to *The Umbrellas of Cherbourg*, but this film, alas, is very far "from the problems that are now worrying the people viewer" (Karaganov, 1964: 18-19).

M. Kuznetsov (1914-1980) approached this masterpiece of Jacques Demy, although warmer, but sour, emphasizing that *The Umbrellas of Cherbourg* is "a modern opera, more of a film opera, the characters are from today's life, the usual everyday conversation is set to music, the plot is a modest everyday drama... Really, it's curious! And something happened. There is a kind of grace in the film, an atmosphere of quiet sadness. What else? They say that there is also a thought: they say, although the heroes achieve the bourgeois ideal – wealth, but there is no happiness, love is also needed. It is possible that this thought will be able to be subtracted, excuse me – "to look out" in this sweet, but, alas, extremely shallow film. After all, despite the deliberately bright colors, he is all kind of internally faded, the stamp of artistic anemicity, thinness lies both in directing and in acting ... And not at all because the authors prefer halftones, want to speak softly, take mediocre characters" (Kuznetsov, 1965: 16-17).

And only film critics M. Dolinsky and S. Chertok, in our opinion, adequately assessed this film, based not on stereotypical ideological approaches, but on the features and logic chosen by the authors of the genre and style: "There is such a kind of literature – a poem in prose. Jacques Demy filmed *The Umbrellas of Cherbourg* as a poem in music and color. The coloristic solution of this picture with bold, bright spots of carmine, crimson, ocher on a lilac-black background, a picture where the air itself seems to change shades every minute, resembles, although it does not repeat, does not imitate, the canvases of the Impressionists. ... The poet always sees the world in his own way, for him the word "sadness" is not only herself, but all the infinite richness of human feelings is in it. This film is full of sadness. And, without being imbued with it, without trusting the poetry contained in each frame, one can, as if hearing everything, hear nothing. And then a cold analysis will come into play, easily revealing in the plot both unoriginality, and sentimentality, and a certain isolation. And then algebra will kill harmony, destroy the fragile world of poetry, dissipate the charm.

The Soviet press has already written about the film *The Umbrellas of Cherbourg*. This picture was reproached for its intimacy, reproaches, to be honest, strange, because, going this way, one can also complain about Pushkin, who wrote "I remember a wonderful moment ..." too intimately, only about love. It was even said that Demy's film is asocial, that the hero who goes to the Algerian war could just as well go on a trading business: after all, this war is only named, but there is no wide public background in the picture.

It really does not exist, because the task was completely different. And does anyone have the right to demand from the delicate canvases of Renoir the battle scale of Delacroix's canvases, from the lyrics – the properties of the epic? ...

The film simply would not exist if it did not combine text with music. He is the first step into an unexplored area. Demy brilliantly proved in practice the possibility and legitimacy of the existence on the screen of such a conditional genre as a film opera, destroying the speculative theoretical constructions of his opponents. ... *The Umbrellas of Cherbourg* is a film opera in its purest form, where both the laws of the screen and the laws of music are observed and correlated with the same tact. No, the rigid standards of rationalism do not apply to poetry and

music. This movie should be watched with an open mind. He must be trusted” (Dolinsky, Chertok, 1966: 12-13).

But the next musical by Jacques Demy – *The Young Girls of Rochefort* (*Les Demoiselles de Rochefort*. France, 1966) – was, in our opinion, quite reasonably perceived by T. Bachelis (1918-1999) without enthusiasm: "Accepted to think that pure entertainment is bad in principle. Jacques Demy and composer Michel Legrand, the authors of the charming, elegant film *The Umbrellas of Cherbourg*, apparently undertook to refute this current opinion when they created *The Young Girls of Rochefort* – a three-hour mass gala performance with dances and songs in delicate pink, yellow, bluish tones. ... All this would be nice if it were not so treacherously long and – again. Demy decided to develop the wonderful findings of the *Umbrellas* on a large scale, and from this alone everything changed. Naivete, repeated twice, runs the risk of seeming stupid. What was so charming and original in *The Umbrellas of Cherbourg* – their ingenuous lyrics, recitatives, bold colors of painted nature and, finally, captivating melodies that led the dramaturgy of the film, musical and color in nature, all disappeared. The cute, provincial town of Cherbourg has turned into some kind of huge stadium, which is provisionally named the city of Rochefort. It seems to me that there has been an attempt to Americanize the genre, to compete with *West Side Story*, to make it a French, provincial version. Unfortunately, the variant turned out to be really provincial” (Bachelis, 1967).

But, undoubtedly, the main Western melodrama in the Soviet film distribution of the 1960s was the film by Claude Lelouch *A Man and a Woman* (*Un homme et une femme*. France, 1966), as well as *The Umbrellas of Cherbourg*, which received the Palme d'Or at the Cannes Film Festival.

And here the theater and film critic T. Bachelis (1918-1999), in our opinion, very accurately and stylistically exquisitely wrote on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* that the film *A Man and a Woman* is “filled with love for life, for beauty, sometimes unfinished, into poetry, sometimes sad. ... Lelouch experiences and causes aesthetic pleasure. An operator himself, Lelouch combines the color of the world and its colorlessness, grayish mists in special rhythms, like a painter. This is how Vigo once worked at the dawn of French cinema. ... And the rain is constantly lashing against the glass, and two faces are always nearby, and the memories of both are rushing before us. The sun bursts into a fireball, everything is flooded with orange light. Love, hugs, closed eyes of a woman, the back of a man's head – the fire color of these frames of love and intimacy conquers everything in advance: the color of Anna's memories, and the fog of the night road, and the burning of the station, the distance of the sea, the scope of the sunset, the cold beach, the risk of auto racing ... Happiness must necessarily defeat the past that has risen between two people. The love elegy of Lelouch's film is subtle, just as the relationship between two people is subtle and important. But still, the main thing in the film is painting, perfectly coordinated with that fragile force of gravity, which is the most unique thing in meeting and love. ... Lelouch paints with light. He has transparency and fog, softness and undisguised tenderness of the artist, innocently, trustingly and selflessly in love with what he sees. And he sees the beauty of the air, the transparency of the light, the embrace of the arms, the fate of crossing...” (Bachelis, 1967).

And although the film critic I. Rubanova (1933-2024) was stricter about this film, she also noted the merits of this poetic melodrama: “Neither the life material that formed the basis of the picture, nor its interpretation is new and does not bring discovery. Perhaps they even have a taste of literature: such lyrical stories with a happy ending often come across in popular fiction. Everything was decided by execution. The way the film is made and the way it is played. Go and see for yourself that Anouk Aimée's work here is the most complex score of feelings prompted by experience, skill and bright inspiration. Enchanting modesty, forbidden yearning for happiness, timid hope and melancholy disbelief – this is Anna Gauthier, as the actress composed and played her. Her role is a melody sung in a clear and true voice. In this melody is the birth of a feeling, unabashed, relentless, tender, a little bitter, genuine, hot, a feeling that ordinary people cannot experience and ordinary actors cannot express” (Rubanova, 1968).

The main role in the next film by Claude Lelouch – the melodrama *Live for Life* (*Vivre pour vivre / Vivere per vivere*. France-Italy, 1967) was played by Yves Montand (1921-1991), and in 1968, just before the Soviet troops entered Czechoslovakia, Soviet Screen managed to publish a review of the film: “And again about love. Claude Lelouch's film *A Man and a Woman*, striking in its chastity and beauty, did not have time to enter our rental, and the director had

already finished work on the original continuation of this story of feeling – the film *Live for Life*. ... Again love, only not the beginning of it, but the end, excruciating agony, slow and agonizing. Indifference, tiny intrigues on the side. Finally, a new love – for a young American, again deceptions, a break, a return to the bosom of the family. Pastel colors again, virtuoso camera, elegant editing. Again the brilliant actors Yves Montand and Annie Girardot” (Zhit..., 1968: 18).

True, the anonymous author of the review further drew the attention of the magazine's readers to the shortcomings of this picture, since “inconsistency also leads to stylistic inconsistency: chamber lyrical scenes in the familiar Lelouch's manner peacefully coexist with purely spectacular episodes ... And in the final analysis, the title of the picture turns out to be evidence conformism. And the weaknesses of a person who cannot cope with the chaos within himself, and not just in the world around him. Evidence that revealing the psychology of modern man by means of art is too difficult a task, even for such a talented artist as Claude Lelouch, if he is not able to formulate his clear and defining social position in our changing world” (Zhit..., 1968: 18) .

In the same 1968 film *Live for Life* was bought for distribution in the USSR, but due to Yves Montand's support for the "Prague Spring" it was put "on the shelf" and was released on Soviet screens only a few years later...

But to French and Italian comedies and other entertainment films that reached the Soviet film distribution, the reviewers of the *Soviet Screen* often approached with the utmost severity, carefully warning readers that "most of these films are not among the best works of cinema art ... There is a the tendency to turn the film into an entertaining spectacle, pleasing to the eye and easy on the mind" (Bozhovich, 1962: 18-20).

While tens of millions of Soviet viewers laughed at the screenings of Christian-Jacques' comedy *Babette Goes to War* (*Babette s'en va-t-en guerre*. France, 1959), in the *Soviet Screen* magazine a review was published stating that “in the film, Babette is an empty place. ... Having lost the folk basis of the central image, Christian-Jacques seems to have lost the best features of his comedic gift. His lightness begins to border on lightness, ease with carelessness, wit with frivolity, fun with vulgarity. All this is jarring, starting from the very first shots depicting the “glorious flight” from France of the inhabitants of a brothel who did not want to become free prey for the enemy” (Vladimirov, 1960).

Got it from the *Soviet Screen* and a parody adventure comedy about Fantômas.

M. Kuznetsov (1914-1980), on the one hand, correctly noted that “the authors laugh at horror films, at all sorts of supermen and other rubbish. There are scenes that are really funny and entertaining. A smile saves the authors more than once...”, but, on the other hand, the critic was convinced that “more than once or twice a smile turns out to be a kind of “pass” into the primitive world of an ordinary detective story, where the creators of the picture plunge so “with their heads” that they no longer Do you know what is serious here – a parody or Fantômas himself? The genre of parody requires a full measure of intelligence, grace, wit, and finally, the purpose for which a parody is created ... Okay, let's agree that *Fantômas* is a parody. But, alas, not the first (perhaps not even the second) grade” (Kuznetsov, 1965: 16-17).

In a similar vein T. Bachelis (1918-1999) wrote about the second series of this trilogy – the parody comedy *Fantomas raged* (*Fantômas se déchaîne / Fantomas minaccia il mondo*. France-Italy, 1965): without some playful irony; it is she who helps the most highbrow spectator to see through to the end all the absurd situations of this, let's face it, though the most base, but completely harmless genre of "mass culture". ... Hunebelle's film does not hide its commercial nature and is not satisfied with significant lengths. That doesn't mean it's good, of course. The mixture of guignol and farce is strained. And neither the magnificent "hypnotic" plasticity of Jean Marais, nor the magnificent facial expressions of Louis de Funes saves from the strain” (Bachelis, 1967).

However, some French and Italian comedies, due to their "public significance" and "satire in relation to the bourgeois system", received much higher marks from the reviewers of the *Soviet screen*.

For example, film critic V. Kolodyazhnaya (1911-2003) wrote very positively about such comedies as *The Scandal in Clochemerle* (*Clochemerle*. France, 1947), *Mr. Taxi* (*Monsieur Taxi*. France, 1952), *Fanfan la Tulipe* (France-Italy, 1951) and *Policemen and thieves* (*Guardie e ladri*. Italy, 1951) (Kolodyazhnaya, 1958: 13).

For example, she noted that “one of the best Italian neo-realistic film comedies, the

Policemen and Thieves, directed by Steno and Monicelli, wittily exposes the ugliness of capitalist society" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1958: 13), and in the comedy *The Scandal in Clochemerle* the provincial town due to the construction of a public restroom, reveals the true essence of rich and "respectable" people – military merchants, officials. Debauchery, stupidity, lies, hypocrisy and demagoguery of the characters are well displayed in the satirical mirror of the comedy. Not without reason, before the film was released, it was shown to the highest authorities of France, and they discussed the issue of the "dangerous" moments of the film, beginning with the too long stay of the Minister of Agriculture in the public toilet" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1958: 13).

And the general conclusion of V. Kolodyazhnaya was clearly ideologically sustained: "Foreign comedies appearing on our screens are extremely diverse in their types, themes and the creative manner of the authors. In them you can find the image of the most diverse phenomena of life. With different strengths and depths and in different forms, they criticize the negative phenomena of reality and serve to affirm the best in a person" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1958: 13).

A similar approach in evaluating the comedy *The Law is the Law* (*La Loi c'est la loi / La Legge è legge*. France-Italy, 1958) was used by the film critic Y. Sher: "The meeting with the work of Christian-Jacques in the film *The Law is the Law* is nice meeting. A smile appears on the lips of the viewer literally from the first frame, and behind the smile a feeling of deep sympathy for the heroes of the film is born – small, ordinary people, victims of ridiculous, formally applied laws. Laws are ridiculed evilly, in detail, wittily. In every plot twist, in every misadventure... the authors of the film expose more and more inert aspects of bureaucratic legislation" (Sher, 1960: 15).

The *Soviet Screen* also rated the comedies of Jacques Tati very positively: "Funny makes you think. Funny sometimes makes you hate. But for all that – and this is the main thing – the funny here makes me laugh. And very much" (Solovieva, 1962).

About adventure films shot in France and Italy, *Soviet Screen* wrote less often.

So M. Kuznetsov (1914-1980) reacted rather favorably to *The Three Musketeers* (*Les Trois mousquetaires*. France-Italy, 1961) by Bernard Borderie: "To say something new in another adaptation of Dumas' novel is a task of great difficulty... The director is not too deferential to the novel, he allows himself a bit of mischief. For the artistic aim of the picture is to create a funny play-presentation. And the novel is only a pretext for that. The irony, the banter, the mockery is the secret of the film's charm. ...In *The Three Musketeers*, the dynamics of the action are spectacular. The viewer is not given a single minute to be bored, or even just to stare around. ... But let's be deceived – the film is not the pinnacle of art at all. There are no outstanding artistic discoveries in it, although there are some small achievements that we tried to tell you about. But, rightly, without claiming to be much, it succeeds in one task: to give fun" (Kuznetsov, 1962).

Spaghetti western *The Golden Bullet* (*El Quien sabe?* Italy, 1966) by Damiano Damiani received an even more positive assessment in the *Soviet Screen*, this time with an emphasis on the political significance of the movie: "Here is another film based on the Mexican revolution – *The Golden Bullet* – was released on the screens. This time from Italy. More shots and jumps. Again imitation and direct quotes from the textbook *Viva Villa!*. Again, the desire to amaze us with the mystery of the plot. And, despite the professional direction and strong actors, this film would be a typical standard western, if not for one circumstance. ... A living assassin who felt attached to a friend in adventures, who understands the "laws of honor" in his own way (even if these are the laws of sharing!), disinterestedly punctual, respecting this disinterestedness in himself above all – that's who the film shows us goodbye. Look, murderers probably have friends too! That's what's really creepy ... So a western enters a completely uncharacteristic topic. This is how tragedy begins. So a film about shots and jumps becomes a study and a story about the most vile phenomenon on earth – about a hired killer. ... Yes, the guy is real. And his real, and not cinematic, descendants fled from the railway embankment in Dallas, aimed optical sights at the balcony where Martin Luther King stood for the last time, presented a toy pistol to the killer Sirhan Sirhan ... I don't know if the directors of the Italian western were planning on Mexican themes tell us something about the American way of life. But they told enough" (Orlov, 1968: 17).

But the peplum *Labors of Hercules* (*Le Fatiche di Ercole*. Italy-Spain, 1958) was sarcastically, but with a clear overkill of demanding seriousness, crushed in the *Soviet Screen*:

“There are adventures. There is tempo and rhythm. There are some good outdoor shots. There are even natural ruins, and mountains, and the sea. ... And then we gradually realize that there are no Greeks in front of us, that the authors of the film trimmed the ancient characters to the current standards, or rather, the schemes. Superman hero without fear and reproach. A pretty, loyal and defenseless heroine. The hero's friends are a dashing company of fellows who – dress them accordingly – will still fight, stab and cut in any era ... And then we find the answer to the question: why was this done? ... with one thought: how to adjust both the ancient legend and the era, and its characters under the primitive concepts of the bourgeois film market. How would it be smarter to let them into the meat grinder, called the entertainment machine. ... But has art ever been valued, measured by the amount of money and colorful rags for the production of those released, and the brilliance of names, and the level of purely handicraft professionalism of its creators? The measure of art is thought. And what is the idea in the same action films with the same adventures, the same love, the same ends, even the same slanting snub-nosed faces of the heroines” (Orlov, 1966: 14-15).

The works of the so-called "author's cinema" were rarely seen in Soviet cinema theaters during the "thaw", but they were presented by the names of the first row: F. Fellini, M. Antonioni...

The films of Federico Fellini, made by him in the 1950s, in most cases were highly appreciated in the Soviet Screen.

So film critic V. Bozhovich (1932-2021) wrote that F. Fellini's film *The Road (La Strada, Italy, 1954)* "marked a turning point in the development of post-war Italian cinema. Then he triumphantly passed through the screens of the world. ... Many contemporary artists prove to us, like two times two – four, that the world is absurd, life is meaningless, and the fate of man is loneliness. Now it is in the works of this direction that they often see the highest expression of artistic maturity and insight, and Fellini is reproached for naivety, sentimentality and melodrama. In fact, disagreements concerning style and artistic taste turn out to be in this case an expression of a dispute about a person, about his spiritual resources, about his ability to withstand the deadly breath of cruel time. No matter how bitter Fellini's film, it does not exude hopelessness. For the artist believes in man, in his moral principle, which is stronger than the cruelty and cynicism of an unjustly arranged world” (Bozhovich, 1967: 14-15).

Director G. Kozintsev (1905-1973) wrote about *Nights of Cabiria (Le Notti di Cabiria, Italy-France, 1957)* something like an ode in prose: “A reminder of reality, of the dirty streets of the Roman outskirts, where vice, where the horror of social inequality turns people into semi-animals. Giulietta Masina makes us believe that these warped creatures in other social conditions would be people in the beautiful sense of the word. The actress is characterized by the courage of the tricks of the game. She is not afraid of exaggerations, a sharp clash of contrasts. And at the same time, her Cabiria is sincere, direct, touching” (Kozintsev, 1959: 4).

But the article of film critic S. Tokarevich coincided with the opinion of G. Kozintsev only at first: “It is difficult to imagine a person whom the film *Nights of Cabiria* would leave indifferent. The audience leaves the hall shocked by the terrible life of little Cabiria, about which the director Federico Fellini tells with such captivating talent. And all without exception find themselves in the grip of a peculiar and completely irresistible charm of the performer of the role of Cabiria – the actress Giulietta Masina” (Tokarevich, 1960: 14).

But further, S. Tokarevich, in fact, launched an ideological attack on the outstanding Italian director, informing the readers of the *Soviet Screen* that Fellini's “religious worldview ... was combined with outright decadence. Fellini the artist saturates his works with a vision of the reality surrounding him, sharpened to the point of cruelty. Fellini the decadent selects from this reality all the sickest, the ugliest. Pathology in his works often replaces psychology, and violence – love. Especially characteristic is his specifically decadent mania for constant confession, his desire to show the very unattractive insides of his heroes, internally identifying himself with them...

Fellini the Catholic, having painted a tragic picture of modernity, finds a way out only in a religious miracle. With his films, he is trying to say: "Look to God – and you will see a miracle and find redemption" ... But after all, it has long been known that only those who do not believe in a person, in his healthy beginning, in his spiritual strength, are looking for a way out in a miracle. Is this unbelief connected with Christian love for one's neighbor, with faith in him as in the likeness of God? ... And although Fellini believed that with Cabiria's smile “not only the

finale was born, an idea was born that inspired the entire film,” this idea of his came into such conflict with the entire content of the film that the finale could not be perceived otherwise than as an artificially glued ending. What he saw in life, truthfully and talentedly depicted on the screen, killed the far-fetched idea” (Tokarevich, 1960: 14-15).

Paradoxically, the same film critic V. Bozhovich (1932-2021), who highly appreciated the work of F. Fellini, approached the interpretation of the film of another outstanding Italian director, M. Antonioni, rather dogmatically.

Here is what V. Bozhovich wrote about M. Antonioni’s masterpiece *The Eclipse* (*L'Elisse / L'Éclipse*. Italy-France, 1961): "*The Eclipse* is often seen as the completion of the trilogy created by Italian director Antonioni in the late '50s years. The first two parts are *Adventure* and *Night*. The cross-cutting theme of all these works – loneliness, the disunity of people, the fading of feelings – received in *The Eclipse* the most distinct, visual, almost illustrative expression. ... Antonioni is attracted by moments of emptiness that can only be described negatively, moments when there is no love, no anger, no hope, no despair, only sluggish and hopeless longing. It can be said about his heroes that despair and pain would be a boon for them. But their souls are demagnetized, their feelings have atrophied, their will has died. The director is far from to see in the state of mind of their heroes a simple psychological incident or the result of the moral degeneration of a narrow social group. No, for him it is a sign of the times, symptoms of a general spiritual crisis in society. Antonioni is the author of one theme, and he is convinced that this theme is of universal importance. That is why he does not get tired of varying it from film to film.

What is the reason for the crisis? Antonioni develops a “vein” that is too old, too traditional for modern art, to linger on this for a long time ... In all Antonioni's mature films, the same thing is repeated: the event is not allowed to take shape; barely outlined, it disintegrates, dissolves, goes into the sand. Antonioni's themes and motifs, his worldview are consistent with the style of his films, their polished and cold performance. ... To a world in which human feelings have faded and all moral values have depreciated, he can oppose only his professional conscientiousness, his impeccable skill.

It is often said that Antonioni's art is tragic. It's hard for me to agree with this. After all, a true tragedy presupposes a high intensity of feelings, a formidable, sometimes catastrophic clash of mighty forces, tension, struggle. Only art can be tragic, reflecting the world in motion, in the struggle of contradictions, and only it can help to rise above the oppressive monotony of everyday life, or, as Gleb Uspensky said, “straighten” a person” (Bozhovich, 1966: 17-18).

The opinions of the reviewers of the "Soviet Screen" about the West German and Austrian films shown in the Soviet box office

The first West German films that appeared in the Soviet film distribution – *Rats* (*Die Ratten*. Germany, 1955) and *Before Sundown* (*Vor Sonnenuntergang*. Germany, 1956) and others were met in the *Soviet Screen* quite positively. An anonymous reviewer of the magazine noted, for example, that in *Rats* the viewer excitedly follows the development of events, the interesting fates of the characters. The leading role is played by one of the best modern German film actresses – the charming and talented Maria Schell. The images she created on the screen captivate with lyricism, deep drama, combined with tenderness and utmost truthfulness” (*Rats*, 1957: 5).

Film critic M. Turovskaya (1924-2019) emphasized the importance of anti-war and anti-Nazi themes in the drama *The Bridge* (*Die Brücke*. West Berlin, 1959).

The magazine approved of the criticism of capitalist society in the film *The Girl Rosemarie* (*Das Mädchen Rosmarie*. Germany, 1958): “Although the film feels the presence of standard techniques, excessive curiosity for intimate details, and everything that characterizes the style of bourgeois cinema, *The Girl Rosemarie* did her job: she exposed the halo of morality of the country's masters” (Samoilov, 1959; Chudo..., 1966).

Approximately in the same vein, the film *We are geeks* (*Wir Wunderkinder*. Germany, 1958) was evaluated (Orlov, 1960: 15).

But the picture *The Power of the Uniform* (*The Captain from Köpenick / Der Hauptmann von Köpenick*. Germany, 1956) in the *Soviet Screen* clearly did not do well. Film critic A. Zorky (1935-2006) approached him based on the canonical Marxist-Leninist class positions: “It seems that the authors of the film *The Power of the Uniform* are ultra-brave people. Through the mouth of Willy Voigt they say: “I have no homeland”, and in the line above: “I am ready to die

for it." In desperation, the hero of the film steals only his passport from the police. Obviously, this decency should shock us? But are we, living in a country whose people have taken away their power and wealth from the landowners and manufacturers, to be touched by the feat of good will of Willy Voigt? (Zorky, 1960).

The *Soviet Screen* also treated frankly entertaining German and Austrian films very seriously and ideologically strictly.

For example, about movie *12 Girls and One Man* (*Zwölf Mädchen und ein Mann*. Austria, 1959) in the log it was written as follows: "We will not claim that the film will seem boring to you. No, you smile more than once. You will enjoy the beautifully staged "ski" numbers, and the perky musical rhythms, and the brilliant sportsmanship of the leading actor. But is it enough for a work of art? ... in this case, and this does not save the situation. The acting skills of the performers are also not encouraging. ... Purely entertaining films that become an advertisement for a beautiful, easy, carefree life are an integral part of the ideological propaganda of the bourgeois world. ... Perhaps this picture will bring income to rental organizations, but who will calculate the moral and aesthetic losses?" (Vladimirsky, 1960: 15).

The opinions of the reviewers of the "Soviet Screen" about the Scandinavian films shown in the Soviet box office

The leading Soviet specialist in Scandinavian (especially Swedish) cinema in the 1960s was V. Matusevich (1937-2009), who, by the way, emigrated to the West in 1969 and then worked for *Radio Liberty* for many years.

But until 1969, the publications of V. Matusevich on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* did not contain even a hint of the future "dissidence".

So he wrote about the film *Legend of the Fugitive* (*Qivitoq*. Denmark, 1956), which "Here, the Greenlandic exoticism is not an end in itself, but an organic and necessary background against which complex and very topical ideological and ethical problems are resolved. ... The filmmakers are on the side of those who choose difficult but honest paths in life, full of creative work. The indigenous inhabitants of the island, the Eskimos, are depicted with sympathy and respect; excellent knowledge of the material is felt in showing their way of life. ... And although *The Legend of the Fugitive* is not a masterpiece from a purely cinematic point of view, this film is a bright line of that page in the history of Danish cinema that is being written today. ... Danish cinematography has not been flourishing in recent years. But this film showed her a growing creative force capable of creating something more than the vulgar comedies that make up the vast majority of Danish film production" (Matusevich, 1960: 14).

And about the drama *Elvira Madigan* (Sweden, 1967) V. Matusevich, in general, sang a kind of film-critical anthem "It was joyful to see the victory of healthy, simple and vital art, like black bread, a work of deep tragedy, but at the same time courageous and purifying beauty. It was a joy to know that just such a film has become one of the most outstanding phenomena of Swedish cinema in recent times. Based on the textbook story of love and death of an aristocrat and a circus dancer, the talented Swedish director Bo Wiederberg creates a pastoral pierced by the soft rays of the northern sun. Here everything is in harmony, everything breathes with young, healthy, chaste happiness, the beauty of natural being that is understandable and accessible to everyone. And at the same time, the motif inherent in Swedish cinema for a long time, obviously doomed summer idyll is given in *Elvira Madigan* with chilling sobriety. ... With the utmost laconism and inexorability, with a genuine maturity of social thinking, Wiederberg traces the movement of moral conflict, the tragic climax of which occurs when the heroes silently, deeply realize three simple truths: love is unthinkable outside of society; such love is unthinkable in such a society: without such love and in such a society they will no longer live. ... For Wiederberg, lyricism is inseparable from a rational analysis of the social nature of things; that is why the logic of artistic self-development has now led the director to work on a film about a labor strike" (Matusevich, 1968).

Quite positively, the "thaw" *Soviet Screen* also responded to other Scandinavian films that got into the Soviet film distribution: *Princess* (*Prinsessan*. Sweden, 1966) (Karinskaya, 1967: 13), *Ditte is a human child* (*Ditte menneskebarn*. Denmark, 1946) (Ditte ..., 1957: 6), *A Sailor Goes Ashore* (*A sailor has never been in this skin / Das haut einen seemann doch nicht um*. Denmark-West Germany, 1958), *The Red Mantle* (*Hagbard and Signe Røde kappe / Den röda kappan*. Denmark-Iceland-Sweden, 1967) (Pisarevsky, 1967).

In particular, it was noted that the film *A Sailor Goes Ashore* "not everything ... the Soviet

viewer perceives with the same satisfaction. Of course, something will seem unusual to him, alien, sometimes naive. But the film also has undeniable merits. Willingly or unwillingly, the authors of the film reveal the disgusting ulcers of the capitalist world. And in little Denmark, people live in slums. And here there is poverty, unemployment, And prostitution, smuggling, secret drug trade flourish here. And here you have to pay dearly for everything ... Another advantage of the film is that it is mostly ordinary people who act in it – sailors, stokers, cafe waiters, hotel employees ... Elements of melodrama and sentimentality do not harm the film with such a healthy beginning. They are quite appropriate and organic, in the plot, associated with the child. Moreover, these features largely determine the course of development of the thought of the work and the images of its characters. They do not become tiresome, because the whole film is lit up with cheerful, bright humor” (Shabanov, 1960: 15).

But, of course, the greatest interest among the Scandinavian films shown in the Soviet film distribution of the 1960s was the philosophical parable of the outstanding Swedish director I. Bergman *Wild Strawberries* (*Smultronstället*. Sweden, 1957).

Literary and film critic L. Anninsky (1934-2019) wrote that *Wild Strawberries* is “Bergman’s best film... crystal clearness, analytic form in Bergman’s films only paradoxically set off the painful hopelessness of his thoughts. ... What does it mean to live? ... Dr. Borg is endowed with a brilliant ability to rise above time: a clock with broken hands is a nightmare that haunts him. He could not bear people, their disgustingness, their bestiality. He did not want to judge or punish them. On the contrary, he even treated them for diseases. But he just didn't want to live like them. And what? Ingmar Bergman is called a religious artist. This is hardly fair. In any case, he has nothing to fill the religious abyss... What a horror that there is no God, and we are alone! This mood of modern Western atheists is completely mastered by Bergman. No god means a spiritual absolute is inconceivable in this stupid, swine, base world. ... In the world surrounding Ingmar Bergman, there is no clue, no meaning and measure, no shrine. Bergman knows no way out of this spiritual impasse; his latest films, very contradictory, testify even more clearly to the impotence to protect and justify a person. And even in *Wild Strawberries* (and this is Bergman's best film) there is, in fact, no answer” (Anninsky, 1965: 16-17).

The opinions of the reviewers of the "Soviet Screen" about the films of other Western countries shown in the Soviet box office

Of course, films from France and Italy, which were traditionally considered more democratic than the rest, were the basis of the Western repertoire of the USSR film distribution during the thaw period, especially in the light of their influential communist parties at that time (about two million members of the Communist Party in Italy and more than half a million in France). Carefully selected American, British, West German and Scandinavian films also fell into Soviet distribution. Films from other countries were guests of the Soviet screens much less frequently.

As a rule, Spanish, Greek, Finnish films received a rather warm welcome from the *Soviet Screen*. So about the Finnish drama *Women of Niskavuori* (*Niskavuoren naiset*. Finland, 1958) it was written that it contributes to "improving mutual understanding and strengthening friendship between the Soviet and Finnish peoples" (Krymova, 1959: 12). And although the film *Three Mirrors* (*Tres Espelhos*. Portugal-Spain, 1947) is "a typical detective story, the plot of which is built on the Hollywood model", it "attracts not with a plot, but with good acting" (Tri..., 1958: 4). And let in *Electre* (*Ilektra*, Greece, 1962) in expressive, unusual angles, in excessively close admiration of details, there is a well-known aestheticization of suffering, poverty. But this is still not the main thing in the film... Behind the ancient tragedy of *Electre*, today's Greece appeared on the screen – beautiful and sad” (Galanov, 1964: 17).

Of the Spanish films that got into the Soviet film distribution, the magazine received the greatest support for the dramatic *The Executioner* (*El Verdugo / La Ballata del boia*. Spain-Italy, 1963) by Luis Berlanga: “His hero José Luis is a cheerful, sociable guy, what is called a nice guy. Only the trouble is, he married the daughter of an old executioner and must inherit his position, otherwise the family will not receive a government apartment. José Luis doesn't want to be an executioner. But the apartment! Calmly, cheerfully and evilly, Berlanga explores the psychology of the tradesman, consumed by temptations and tormented by conscience. Yes, this good-natured guy allows himself to be persuaded, signs an obligation. ... The director does not forget about the circumstances, but he does not justify, does not pity the person who succumbed to them. He is well aware that in human history there have been far fewer enthusiastic killers

than those who "simply served" (Khanyutin, 1965: 14-15).

It is interesting to note that sometimes the articles of film scholars and film critics published in the *Soviet Screen* of the 1960s went beyond reviewing individual Western films or festival reviews.

For example, these could be reflections (in our opinion, not at all outdated even today) about the detective genre in cinema: "A detective, revolving for decades in the circle of the most traditional plot schemes and provisions, most often evokes an ironic attitude towards himself. He is regularly blamed for superficiality, aimless sophistication of riddles, inability to comprehend the complexity of human psychology. But sometimes they do not notice that creative search breaks into this genre, as if stagnant in clichés and platitudes.

Of course, ... sometimes artists in the West seek to destroy the traditional plot of a detective investigation, when a detective (Sherlock Holmes, for example) created for himself a logically accurate picture of a crime. But they see a departure from the stereotype in the complication of the plot, in juggling with unthinkable and extremely unrealistic circumstances. Having confused the situation, the authors resolve it either with the help of an absurd, artificial plot twist, or pull out into the light of day the "dark recesses of the human soul", which are no longer amenable to logical decipherment. But from such works is also excluded what was the true humanistic value of the classic detective story: the assertion of the omnipotence of a thinking person. It seems that the days of Sherlock Holmes are long gone, and even the commissar Maigret in the modern novels of Georges Simenon looks like a good-natured elderly gentleman of the era of the latest gas lamps and the first automobiles. They were replaced by a sporty-looking young man with a square jaw, resolving any difficult situation with the help of fists and a revolver.

Other artists working in this genre follow a different path: they try to qualitatively change the conflict itself, on the basis of which the detective story is built. At the forefront is no longer a detective mystery, but the important questions of human existence that can be resolved with its help.

The hero of the work is not necessarily one of the parties to the simplest conflict between the criminal and the investigator, but the entire sum of detective circumstances serves as an indicator, a litmus test that reveals the true essence of the hero. Not only events draw a person into their course and lead to changes in his destiny, but also a person actively influences their development. This complex interrelation causes a step forward both from the usual level of a traditional detective story and from those works where adventures serve only as a background for solving an artificially introduced problem" (Dmitriev, Mikhalkovich, 1964: 18-19).

And sometimes the magazine also published articles, the main message of which was a dialogue with readers, a hope (maybe in many ways – naive) for the development of their artistic taste.

So the poet and film critic V. Orlov (1929-1972) wrote about a typical situation in audience disputes when "hot people ... seriously rush at each other, and for the hundredth time one hears: "You are all philistines if you don't understand *Marriage Italian Style!*" (Orlov, 1966: 19).

And here V. Orlov reminded the readers of the magazine that the film perception and further conclusions of the audience depend on "what a person today expects from a picture. And he, by the way, has the right to wait for what he wants. We must not forget the simple truth: he is a consumer. Yes, yes, the consumer, or, if you like, the buyer - and there is nothing shameful or offensive in this for respected cinematic masters. The viewer goes to the cinema, pays for the cinema, and millions of cinematic incomes are made up of his countless fifty dollars. And the buyer has the right to demand.

"What do you expect from art?" we, the critics, ask the question, and then we rush to answer it ourselves. And our opinion is known. We are professionals and – let the viewer not be offended – we know more and understand more, because this is our specialty. This is forgotten by people who write in the editorial office, "correcting" critics, often with abuse, with insults, but they themselves would hardly allow criticism to teach them how to pour steel or prescribe potions. We, professionals, are in principle for the art of thought. Our opinion has been put forth, frankly speaking, gained through suffering as a result of long and hard work, viewing, studying life, books, documents, and audience reviews, the most detailed acquaintance with the live work of the studios, and most importantly, as a result of the difficult education of one's own critical level.

But when we begin to unrestrainedly attribute our own – albeit qualified – views to the entire audience, this is both premature and incorrect. We answer the question “what do you expect from art” in our own words, and a huge number of dissidents remains to be declared aesthetically backward people.

And dissenters, of course, are offended. Dissenters are rising up against us, the critics, and our supporters, the spectators. ...

And the viewer expects different things from art. ... You can search in the art of thoughts. Possibly entertainment. And you can demand: let it be funny to me – that's what I wish today. It happens. There is a time for everything” (Orlov, 1966: 19).

But then V. Orlov moved on to the “educational part” of his article (adding a fair amount of ideologization here), where, in fact, he largely refuted his own thesis about the acceptability of a variety of audience tastes:

“But therein lies our account with today's entertainment consumers. Or rather, our first concern. Isn't entertainment self sufficient for you? Always fun – and only fun? ... That's when it's bad. Think about it. You are robbing yourself. You do not want to pay attention to excessively mentoring articles and reader letters, you yourself are the masters of your free time ... but still, for your own good – think about it ...

For works of “fake” are not so harmless as they seem at first glance. They instill in people their own, distorted view of life, of human relations, their bad taste. And from the views close to the actions. Brought up on superficial, sentimental-slobbering explanations of the heroes of other cinematic melodramas, how will you treat people yourself? How to love? Brought up on “power” methods of conflict resolution, will you lose a precious gift – humanity?

Art acts in different ways – both directly and indirectly. But it works – gradually instills thoughts, shades in behavior and, most importantly, a worldview. And the worldview in other petty-bourgeois militants, which also appear on our screens, is often very doubtful. Not only not Soviet, but also not human in the sense in which we are accustomed to understanding it. This worldview rests on two “pillars”: the alleged commonality of all people (there are no classes, there are no capitalists or workers) and the alleged separation of each person from his neighbor ... To live in such a wolf world with blue trim – no, you'll excuse me! ...

These are our worries – and, you see, the worries are justified. And the conclusion from all the same will be unexpected: art needs different things. Miscellaneous, but necessarily bearing noble thoughts. Not bringing up superficiality, indifference, vulgarity in behavior and relations between people. Does not distort the picture of life. ... Art needs different things. When we truly understand this, then discussions like the ones I mentioned at the beginning will disappear. People will begin to respect the tastes of others. And perhaps an admirer of Wajda or Kramer will make peace with an admirer of trick comedy on one condition: both of them must be thinking people. Mutual understanding does not mean universal tolerance. ... And now, when we learn mutual respect, we will present our bill both to our cinema and to our rental” (Orlov, 1966: 19).

Evaluation of Western films that, for one reason or another, were not shown in the Soviet film distribution

The opinions of the reviewers of the “Soviet Screen” about American and British films that were not shown in the Soviet box office

The approach of the editors of the *Soviet Screen* during the “thaw” to Western films that, for one reason or another, did not fall into the mass Soviet film distribution, was similar to the assessments of the rental repertoire: they praised films for their social orientation and criticism of the bourgeois system, anti-war themes, scolded for “unrestrained” entertainment and ideological hostility.

So in the article *Soviet Screen* it was noted that in the film *Bonnie and Clyde* (USA, 1967) “director Arthur Penn managed not only to brilliantly recreate the atmosphere of the thirties – the atmosphere of depression and the general crisis of ideals, but also to show how in this situation two young people, without strong moral fundamentals, not finding an application for their strength, the desire for romance and adventure, they turn to crime as the only outlet for their passions. ... The killers are not pathological degenerates, but ordinary people, similar to many spectators looking at them. People who grew up in a certain country – in the United States of America, morally crippled by its system. ... Many events ... – and the barbaric bombing in Vietnam, and the vile assassination of Martin Luther King, which stirred up all of America, and

much more – confirm this” ([Vozlublennye..., 1968](#)).

It was also noted that in *Planet of the Apes* (USA, 1968) by Franklin Sheffner argues “with the American society will go further and further along the path of dehumanization of man! ... Sheffner's film, one of many warning films made in recent years in the West. And let neither Godard in *Alphaville* (France-Italy, 1965) nor Truffaut in *Fahrenheit 451* (UK-France, 1966) nor Scheffner on *Planet of the Apes* see or do not want to see ways out – their anxiety, their preoccupation, their bitterness and satirical intensity make these fantastic films about the future a serious phenomenon of art” ([Filev, 1968](#)).

But the film *In the Heat of the Night* (USA, 1967) by Norman Jewisson was already unconditionally praised in the *Soviet Screen* for telling how racism is “deeply rooted in the USA, how strong are the ideas brought up by generations about the superiority of some people over others only on the basis of skin color. The more contrasting is the position of the authors of the film, the position that more and more Americans are now taking. In fact, for the first time in US cinema, it is shown that a smart and capable Negro is better than stupid whites. This recognition is a noticeable phenomenon not only in the art of the country, where the racial problem is so tragically expressed, but also in its social life. ... So gradually, slowly, overcoming many and many obstacles, progressive-minded American filmmakers raise their voice of protest against the "stuffy night" of racism,

Another American film on the topic of racism, *Guess Who's Coming to Dinner* (USA, 1967) by S. Kramer, was also highly praised in the magazine, which was called "a vivid satire on American mores", where "dramatic collisions, like in a mirror, reflect the social gulf between the white and black populations of America” ([Goncharova, 1968](#)).

Moreover, the famous Soviet actor V. Sanaev (1912-1996) shared with the readers of the *Soviet Screen* his positive impressions of the sensational film *The Wild Angels* (USA, 1966) by Roger Corman: “He talks about the “innocent”, at first glance, entertainment of young Americans, ending in orgies, murders and the appearance of a swastika on flags. The young actor Peter Fonda, the son of one of the most talented actors in America, Henry Fonda, plays the main role with great skill. The rest of the skillfully selected actors play freely and sincerely. The film warns of the dangers of a slippery slope that could lead American youth to fascism, and I was surprised and saddened by the cold reception that was given to this socially significant and necessary work, while the American film *Chappaqua ...*, which tells about life drug addict, was awarded a special jury prize for musical accompaniment and interesting camera work” ([Sanaev, 1966: 17](#)).

By the way, *The Wild Angels* was even purchased for Soviet distribution, but then the censors still didn't let it through, apparently, frightened by the “propaganda of violence” and the possible negative impact of the movie on “unstable” youth.

Positive ratings were awarded in the *Soviet Screen* to such significant works as *Paths of Glory* (USA, 1957) ([Cher, 1958](#)), *2001: A Space Odyssey* (UK-USA, 1967) and *The Charge of the Light Brigade* (UK, 1968) ([Hibbin, 1968: 13](#)), *The Hill* (UK, 1965), *It Happened Here* (UK, 1965) ([Pisarevsky, 1965](#)) and *The Bridge on the River Kwai* (UK-USA, 1957) ([Kuznetsov, 1965](#)).

But one of the largest military dramas – *The Longest Day* (*Le Jour le plus long*. USA-France, 1961) – was accused in the *Soviet Screen* of misinterpreting the events of the Second World War: *The Longest Day*, is undoubtedly interesting as an attempt to resurrect the historic day of June 6, 1944, when the Allies landed in Normandy, on a grand scale with the help of feature films. Episodes of dropping paratroopers, a battle on the coast are really impressive, but ... Attempts to convey the inner world of soldiers and officers are insanely weak, and, most importantly, the war itself is portrayed as a kind of large-scale football match between two rivals – allies and Nazis. What about the aims of the war? Was it the salvation of mankind from the fascist gas chamber or just a jousting tournament? The authors of *The Longest Day* were on the side of outspoken politicians, but true art cannot live in the stale atmosphere of "politicking" ([Kuznetsov 1965: 2-3](#)).

Similarly, other American and British films on the theme of the Second World War were evaluated in the *Soviet Screen*: *The Desert Fox: The Story of Rommel* (USA, 1951), *Battle of Britain* (UK, 1969), *Battle of the Bulge* (USA, 1965) and others: "Our press has repeatedly reported a whole series of falsified "military" films of Anglo-American production, seeking to whitewash and rehabilitate the "exploits" of the Nazi warriors during the days of the last war. It began ... with the American painting *The Desert Fox: The Story of Rommel*, this continues today,

which is exemplified by such a grandiose and false falsification of history as the movie *The Longest Day* – about the landing of Anglo-American troops in Normandy. Now the infamous producer of the James Bond spy series, Harry Saltzman, is directing the filming of the rabidly faked film *Battle of Britain*. ... The press of Germany enthusiastically writes about this picture, emphasizing its role in the rehabilitation of Hitler's Luftwaffe. And this is understandable: the military of the fascist Reich has long peacefully coexisted in NATO with representatives of British aviation. ... Thus, the *Battle of Britain* will be for the Nazi aces evidence of their chivalry and nobility. ... The *Battle of Britain* broke the record of lies and slander against the heroes of the past war, the record of indignation and protests of the progressive press of Great Britain and the West Germany" (Lesovoy, 1968: 12).

It should be noted that in the "thaw" era, sometimes even Western cinematic experiments that did not carry any ideological danger were met extremely negatively in the *Soviet Screen*.

So about the experimental Hollywood film *Scent of Mystery* (USA, 1960) a feuilleton was published in the magazine called "Movies with Smell": "It seems that only recently a *New York Times* film critic wrote ironically about the experiences of several film entrepreneurs who, no matter what it took to achieve an impact on the viewer, they arranged the chairs in the hall so that they either oscillated or began to sway during the session (thus, regardless of the quality of the picture, the viewer literally bounced on the spot). And now these tricks seem to have already passed the stage. American producer Michael Todd Jr. made a film called *Scent of Mystery* in which the title is at least half true. Half in the sense that, although there is no particular secret, the smell is always present in the hall. The "Smellvision" system (smelling image) is a device with the help of which various smells are supplied to the hall during the session through pipes, corresponding to what is happening on the screen. In *Scent of Mystery*, viewers pay three and a half dollars for a ticket and can inhale the smell of apples, wine, tobacco, shoe polish, garlic and roses, not to mention the more common scents. ... According to the American magazine *Time* (and in this case we are inclined to believe it), the majority of visitors, having left the cinema, will unanimously decide that the best smell in the world is the smell of fresh air. ... It remains to be added that the Smellvision system opens up the broadest prospects for American cinema. Imagine how easy it will be to make melodramas now. Let some tear gas through the system – and the sobs of the audience are guaranteed.

An article by the then head of Mosfilm V. Surin (1906-1994) gives a complete picture of how it was customary to cover the repertoire of Western film festivals during the thaw: "The festival screen collided two types of works: those that glorify a person and his strength, are imbued with attention to his position in the world and the subtlest movements of his soul, are devoted to acute social topics, raise important social problems, and those whose leitmotif is pessimism and hopelessness in which the absence of big themes and bold ideas is replaced by exoticism, savoring human vices. It would seem that horrors, abominations, base passions, which form the basis of hundreds of Western films, should have remained outside the festival screen, where all the best and loftiest are invited. Unfortunately, it is not. The ancient Greek god of love Eros himself would blush with shame for this unbridled pornography that reigned in world cinema and managed to penetrate Cannes" (Surin, 1967: 15).

B. Galanov (1914-2000) also wrote about the Cannes Film Festival in a similar spirit: "How many hopelessly pessimistic films there were at Cannes, imbued with disbelief in man, in his strength and capabilities" (Galanov, 1963: 16). The anonymous "editorial article" was approximately the same: "there were quite a few frankly reactionary paintings, alien to the truth of life and humanism, imbued with hopelessness and darkness, paintings whose content was reduced to depicting bloody dramas and bed stories" (Cannes..., 1963).

Here is what, for example, the then editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen* D. Pisarevsky wrote about the film *The Collector* (USA-UK, 1964) by William Wyler: "A story about a mentally ill young man, a maniac who lures young girls into the basement of his there, in confinement, striving to achieve their love, smacks of frank guignol. And what's the point that the film is professionally and deftly staged, that good actors are involved in it: the art here is given to the needs of the most undemanding tastes, for the sake of commercial purposes" (Pisarevsky, 1965: 16-19).

Even about M. Antonioni's masterpiece *Blowup* (UK-Italy, 1967), won the Palme d'Or at the Cannes Film Festival, the *Soviet Screen* wrote with a big fly in the ointment: "If you want to live peacefully in this society, as Antonioni says, be indifferent, skim the surface of events, do

not try to penetrate their essence. The problematics of this movie, its dramatic structure, pictorial side are of considerable interest. But I want to say about what upset me in this film. Antonioni paid tribute to fashion – savoring sex scenes. Western critics called *Blowup* the best work of Antonioni. I do not agree with this” (Surin, 1967: 14).

The opinions of the reviewers of the "Soviet Screen" about French and Italian films that were not shown in the Soviet box office

At the initial stage of its "relaunch" in the second half of the 1950s, *Soviet Screen* often resorted to the services of Western film critics of a socialist or communist orientation. In this sense, the French film critic, member of the Communist Party, Georges Sadoul (1904-1967) was an almost perfect figure.

So, for example, in an article by G. Sadoul about French cinema, published on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* in 1959, the films *The Cheaters (Youthful Sinners / Les Tricheurs / Peccatori in blue jeans. France-Italy, 1958)* and *One Life (Une vie. France-Italy, 1958)* were positively evaluated (Sadoul, 1958).

And in his kind of programmatic article entitled “Realism and world cinematography”, Georges Sadoul wrote that “there is cinematography that shows life, social reality. And there is also the cinema of "white phones". ... “White phones” are almost never seen in everyday life, but they were, and still are, an obligatory prop of bad films, in which gentlemen in tailcoats and ladies in evening dresses in luxurious salons, surrounded by a crowd of maids and lackeys, discuss heart problems. ... Sometimes it looks comical, sometimes dramatic, but in general it remains a false, fictional world that has nothing to do with reality. In France, and in other Western countries as well, cinema for millions of people, which really reflects the hopes and aspirations of the masses, is in constant struggle with the cinema of "white phones", that is, with films that financed by millionaires who seek to use the screen as a means of profit, a means of harmful propaganda, intoxicating the people. In this struggle, the best filmmakers, although not always, win victories” (Sadul, 1959: 12).

And then G. Sadoul praised such artistically significant films as *Hiroshima, My Love (Hiroshima mon amour. France-Japan, 1958)*, *The Lovers (Les Amants. France, 1958)*, *Handsome Serge (Le Beau Serge. France, 1958)* and *Cousins (Les Cousins. France, 1959)*.

It was noted that in the drama *Hiroshima, My Love* by Alain Resnais "with hatred opposes war, against massacres with the help of an atomic bomb, against racism that has taken such deep roots" ... In *The Lovers* by Louis Malle, "some scenes are shocking, but should admit that in other episodes the director satirically depicted the mores of the big bourgeoisie. And although Claude Chabrol's *Cousins* is not without "shortcomings, it is a completely realistic work with undeniable merits, like the first film of this director, *Handsome Serge*" (Sadoul, 1959: 13).

Approximately the same confidence in the era of the “thaw” was evoked by the editors of the *Soviet Screen* by another well-known French film critic, a member of the French Communist Party, Marcel Martin, who told the readers of the magazine about the French “new wave” (Marten, 1961).

The Soviet film critic and translator A. Braginsky (1920-2016) fully agreed with the opinion of G. Sadoul about the film *The Cheaters (Youthful Sinners / Les Tricheurs / Peccatori in blue jeans. France-Italy, 1958)*. He believed that by showing “the drama of modern youth, focusing on it as a national disaster, Marcel Carnet, obviously, from the point of view of some zealous defenders of the bourgeois system, insulted the patriotism of the French. ... Marcel Carnet is not only a prosecutor in *The Deceivers*. He made his film with great heartache for the fate of the younger generation” (Braginsky, 1959).

A little later, the same A. Braginsky (after all, it was only after the “Paris May” that Jean-Luc Godard began to be considered one of the enemies of the USSR) praised the drama *The Little Soldier (Le Petit soldat. France, 1960)*: “This is the story of a deserter of the French army, operating in Algeria. The hero of the film is trying to personally decide for himself the question of who is right and who is to blame in this cruel war. Godard is far from taking the side of the Algerian patriots to the end. But he opposes the war, denouncing the cruelty of the colonialists. By thirteen votes to six, the censorship commission demanded ... a ban on the film *The Little Soldier*. The Minister, who has the right to uphold or revoke the decisions of the censorship, agreed with the opinion of the commission. For what reasons? Yes, because scenes of torture are shown on the screen. Because the hero of the picture was a deserter looking for the truth. "At that moment, when all French youth, says the communiqué of the Ministry of Information, are

called up for military service in Algeria, an attempt to oppose this cannot be supported. Various public and professional organizations protested against the ban on *The Little Soldier*. The struggle against the arbitrariness of censorship in France merges today with the movement of broad public circles against the continuation of the war in Algeria" (Braginsky, 1960: 17).

Another film by Godard, *Alphaville* (France-Italy, 1965), presented at the Moscow Film Festival, but not purchased for Soviet film distribution, was also rated very positively in the *Soviet Screen*.

Film critic Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978) wrote that "the threat of neo-fascism is embodied by the French director Jean-Luc Godard in the gloomy images of the totalitarian state of Alphaville. Alphaville is a city where science is put at the service of destruction, where the conquest of foreign countries is the main task, and the reprisal against dissidents is an iron rule. In this world of concrete walls, endless corridors and empty-eyed people, the word "love" has been replaced by the word "voluptuousness", and the concept of "conscience" does not exist at all" (Khanyutin, 1965: 14-15).

The anti-totalitarian significance of the film was also emphasized by film critic E. Kartseva (1928-2002), emphasizing that, although *Alfaville* is made in the tradition of social science fiction, "this, however, in no way meant a departure from the problems of our time. On the contrary, the originality of the form made it possible to look at these problems more broadly and put them more sharply. Worried about the activation of fascism, the tendencies of social development leading to dictatorship, the French director, warning, although not always consistently and clearly in position, created on the screen a prototype of an authoritarian state, from the life of which normal human relations were etched out" (Kartseva, 1966: 19).

The importance of anti-war themes in the film *317th Platoon* (*La 317e section*. France-Spain-Cambodia, 1965) was emphasized in an article by D. Pisarevsky (1912-1990): "The painful path of a French platoon retreating through the jungle, the death of its people, the cruel drama of the soldiers involved in an adventure alien to them – all this grows in the film into incriminating evidence against a dirty war. Although the author is not bold enough and consistent in all his conclusions, the material of his film, the whole structure of his images suggest to the audience the thought: it is impossible to defeat the people fighting for freedom. And this page of recent history acquired a topical sound, highlighting the events that are still taking place in the same places today" (Pisarevsky, 1965).

Of course, the *Soviet Screen* was very sympathetic to those Western films where the positive characters were revolutionaries of "democratic views". So Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978) enthusiastically wrote about the political drama *The War is Over* (*La Guerre est finie*. France-Sweden, 1966) as follows: "therefore, its spiritual wholeness is clearly visible. He does not yet know how he will fight, but he will fight. The Spanish war is over, a new generation has come, conditions have changed, but the struggle continues. ... The main role in the film is played by Yves Montand. He has grown old, the charm of the darling of the public has gone, bitterness and fatigue have appeared in his eyes. Now Montand has somehow subtly become similar to Gabin of his mature years. The same stinginess of acting means, unexpected change of rhythms, charm of masculinity. And next to Montand is Ingrid Thulin. The well-known actress from Bergman's films found some kind of inner harmony in this picture. Her acting duets with Montand are perhaps the best of the film. Perhaps, love has not yet been shown as in this film. So candid and so chaste. So sensual and so sublime. In general, it is difficult to determine the style of Resnais in this film. Maybe it can be called poetic, enlightened realism. His thought retained complexity, volume, and the language became simpler, more expressive. This picture requires intellectual effort, and it captures with its emotional power. This is where the synthesis that modern cinema is looking for is born, the synthesis of thought and feeling that captivates the viewer and raises him to the heights of great art" (Khanyutin, 1966: 15).

It can be assumed that *The War is Over* could well have appeared in the Soviet film distribution, but in 1968 the "black list" of Western cultural figures in the USSR included both the scriptwriter of the film Jorge Semprún and the actor Yves Montan...

It is clear that Mario Monicelli's drama *The Organizer* (*Les Compagni / I Camarades*. Italy-France-Yugoslavia, 1963) was also highly rated by the magazine, since "the film deeply and truthfully shows the origin and development of revolutionary consciousness among Italian workers" (Matveev, 1964: 18).

At the same time, the chamber psychological drama *Mouchette* (France, 1967): "Robert

Bresson. His view of the world is rigidly predetermined and firm, his film *Mouchette* based on the novel by Bernanos is a terrible, depressingly hopeless film, full of despair and a special, purely Bressonian silence. A work of high veracity, *Mouchette*, perhaps, does not rise in its strength and depth of silence to Bresson's famous masterpiece *The Condemned to Death Fled*, but it is no less amazing. Here, in *Mouchette*, silence reigns, for the whole world is a prison. The loneliness of man is absolute, life is monstrous, cruel, the author's pessimism is boundless. You can not share this pessimism. You can not love Bresson, but his goal – to show the defenselessness of man in the conditions of animal existence – is a necessary goal. In the Bressonian picture of the world, there is no god, no devil, no "special" villains, and the human being is nevertheless hunted. ... A terrible, inexorable picture. There don't seem to be any criminals. At the same time, Bresson sees them, and we see them. This is indifference. Indifference to someone else's poverty and misfortune, to the torment of an almost feral soul. Their indifference is the main source of Bresson's bitter pessimism" (Bachelis, 1967).

At the turn of the 1960s, Antonello Trombadori (1917-1993), then member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Italy, editor-in-chief of the magazine *Contemporaneo*, was entrusted to tell the readers of the *Soviet Screen* about modern cinema in Italy.

In his article, A. Trombadori argued that "in 1959, a new upsurge of Italian cinematography began. It is an upswing, not a resurrection. Despite the fierce attacks of censorship, Italian cinematography has created a number of films of a certain artistic and public interest. But it cannot yet be said that the working conditions of directors and their ideological views meet the requirements that can guarantee the creative flourishing of Italian cinema. Censorship continues to stifle any attempt by Italian cinema to comprehend social processes. The political views of many of the most prominent directors and screenwriters are still very vague. They oscillate between subjectivism, bordering on mysticism, and the illusory hope that all the plagues inherent in modern bourgeois society, can be eliminated by social democratic reforms. It is interesting to note, however, the fact that censorship shows hostility even towards a very moderate ideological orientation" (Trombadori, 1960: 10).

However, continued A. Trombadori, "it should not, of course, be approached with a doctrinaire yardstick to assess the worldview of the most prominent representatives of Italian cinema. Some of them, as you know, occupy advanced, socialist positions. However, others, those who are obviously far from the Marxist worldview, are by no means singers of longing and loneliness, they do not act as preachers of the ideas of neo-capitalism. They are characterized by a sincere desire for something new, a passionate spirit of creative search. At the heart of their work lies the problem of the relationship between the people and art, between personal experiences and the structure of society. Thus, it is by no means accidental that the films that will now serve as the basis for talking about the new rise of Italian cinema attract attention, above all, for their subject matter" (Trombadori, 1960: 10).

And further in the article, an analysis was given to such significant films as *The Great War* (*La Grande Guerra*. Italy-France, 1959), *The Cruel Summer* (*Estate violenta*. Italy-France, 1959) and *The Sweet Life* (*La Dolce vita*. Italy-France, 1960).

A. Trombadori noted that in Mario Monicelli's movie *The Great War* is "the story of two soldiers who do not want to fight and think only about how to return home alive is told. The director endowed these characters with a comedy-grotesque character, thanks to which their low-heroic behavior does not become repulsive. ... Elements of the comic, grotesque, pathos are closely intertwined with each other, organically penetrating into the overall fabric of the narrative. And yet, at the end of the viewing, you involuntarily think about how much this film would have won if the historical and social essence of the events had been clearly revealed in it" (Trombadori, 1960: 11).

Valerio Zurlini's drama *The Cruel Summer* also received an ambiguous assessment from the critic: "This movie shows the moral decay of a wretched provincial bourgeois society during the years of fascism. ... The love that arose between the thirty-year-old widow of a naval officer who died heroically in the war, and the young man – the son of a Nazi leader – is doomed to a tragic outcome by the inhumanity of the fascist regime. ... The film has many shortcomings, although the main scenes are distinguished by their brightness and great expressive power" (Trombadori, 1960: 11).

The now classic *The Sweet Life* (*La Dolce vita*. Italy-France, 1960) deserved a very positive assessment from A. Trombadori: "The viewer sees the rampant wealth that destroys all moral

foundations, sees spiritual squalor, stupidity, and boundless boredom representatives of the upper bourgeoisie and the aristocracy. ... From the point of view of directing and acting skills, this film ... is a significant step forward for the director on the way to eliminating elements of spiritualism and metaphysics in his work. The negative aspects of the life of modern Italy are revealed with merciless realism. And only at the end of the film, the clear, clear eyes of a young girl, as it were, tell the viewer that there is a saving outcome, there is another path that you can follow. It is to be expected that Fellini would come to this conclusion. However, Italian cinematography cannot limit itself to showing only the negative aspects of contemporary society, and this is not the key to its further flourishing" (Trombadori 1960: 10-11).

Approximately in the same ideologically verified vein, the article of another Italian journalist and communist Paolo Alatri (1918-1995) was sustained, who, in a review of Italian films, although in general, praised the films *We Still Kill the Old Way* (*A ciascuno il suo*. Italy, 1967) by Elio Petri, *The Climax* (*L'Immorale / Beaucoup trop pour un seul homme*. Italy-France, 1967) by Pietro Germi and *Excuse me, are you for or against?* (*Scusi, lei è favorevole o contrario?* Italy, 1966) Alberto Sordi, but then emphasized that "the desire of Sordi and Germi to solve the issues in a sugary tone, avoiding really dramatic moments, severely limits the value, meaning and effect of the works" (Alatri, 1967), and "the overall picture of Italian cinema very depressing. Particularly distressing is the gradual surrender of even the best film directors of commercial cinema. To create a "difficult" and that is why it could turn out to be a significant film, Italian masters lack not so much artistic strength as moral" (Alatri, 1967).

Curiously, highly rated *The Sweet Life* (*La Dolce vita*. Italy-France, 1960) Federico Fellini gave S. Bondarchuk (1920-1994), as this film, "exposing the vices and ulcers of various strata of modern Italian society, made an impression exploding bomb" (Bondarchuk, 1960).

And the director of Mosfilm, V. Surin (1906-1994), practically agreed with the assessment Paolo Alatri film Pietro Germi *The Climax* (*L'Immorale*. Italy-France, 1967): "The hero of his movie ... is a decent man and a good family man. But his character is such that he has already acquired a third family. He loves all his wives and children equally, but, rushing between three homes, he dies of a broken heart. Had this story fallen into the hands of another director, it would have turned out to be a vulgar, banal picture. It is saved by her talent, an unusually kind attitude toward man, Germi's ingenuity, a cascade of unexpected and funny situations. Saves it and a great actor Ugo Tognazzi, who knows how even in the funniest moments to maintain an unflappable seriousness, makes not only laugh, but also to think about life. His acting contributed greatly to the fact that the curious story became a sharp, accurate and funny satire of the mores of modern society" (Surin, 1967: 14).

Michelangelo Antonioni's existential drama *The Red Desert* (*Il Deserto rosso / Le Désert rouge*. Italy-France, 1964) was also quite positively assessed in *Soviet Screen*: "One of the most poignant and socially significant pictures ... was *The Red Desert*. ... Sometimes questions arise: is Antonioni not speaking out against progress and technology in this film, is he not a kind of preacher of neo-Russianism, calling mankind back to the primordial nature? It is hardly right to imagine Antonioni as being so naive. He shows the other side of the economic miracle in Western countries, he speaks of the terrible price of spiritual devastation with which bourgeois prosperity is bought" (Karaganov 1964: 18-19). Nevertheless, this film only became available to a mass audience in the USSR during the years of Perestroika...

Positive reviews were published in the *Soviet Screen* about *The Leopard* (*Il Gattopardo / Le Guépard*. Italy-France, 1963) by Luchino Visconti (Galanov, 1963: 16), *The Moment of Truth* (*Il Momento della verità*. Italy-Spain, 1965) by Francesco Rosi (Pisarevsky, 1965), *The Battle for Algeria* (*La Battaglia di Algeri*. Italy-Algeria, 1965) by Gilo Pontecorvo (Sanaev, 1966: 18), *Seated at His Right* (*Seduto alla sua destra*. Italy, 1968) (Solovieva, Shitova, 1968: 14).

But although the festival audience "followed with great excitement ... the almost documentary footage of the heroic struggle of the Algerian people for freedom" (Sanaev, 1966: 18) in the *The Battle for Algeria*, although it was purchased for Soviet distribution, but on the screens of cinemas in The USSR never came out, because it showed too naturalistically and quite objectively not only the cruelty of the French army, but of the Algerian rebels...

By the way, a similar case (purchase and subsequent absence from the Soviet film distribution) happened with Valerio Zurlini's drama *Seated at His Right*, which also received a very positive assessment in the *Soviet Screen*: "Behind her hero, who here bears the name of Maurice Lalubi and who is killed after torture by mercenaries of a foreign legion in an unnamed

African country, behind this hero is, perhaps, not only Patrice Lumumba, but also Martin Luther King, but also Mahatma Gandhi, but also other moral leaders of the peoples, heralds of freedom and goodness who were shot or torn to pieces. From this film, the viewer can run away, because it is terrible to see torture. But you can't run away from the fact that in life now, this very minute someone is being tortured ... Zurlini's tragedy is both revealed and balanced by the harsh classicism of construction; the hero's death journey on the cross is at the same time traditional for Italian art and preserves the bleeding authenticity of the fate of this particular man and his two random cellmates, who will be killed along with him. ... Here is the height of the conscience of the artist, for whom the world is full of problems, social battles, violence and courage. This is ... one of the best films of today's Italian cinema" (Solovieva, Shitova, 1968: 14).

As for the *The Moment of Truth*, he received support from the magazine and personally from its editor-in-chief for the fact that "ruthlessly exposed" "the social ulcers of Spain", and at the same time "this picture, which strikes with the virtuosity of filming bullfights, the sincere play of non-professional performers, continues the traditions of Italian neorealism" (Pisarevsky, 1965).

And here is the *Sandra of a Thousand Delights* (*Vaghe stelle dell'Orsa...* Italy, 1965) by Luchino Visconti, *Accattone* (*The Scrounger*. Italy, 1961) by Pier Paolo Pasolini and *Last Year in Marienbad* (*L'Année dernière à Marienbad / L'Anno scorso a Marienbad*. France-Italy, 1961) provoked serious reproaches from the *Soviet Screen*, since in the *Sandra of a Thousand Delights* "everything in the film is unsteady, unclear, human relations are confusing, unnatural" (Skobtseva, 1965: 17), gloominess and pessimism prevail in *Accattone* (Kremlev, 1962), and the parable *Last Year in Marienbad* is clearly over-praised by Western journalists (Kremlev, 1962).

In contrast to *The 400 Blows* (*Les Quatre cents coups / Les 400 coups*. France, 1959), another work by Francois Truffaut is the subtle psychological drama *Silken Skin* (*The Soft Skin / La Peau douce*. France, 1964) did not find understanding from the reviewer of the *Soviet Screen*: "Love is a great and eternal theme of art. But one does not have to be an art critic to catch one pattern in the artistic development of this topic: an elementary depiction of a love affair with an importunately diligent depiction of bed details cannot become, never became a fact of great art. With such an image of love, the work dedicated to it will say little about time and people. Yes, and love itself, turned off by the artist from the stream of multi-layered life, will inevitably lose its real strength and beauty. In order to truly understand and experience the love of on-screen characters, the viewer must recognize them, be spiritually interested in their fate. The creator of *Silken Skin* is surprisingly superficial in the depiction of characters. All his outstanding skill is aimed at showing the dating scenes more accurately and more expressively. Without delving into the characters of the characters, he cut off the possibility of a deep depiction of their drama. Heroes have become elementary performers of plot functions, nothing more. *Silken Skin* leaves such a feeling: the director took on an extremely dramatic film, not wanting and not trying to illuminate the life and characters of the film's characters with observations and thoughts that go beyond the banal love story. He clearly cheated on himself, going backwards from films like *The 400 Blows*. And this is a very revealing case, all the more revealing because we are talking about a major artist, not a craftsman" (Karaganov, 1964: 18-19).

An extraordinary review of the most significant Italian films of the mid-1960s was made on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine by film critic Tatiana Bachelis (1918-1999).

So she wrote about *Sandra of a Thousand Delights* (*Vaghe stelle dell'Orsa...* Italy, 1965), that "ultimately this film is a kind of escape from reality into a gloomy, closed sphere of dark and extravagant passions" (Bachelis, 1966). And *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (*Il Vangelo secondo Matteo*. Italy-France, 1964) by Pier Paolo Pasolini, "on the contrary, is monumental in style and design ... directly introduces cinematography into ideological spheres. Before us, no doubt, is something innovative in many respects. New and bold is the very idea of making the gospel epic accessible to the wide screen, of making a picture according to the "scenario" of the Holy Scripture. The interpretation of the image of Christ is also interesting. He is Pasolini – as once in the books of Barbusse about Jesus – a real person (a person, not a deity), fanatical and militant. His angry, fiery, and sometimes downright vicious sermons delivered over the shoulder to invisible followers and adversaries (which is done cinematically well) all too often evoke the slogan of an end that justifies any means. ...

It is said that Pasolini seeks to bless historical materialism with the name of Christ and, by

showing Christ at the moment of the destruction of the temple, to unite his teaching with Marxism. But the Pazolinian Christ, an ascetic and propagandist, preaches the sword and wrath, not peace and goodness, he is the first dogmatist who fights both against the Pharisees and against his own apostles, disciples, who therefore look in the film as very stupid representatives of a stupid people, because they don't given neither to understand nor to act; for here a man "appeared" – a leader who knows the ultimate truth, who wants to take full responsibility for the fate of the world on himself alone.

Pasolini's Christ acts in exactly the same way as Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor, basing his feat "on miracle, mystery and authority." And he obviously cannot, and does not want to change life for the better. He promises salvation and joy only in the afterlife... No, we are not going to conduct anti-religious propaganda among Pasolini. But to preach in our day the religion of one person, the religion of the sword and authority, now that the consciousness of the individual has awakened?

I don't know who can be happy with such a thought today. Perhaps the director was "confused" by the contradictions of the gospel text itself? But it is no coincidence that of the four canonical gospels he chose the most dry and militant, the most unkind? Even the Sermon on the Mount, which is cinematically excellent, even it is suppressed by the idea of Golgotha, the idea of suffering,

Referring to the film *Juliet of the Spirits* (*Giulietta degli spiriti* / *Juliette des esprits* / *Julia und die Geister*. Italy-France-Germany, 1964), T. Bachelis wrote that this "comparatively modest theme, chamber Fellini's film ... is perceived as a work of intensely emotional. Of course, this film is weaker than *8 1/2*, awarded the highest prize of the Moscow Film Festival, weaker than *The Sweet Life* – there is no doubt about it. But how much stronger, brighter, and simply more lively than the last movies of Antonioni, Visconti, Pasolini! Fellini does not go into the sphere of exceptional passions, is not interested in madmen, laughs at the prophets. In general, he laughs at a lot of things in the life of contemporary Italy ... And at the same time he does not fall into a state of panic, despair, he does not scare us with future ruins ... And the heroine of her last film teaches only one thing: do not lose your presence of mind, do not complain. This time, the director's imagination is riveted to the drama of a woman who is abandoned by her husband. It is only about women's - about human – dignity. ... Compared to Fellini's previous films, what's new here is color, anger and improvisation. The color of the booth is bright, theatrical, hyperbolic. Anger is barely contained. The experience of free directorial improvisation on the screen - in the spirit of commedia dell'arte, surprise, "tricks", "lazzi" in every frame, as once in every scene of the Italian comedy of masks. At the same time, the whole lyrical theme of the film is convincing, fresh and saturated with spiritual health – the theme of the simple joys of life, the natural beauty of being, in which the heroine gradually finds a foothold and finds salvation" (Bachelis, 1966).

At the same time, T. Bachelis reacted very negatively to the film of another famous director of the 1960s – *Second Breath* (*Le Deuxième soufflé*. France, 1966) by Jean-Pierre Melville, reproaching him for "romanizing a lone gangster and his "code of honor". ... If the authors of *Second Breath* imagine that they are giving an example of a "strong personality", then they are mistaken. ... And as a result, the old respected genre ... is violated, the intrigue is inhibited, the plot is stretched, the heads of the audience are confused, high-class camera, acting, and directing skills serve goals that go beyond art" (Bachelis, 1967).

French and Italian cinema of a frankly commercial nature has traditionally evoked either angry or caustically ironic assessments from the reviewers of the *Soviet Screen*.

So about *Contempt* (*Le Mépris*. France-Italy, 1963) by Jean-Luc Godard was published almost as a feuilleton on the pages of the magazine: "While Godard was filming this picture, producer Carlo Ponti sold it to the Americans, apparently promising that they would see B. Bardot in all her glory, as naked as possible. ... The Americans and the producer insisted that Godard make the film "commercial". ... Godard gave in to the demands of American distributors and agreed to add new footage of Bardot in the nude. ... Failure to choose an actress, a misreading of the book, pressure from Hollywood businessmen – all this led to the fact that the atmosphere of Moravia's novel was lost in the commercial picture. The story that happened with the film *Contempt* can serve as a clear illustration of the issue of "creative freedom" in French cinema. At the first collision with reality burst, like soap bubbles, the new wave's broadcast claims that they are against commercial art. It took only a little pressure of moneybags for Godard to agree to make what was demanded of him from a deep and intelligent novel"

(A gde..., 1964).

And the critic M. Kuznetsov (1914-1980) wrote about *Famous Love Affairs (Les Amours célèbres)*. France-Italy, 1961), that “the dominance of the bourgeoisie is, first of all, the domination of the bourgeois, seized power. ... In bourgeois cinema, the bourgeois dictates his miserable tastes, and directors, actors, screenwriters, cameramen, all creative workers are forced to please him. ... their idea is reconciliation with vulgar reality, spiritual and moral promiscuity” (Kuznetsov, 1963).

M. Kuznetsov did not like the dashing adventure film *That Man From Rio (L'Homme de Rio / L'uomo di Rio)*. France-Italy, 1963): “This movie is clumsy, tasteless, frank, without shame and artistic conscience, an imitation of Hollywood Tarzan. From a heap of monotonous fights and chases, you remember only one thing – the amazing buildings of the new capital of Brazil – the city of Brasilia. But this has only a distant relation to the *That Man From Rio*. ... Belmondo is a talented actor, but his talent is not able to overcome the mediocrity of the script and the routine techniques of directing” (Kuznetsov, 1965: 16-17). (P.S. As a result, only in the liberal years of "perestroika" did this movie still get into the Soviet film distribution).

The venerable film critic G. Kapralov (1921-2010), although he admitted that *Monkey in Winter (Un singe en hiver)*. France, 1962) “is not without some merits, which is primarily due to the participation of such famous artists as the venerable Jean Gabin and young Jean-Paul Belmondo. But the talents of these actors, their charm are prudently exploited in the film by director Henri Verneuil to win cheap success. In the plot of this movie, one can catch the poetic thought of a beautiful dream that lives in the heart of a person. But Verneuil missed her, or rather, literally drowned in a sea of wine, in unrestrained drunkenness and drunken bravado of his heroes. Wine trading companies could give a special prize to this film for inventive promotion of their products” (Kapralov, 1962).

In a similar vein, *Soviet Screen* wrote about *A Ravishing idiot (Une ravissante idiote)*. France-Italy, 1964), “a cinematic trifle”, “on which one could not stop, if not for one circumstance. This picture is a parody of films about "Russian spies", which until recently were made seriously, but now have become the subject of ridicule” (Matveev, 1964: 19).

It should be noted here that the *Soviet Screen* reviewers were especially disappointed when Western directors turned to entertainment genres, who had previously earned a reputation in the USSR as “progressive figures in cinema art”.

So the film critic Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978) wrote about the film by Carlo Lizzani *Wake up and kill! (Svegliati e uccidi)*. Italy-France. 1966) like this: “Do you want to experience a moment of horror? Come see our movie! And it is always very sad when an artist depicts something ugly, cruel only in order to tickle the nerves of the viewer. Perhaps the greatest disappointment in this sense was caused by the Italian painting *Wake up and kill!* Telling the story of the famous Milanese gangster Luthring, the authors, they said, wanted to show how society itself, newspapers, and television created an advertising hype around a simple Italian guy and pushed him to new crimes. But the social theme of the film was dissolved in the spectacular adventures of Luthring. The wide screen, the color, the shot of machine guns, the chic windows of the jewelry stores that Luthring robs, and luxury hotels, where he rests before new exploits together with his charming lover (She is played by Lisa Gastoni – an actress of beautiful appearance, explosive temperament) ... looking at Luthring's face, you only think: will he run away or not? ... The saddest thing is that this film was directed by Carlo Lizzani according to the script by Ugo Pirro – two great masters who left their mark on the glorious history of Italian neorealism. A shameful compromise!” (Khanyutin, 1966: 15).

A similar disappointment was caused by the melodrama *Misunderstood (Incompreso)*. Italy-France, 1966), because this film is "sweetly bourgeois, museum-bourgeois, unbearably old-fashioned bourgeois ... It is surprisingly staged by the respected director Luigi Comencini... Sentimentality does not go out of fashion, like sabres and rolls-royces. Those who like to cry in the cinema on the movie *Misunderstood* have every opportunity to drown in sweet tears until the orphan Andrea, misunderstood by his diplomat dad, leaves this world for which he, a quiet angel in shorts, was too good. The film is uncompromising in its own way; no concession to good taste; not a single note of truth that would instantly ruin the idyll in a luxurious villa, among roses, vases and silent servants. His techniques knock out a tear unmistakably – like a blow with the edge of the palm on the tip of the nose” (Solovieva, Shitova, 1968: 14).

Regret was also caused by another commercial work of talented filmmakers – *Ghosts* –

Italian Style (Questi fantasmi / Fantômes à l'italienne. Italy-France, 1967): "Based on the comedy of Eduardo De Filippo" – puts in the credits director Renato Castellani. Eduardo De Filippo never dreamed of that dashing completeness, that comedic springiness... Fountains of ingenuity beat noisily and effectively, but the sound of De Filippo's comedy was completely different – a quiet, questioning, cracked, weak sound of a falling uncertain drop. ... Castellani did not leave anything from anxiety and aching fluctuation. Least of all should one oppose the playwright, artist and citizen, to the commercial director. The fact of the matter is that Renato Castellani... is a name no less worthy than the name of De Filippo. And Sophia Loren and Vittorio Gassman, too, are not working artisans because of money alone, especially since they work perfectly in the film within the limits of the task assigned to them. Apparently, the whole point is precisely within the task. The film *Ghosts – Italian Style* is an energetic parade-alle of comedy situations. The director took the original anecdote from the play... And rolled this anecdote into a full-length and color film. Such is the descent to what is called a commercial film, to the entertainment industry" (Solovieva, Shitova, 1968: 14).

Against this background, I. Solovieva (1927-2024) and V. Shitova (1927-2002) noted that Giuliano Montaldo made his film *Grand Slam (Ad ogni costo / Diamantes a gogó*. Italy-Germany-Spain, 1967) more honest, so like this "film without cheating. He doesn't pretend to be anything. It is entirely within the limits of its task – an energetically entertaining, adventurous and, in the final analysis, still openly bourgeois movie" (Solovieva, Shitova, 1968: 14).

The opinions of the "Soviet Screen" reviewers about West German and Austrian films that were not shown in the Soviet box office

In the era of the "thaw" *Soviet Screen*, as a rule, wrote about West German and Austrian films that were not shown in the Soviet box office in a negative way, emphasizing their commercial and propaganda nature.

So film critic G. Kapralov (1921-2010) condemned the thriller *Game of killers (Mörderspiel*. Germany-France, 1961) for being "inspired" by "dark animal instincts" and for the fact that "the cold sadism of a maniac criminal is depicted dryly, methodically, as if it were a training manual for professional killers" (Kapralov, 1962).

An extremely negative reaction from G. Kapralov was also caused by the scandalous *Lulu* (Austria, 1962), since "Rolf Thiele turned to the old plot not to criticize the capitalist world, not because he planned to show the same dirt on the new one, but say stage. He was attracted only by a spicy plot, and the new film appeared as another film speculation on obscene and semi-pornography" (Kapralov, 1962).

And, of course, the film *Escape from Train No. 234 (Durchbruch Lok 234*. West Germany, 1963) caused complete indignation on the *Soviet Screen*, because "the authors wanted to prove that life is better in the West Germany than in the German Democratic Republic, and the Ost Germans dream of moving to the West" (Matveev, 1964: 18).

The opinions of the reviewers of the "Soviet Screen" about the Scandinavian films that were not shown in the Soviet box office

The main Soviet specialist in Scandinavian films, film critic V. Matusevich (1937-2009), published a long article in the mid-1960s entitled "The Swedish cinema boom" (Matusevich, 1966: 14-15), where he argued that "a complex, curious process is taking place in Swedish cinema, and acquaintance with it is of interest to our film lovers. ... In three years, twenty-four new directors came to Swedish cinema, one can say that he became the most "youthful" in the world" (Matusevich, 1966: 14).

And then the most significant, in the opinion of critics, Swedish films of the "new wave" were selected for analysis.

Here, V. Matusevich drew the attention of the magazine's readers to the fact that *The Crow's Quarter (Kvarteret Korpen*. Sweden, 1963) by Bu Wiederberg is "the first Swedish film in many years dedicated to the working environment. Depicting the beggarly slums of the thirties and remaining at first glance within the "family" plot, Wiederberg directly and closely approaches the understanding of the social situation in Sweden today. The film is filled with simple and pure tenderness, the artist's reckless love for life and people, which is why his ruthlessly sharp conclusions about the social and moral origins of petty-bourgeois complacency acquire special weight" (Matusevich, 1966: 14).

Further, V. Matusevich wrote that Vilgot Sjöman "caused a noisy scandalous controversy" with his outrageous film *491* (Sweden, 1964) about juvenile delinquency, exposing the

sanctimonious-philanthropic in form and essentially inactive position of the ruling circles in the "youth" issue. "This film, in a certain sense, summed up the theme of extreme rejection, worthlessness, ugliness of the existence of the younger generation, which sounded in recent years in many works of Swedish art, and rightfully saw the root cause in the general atmosphere of lack of ideas, hopelessness, in the collapse of petty-bourgeois moral criteria and ideals" (Matusevich, 1966 : 14).

Further, V. Matusevich expressed regret that "even in many serious, significant" Swedish films "there are such horse doses of erotic revelations that the essence of their ideological content, willy-nilly, fades into the background. Go and figure out why the fuss broke out around Sjöman's movie *491*: either in connection with the sharpness of social denunciations, or about the completely indecent display of all kinds of sexual perversions. And now the "rebel" Sjöman is filming an opus, the content of which, if not exhausted, then meaningfully explained by the title: *Bed of a brother and sister (Syskonbädd 1782)*. Sweden, 1965). ... And the competition is expanding, and the censorship bastions are being stormed, and the atmosphere of scandalous sensationalism is being pumped up, and now Mai Zetterling paints the connection between a woman and a dog, and Erling sets a new record, showing a man on the screen, naked down to the causal place... And God knows what other "r-revolutionary innovations" are coming!" (Matusevich, 1966: 14).

As a result of his article, the future employee of *Radio Liberty*, V. Matusevich, made an absolutely "party" conclusion, worthy of publication not only in the *Soviet Screen*, but also in the editorial of the *Pravda* newspaper: "No subsidies, no reforms will create prosperity on their own Swedish film art, if its leaders continue, in the words of one critic, to be concerned only with what people do at night, and not with what people live from day to day, if the consciousness of filmmakers is not filled with genuine citizenship, an imperious need to comprehend a wide range of the most acute problems of reality" (Matusevich, 1966: 15).

D. Pisarevsky (1912-1990), the editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen*, also complained about the Swedish movies alien to Soviet viewers, noting that the film *Couples in Love (Älskande par)*. Sweden, 1964) relied "on striking frankness showing erotic scenes and sexual perversions. On the path of such "problematics" the great masters were also defeated" (Pisarevsky, 1965).

In a negative way, he wrote about the drama *The Adventure Begins Here (Här börjar äventyret)*. Sweden, 1965) film critic Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978), noting that it was filmed "with significant pauses, omissions, deliberate obscurity and unbearable boredom in the auditorium. ... the disease of modern cinema is pictures that seem to defiantly ignore the viewer, the normal psychology of perception" (Khanyutin, 1966: 14).

On the other hand, the anti-Nazi documentary *Mein Kampf* (Sweden, 1960) received full and well-founded support from the *Soviet Screen*: "The film is ruthless, as ruthless is the truth itself. ... The film shows that even after Hitler came to power, the communists continued to fight. The film boldly reminds that the fascist Franco enslaved the heroic Spanish people only thanks to the help of Hitler and Mussolini. The film boldly emphasizes the role of "Western democracies" in the occupation of the Rhineland, in the war in Spain and in the Munich Pact. How many nice services the governments of France and England rendered to Hitler before he swept them out of his way. How many assurances of his friendship did Hitler give in order to trample everything later. How many contracts he turned into scraps of paper" (Versmer, 1961).

The opinions of the reviewers of the "Soviet Screen" about the films of other countries, which also did not go to the Soviet box office

Among the films of other countries that did not get into the Soviet film distribution, the *Soviet Screen* rightly singled out the masterpiece of Luis Bunuel *Viridiana* (Spain-Mexico, 1961): "The story of a young girl about to devote herself to God, and experiencing the collapse of her faith, seems far removed from politics. Let us remember, however, that in a country of fascist dictatorship, art is forced to speak in Aesopian language, and it is a film about human dignity and the thirst for love, a protest against the dogmas of the church, which seek to squeeze man into the rigid rules and prohibitions, [it is] a humanistic call for respect for the human person, a rejection of the dogmatic regulation of his spiritual and moral life, very typical of progressive cinema today (Khanyutin, 1961).

Short informational materials about events in Western cinema

During the era of the "thaw", the *Soviet Screen* under the headings "Chronicle of foreign cinema", "Mosaic", "Guests of our screens" regularly published short information reports about

the shooting and premieres of Western films, about foreign actors, often without any ideological assessment.

But often does not mean always. So in the "Chronicle ..." the attention of readers was drawn that "in 400 foreign and domestic films shown in Germany, recently, it is shown: 34 arson, 54 cases of blackmail, 104 robberies, 310 murders, 405 adultery and 624 scams of various types. A total of 1,531 film crimes" (Hronika..., 1960: 20), and "over the past year, in four hundred films shown on West German screens, the audience saw 1,394 crimes of various types. ... It is no wonder that these visual aids of murder, violence and debauchery contributed to an unprecedented increase in crime in West Germany" (Revanchism..., 1965).

The "chroniclers" from the *Soviet Screen* were also worried about the escalation of sexual themes on Western screens: "Recently, films have often been released in France that rely on erotica, on playing out very frivolous situations. The deplorable impact of such films on the morale of young people is undeniable. But the campaign against these films, which included various leagues, associations, the Catholic Church... often does not pursue the defense of morality. Almost always, the censorship commission prohibits not so much really pornographic pictures as those that contain criticism of the moral state of society, its collapse and decline in morals" (Hronika..., 1960: 20).

In addition, according to the *Soviet Screen*, "it was this terrible reality that gave birth to a new profession of chasing scandalous "sensations", an "industry" that grew on peeping through keyholes, on shaking dirty linen. ... These are the facts. They not only expose the "moral foundations" of Hollywood, but also vividly illustrate the mores of bourgeois journalism. The reader, who sincerely loves cinema, this should be deeply disgusted" (Goncharova, 1962).

With a heavy dose of irony, *Soviet Screen* wrote about the attempts of Western filmmakers to make entertaining films on the Russian topic. In particular, the competitive struggle between the American and Italian film crews was described quite caustically, almost at the same time filming the novel by Nikolai Gogol *Taras Bulba: Taras Bulba* (USA-Yugoslavia, 1962) and *Cossack Taras Bulba (Plains of Battle / Taras Bulba, il cosacco*. Italy, 1963) (Bulba..., 1962: 18).

The *Soviet Screen* also reacted very negatively to the support of the famous American actor John Wayne (1907-1979) for American aggression in Vietnam: "John Wayne is a famous film actor who has been working in American cinema for more than a quarter of a century. In numerous westerns, he created the image of a determined and fearless cowboy, achieving everything in the world with a colt and a fist. But few people know what Wayne is like in life. At one time he was one of the most ardent supporters of McCarthyism in Hollywood, and did not shy away from denunciations. John Wayne is currently in South Vietnam. He is directing a documentary commissioned by McNamara; the film should explain to the Americans what exactly they are looking for in this part of Asia" (Na..., 1966: 19).

And film critic Y. Sher reminded readers of the magazine that in the late 1940s, "Senator McCarthy and his henchmen undertook a campaign in Hollywood to persecute the Reds: the so-called "witch hunt". Ten creative figures of American cinema were sent to jail. The rest, on whom the eyes of the possessed senator fell, were blacklisted. For many years, they lost not only their creative work, but in general any opportunity to earn their living... Hence the scandal with the Oscars for screenwriters from McCarthy's list (they were under pseudonyms). And a no less scandalous story related to how the reactionaries did not allow F. Sinatra to produce a film written by a screenwriter from the "list" (Sher, 1960: 18).

Of course, the important and ideologically necessary "progressive-democratic" events in the West received a very positive interpretation in the news section of the *Soviet Screen*.

For example, the magazine fully supported the information that "increasingly wider circles of French film workers are expressing indignation at the ongoing bloodshed in Algeria. Many outstanding figures of French cinema signed petitions demanding an end to this criminal colonial war, including actors Simone Signoret, Daniel Delorme, Roger Pitot, Laurent Terziev, screenwriters Jules Ferry and Marguerite Duras, directors Alain Resnais, Pierre Kast, Francois Truffaut. (Bozhovich, 1960: 17).

Further, film critic V. Bozhovich (1932-2021) informed readers that "frightened by the growing protest campaign, the French authorities are preparing to subject the "recalcitrant" to repression. According to a bill prepared by the Ministry of Culture, all actors who called for "disobedience to the authorities" will be banned from performing in state theaters, radio and television. All films in which the persons guilty of "calling for disobedience" take part will be

deprived of the right to use the "Aid Fund". ... If the proposed bill is approved, a "witch hunt" could begin in French cinema, similar to the one that raged in Hollywood during the "McCarthy" period. And this will lead to disastrous consequences" (Bozhovich, 1960: 17).

It is interesting to note that the *Soviet Screen* more than once or twice sharply spoke on its pages not only against the "negative influence of bourgeois cinema", but also against the "yellow bourgeois press", sometimes (apparently in order to increase circulation due to "undemanding" part of the audience) resorted to the methods of the latter on his pages.

So in the material about the grandiose peplum *Cleopatra* (USA-UK, 1963), gossip was retold about his filming and that E. Taylor should be filmed naked (*Cleopatra ...*, 1962: 21).

And the film critic F. Andreev (1933-1998) (by the way, he emigrated to the USA in the early 1990s) vividly described how the shooting of the film with the participation of Catherine Spaak (1945-2022) goes on: "She was showered with money. She bathes in them. Not figuratively, but in the most direct sense. It's good that the bills are large. Otherwise, Catherine Spaak, an eighteen-year-old movie star, would have had a hard time ... The director of the film ... carefully thought out this scene. After all, Catherine is removed in it completely naked. Her only clothes are banknotes worth 50,000 lire each. At the very least, but ... a million will come running. ... "The spicy pose of a representative of the class" powerful of this world. And money... Lots of money. Perhaps, if someone sets out to embody the petty-bourgeois tastes of the micro-bourgeois, his base interests symbolically, in some allegorical form, you can't imagine a better episode" (Andreev, 1964: 17).

In a similar "yellow" vein, the note "Microphone... in bed" was sustained: "French movie star Brigitte Bardot unexpectedly left the resort of St. Tropez on the Cote d'Azur, causing great surprise. It is known that the actress was one of the first inhabitants of the town, had a villa here and served as the main bait for holidaymakers. After her departure, St. Tropez began to wither ... Why did Brigitte leave the town? It was only recently that the reasons for her flight became known: it turned out that under the bed of the "star" in villa there was a microphone, secretly installed by order of the New York magazine *Confidential!* Every sound in her bedroom was recorded on movie. Trying to hide from annoying newspaper reporters, the actress surrounded the villa with a tall fence, but it never occurred to her that the highest form of impudence was possible – a microphone in bed" (Microfon ..., 1965: 18).

The genre of "foreign travel notes" was also quite curious in the *Soviet Screen*, where the readers of the magazine, as a rule, who had never been to the West, had to trust the impressions of "ideologically verified" visitors.

So the screenwriter, but most importantly an Soviet official cinema boss Igor Chekin (1908-1970) wrote about his business trip to France as follows: "We are in autumn Paris. The stands of countless cinemas, as if competing with each other, scream furiously about action movies, comics and erotic paintings. *Ecstasy*, *Torments of Love*, *The Last Bacchanalia of Rome*: these names are full of advertising at the hours when Paris lights up its evening lights. We sincerely dreamed of seeing another advertisement – about films in which the voice of the great art of cinema would sound. French cinema knows how to excite and shock the hearts with the tragic power of Simone Signoret and Jean Gabin, ... Fernandel's inexhaustible supply of fun and humor. Alas, Paris did not please us with anything this time. As soon as the evening lights of the French capital are lit, a frenzied pandemonium of advertisements begins.

Place Pigalle is coming – with its decorated bad taste, wild music and yard-high photographs of "stars" performing in programs of "slow stripping" ... People of young, middle and even older age appear on the streets – men and women from dark Paris – characters who have descended from the pages tabloid magazines and newspapers. On the corners of the dark quarters there are suspicious persons trading in human goods... These are the black shadows of Paris... Fog blocking the light. Mud... Night Place Pigalle. Decorated with all the colors of the rainbow and at the same time deathly pale in the neon rays of the face ...

The street of "human misfortune and dishonor", as one of the journalists aptly described this area of Paris. Here they live in the hope of deceiving or luring a foreigner who has fallen into this cycle for the first time, selling a fake stone or selling themselves. Everything is bought, everything is sold. But here comes the day. Place Pigalle is empty.

Beautiful morning in Paris. Under the rays of the sun, the unique features of the city come to life, all the most valuable and dear wakes up. Bright, laboring Paris is waking up" (Chekin, 1961: 16-17).

Conclusion. The subject of Western cinematography was presented in a rather limited volume on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine in 1957-1960. However, with the appointment of film critic Dmitry Pisarevsky (1912-1990) to the post of editor-in-chief the "thaw" tendencies in the *Soviet screen* led to a gradual increase in the number of materials about foreign cinema on the pages of the magazine (sometimes they took up to a third of the total volume of the issue). Increasingly, photographs of Western movie stars were published (in rare cases, even on color covers), neutrally or positively presented biographies of Hollywood and European actors and directors, articles about Western film weeks and international film festivals, reviews of Western films, etc. At the same time, of course, there were also ideologically biased materials in the magazine.

Thus, the *Soviet Screen* kept a balance between the communist ideology (articles and notes about important events and Soviet films from this point of view) and attracting the widest audience, which was interested in a wide panorama of cinema, including foreign.

Based on the content analysis (in the context of the historical, socio-cultural and political situation, etc.) of the texts published during the "thaw" period of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1957-1968), we came to the conclusion that materials on the subject of Western cinema on this stage can be divided into the following genres:

- ideologized articles emphasizing criticism of bourgeois cinema and its harmful influence on the audience;
- articles on the history of Western cinema (as a rule, about the period of the Great Silent, with a minimum degree of ideologization);
- biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors (often neutrally or positively evaluating these filmmakers);
- interviews with Western filmmakers (here, as a rule, interlocutors were selected from among "progressive artists");
- reviews of Western films (positive in relation to most of the Soviet film distribution repertoire and often negative in relation to those movies that were considered ideologically harmful);
- articles about international film festivals and weeks of foreign cinema in the USSR (with a clear division into "progressive" and "bourgeois" cinematography);
- reviews of the current repertoire of Western national cinematographies (here, as a rule, criticism of bourgeois cinematography was also combined with a positive assessment of works and trends ideologically acceptable to the USSR);
- short informational materials about events in Western cinema (from neutral reports to caustic feuilletons and "yellow" gossip).

It is this kind of "thaw" tendencies in the *Soviet screen* of the 1960s in general and the increase in the volume of articles on Western cinema in particular caused an extremely negative reaction from the authorities in 1968. The catalyst for this was the events in Czechoslovakia and the entry of Soviet troops into this country in August 1968. It became clear to Soviet ideologists that "socialism with a human face," which already threatened the fortress of the ideological foundations of the USSR with its very proclamation, was largely supported by the Czechoslovak cinema and press.

In the fall of 1968, the magazine *Ogonyok*, which at that time had a circulation of two million copies, published two articles (most likely initiated by the relevant structures in the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party): from Prof. Dr., member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and the Soviet communist Party V.A. Razumny (1924-2011) ([Razumny, 1968: 26-27](#)) and People's Artist of the USSR, member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and also Soviet Communist Party N.A. Kryuchkov (1911-1994) ([Kryuchkov, 1968: 17](#)), where they sharply criticized the magazines *Cinema Art* and *Soviet Screen* for promoting Western cinema and hushing up Soviet cinema, urging the authorities to urgently restore order in the leadership and editorial line of these publications, to "put these printed organs at the service of Soviet cinematography and Soviet audiences" ([Kryuchkov, 1968: 17](#)).

The initiation of the publication of articles by V. Razumny and N. Kryuchkov in *Ogonyok* "from above" was soon confirmed by the publication January 7, 1969 of the Resolution of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio, television, cinema, cultural and art institutions for

the ideological and political level of published materials and repertoire" ([Postanovlenie..., 1969](#)).

This decree obliged the USSR Ministry of Culture, the USSR Council of Ministers Committee on the Press, the USSR Council of Ministers Committee on Radio Broadcasting and Television, and their local agencies, the creative unions "to take concrete measures to improve the management of the printed press and publishing houses", to raise the ideological and political and professional level of their activities "in a spirit of party affiliation, principled action, high responsibility to the party and the people", "take measures to strengthen the editorial teams of magazines, especially literary and artistic magazines, newspapers, radio and television, editorial and artistic councils of publishing houses" ([Postanovlenie..., 1969](#)).

And here it should be noted that Dmitry Pisarevsky, who managed to retain the position of editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen*, began to strictly follow all the directives of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, which is why the information about foreign cinema in the magazine underwent a significant ideological transformation.

Western Cinema on the Pages of the *Soviet Screen* Magazine (1969-1985)

The subject of Western cinematography on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine in 1969-1985 was presented more poorly than in the second half of the 1960s. There were significant reasons for this.

As we have already noted (Fedorov et al, 2023), the final rejection of the "thaw" tendencies in the USSR occurred after the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968.

Therefore, it is logical that on January 7, 1969, the Decree of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio, television, cinematography, cultural and art institutions for the ideological and political level of published materials and repertoire" was issued (Postanovlenie..., 1969), distributed in within the bounds of "secrecy", that is, for a narrow circle of leaders of various levels related to the media.

In this resolution, it was noted that "in the context of the intensified ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism, the ability of press workers, literary and art workers to oppose any manifestations of bourgeois ideology more sharply from class, party positions, actively and skillfully propagandize communist ideals, the advantages of socialism, is of particular importance, the Soviet way of life, deeply analyze and expose various kinds of petty-bourgeois and revisionist trends. Meanwhile, individual authors, directors and stage directors deviate from class criteria in their assessment and coverage of complex socio-political problems, facts and events, and sometimes become carriers of views that are alien to the ideology of socialist society. ... Some heads of publishing houses, press organs, radio, television, institutions of culture and art do not take proper measures to prevent the publication of ideologically erroneous works, work poorly with authors, show compliance and political unscrupulousness in resolving issues of publishing ideologically vicious materials" (Postanovlenie..., 1969).

As a result, the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party decided "to take measures to strengthen the editorial teams of magazines, especially literary and artistic ones, newspapers, radio and television, editorial and artistic councils of publishing houses, cultural and art institutions, intensifying their activities in the selection and preparation of all basic materials ... intended for publications" (Postanovlenie..., 1969).

In 1972, two more resolutions of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party were adopted: "On Literary and Artistic Criticism" (dated January 21, 1972) and "On measures for the further development of Soviet cinematography" (dated August 22, 1972), which also emphasized the harm of bourgeois ideology and propaganda and the need for an uncompromising ideological struggle against such phenomena and influences. In particular, it was emphasized that Soviet literary and artistic criticism is still not active enough "in exposing the reactionary essence of bourgeois "mass culture" and decadent trends, in the fight against various kinds of non-Marxist views on literature and art, revisionist aesthetic concepts" (Postanovlenie..., 1972).

Of course, the editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen* D. Pisarevsky (1912-1990), who retained his chair after the sharp criticism against him deployed at the end of 1968, tried to do everything to take into account all the "general lines" of these decisions to the maximum extent possible.

In particular, the number of articles about Western cinema in the *Soviet Screen* magazine was reduced, and bourgeois cinema itself began to be subjected to more severe criticism. For many years, it was now unimaginable that a photograph of a Western movie star would appear on the first cover of a magazine (which sometimes happened in the thaw of the 1960s).

On the other hand, the editors of the *Soviet Screen* began to actively promote the cinema of the socialist countries: in 1969, issues dedicated to Polish (No. 14), Bulgarian (No. 17), Romanian (No. 18), GDR (No. 19) cinema were published, and in 1970 the issues of three magazines were largely devoted to positive articles about Hungarian (No. 7), Czechoslovak (No. 9), and Yugoslav (No. 22) filmmakers...

In this chapter, we will focus on the analysis of materials about Western cinema published in the *Soviet Screen* magazine from 1969 to 1985, when its editors-in-chief were: D.S. Pisarevsky (1912-1990), A.D. Golubev (1935-2020) and D.K. Orlov (1935-2021).

In Table 7 presents statistical data reflecting changes (from 1969 to 1985) organizations, the organ of which the journal was, its circulation, periodicity. The names of the editors of the

journal and the time intervals of their leading work in the publication are indicated.

Table 7. *Soviet Screen* magazine (1986-1991): statistical data

Year of issue of the magazine	Organizations whose authority was a magazine	Magazine circulation (in million copies)	Periodicity of the journal (numbers in year)	Editors of the magazine
1969	Cinematography Committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	2.0 - 2.8	24	D.S. Pisarevsky
1970	Cinematography Committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.8 - 2.2	24	D.S. Pisarevsky
1971	Cinematography Committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.4 - 1.9	24	D.S. Pisarevsky
1972	Cinematography Committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR (No. 1-16), USSR State Committee for Cinematography (No. 17-24), Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.5 - 1.8	24	D.S. Pisarevsky
1973	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.8	24	D.S. Pisarevsky
1974	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.8 - 1.9	24	D.S. Pisarevsky (Nos. 1-4). A.D. Golubev (Nos. 5-24).
1975	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.9 - 2.0	24	A.D. Golubev
1976	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.9	24	A.D. Golubev
1977	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.9	24	A.D. Golubev
1978	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.9	24	A.D. Golubev (Nos. 1-11). Editorial board (Nos. 12-13). D.K. Orlov (Nos. 13-24).
1979	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.9	24	D.K. Orlov
1980	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.9	24	D.K. Orlov
1981	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.9	24	D.K. Orlov
1982	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.9	24	D.K. Orlov
1983	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.8 - 1.9	24	D.K. Orlov
1984	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of	1.8 - 1.9	24	D.K. Orlov

	Cinematographers of the USSR			
1985	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.7	24	D.K. Orlov

So, the circulation of the *Soviet Screen* in 1969 (Table 7) was still one of the highest in its history: from 2.0 to 2.8 million copies, however, with a downward trend. The downward trend in circulation (with some fluctuations) continued until 1974, and then (in fact, until the beginning of 1985) stabilization occurred at the level of 1.9 million copies.

This kind of decline from 2.8 to 1.9 million copies, in our opinion, cannot be explained only by a drop in film attendance, since at the turn of the 1970s it remained at about 19 per capita per year (but the same time, the average city dweller watched a movie 21 times a year, and a rural dweller – 17.5 times a year)... In 1972-1974, the average cinema attendance in the USSR was also very impressive: over 18 a year. But during the stabilization of the circulation of the *Soviet Screen* magazine at the level of 1.9 million copies, cinema attendance (largely due to competition from television) began to fall much more noticeably: from 18.1 (1974) to 15.3 (1984).

Suppose, starting in 1970, the magazine's subscription began to fall, but it could easily be compensated for by an increase in the number of retail sales at the press kiosks. After all, the drop in movie attendance did not in the least prevent from the mid-1970s to 1984 inclusively maintaining the circulation of the *Soviet Screen* at the level of 1.9 million copies.

Perhaps the decline in journal's circulation since 1970 was the result of an administrative decision, and printing facilities were needed for something more important from the point of view of the authorities. Perhaps the authorities decided to save paper (remember that "hundreds of tons of precious paper" was also mentioned in an open letter from the famous Russian actor N. Kryuchkov in the *Ogonyok* magazine in 1968, where he sharply criticized the *Soviet Screen* just for promoting foreign cinema (See: Kryuchkov, 1968: 17), which was given to something else...

Of course, starting from 1965, the *Soviet Screen* had a competitor – the monthly illustrated advertising review *Cinemasgoer Companion*, which started in a small circulation of 50 thousand copies, but by 1969 had reached 400 thousand copies. However, competition from this publication also do not exaggerate: in the era of "frozen" at around 1.9 million copies circulation of *Soviet Screen* in the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s, the circulation of *Cinemasgoer Companion* also stabilized and maintained an average circulation of 400 thousand copies (with a peak of 480 thousand copies in 1978).

Between 1969 and 1985, three editors-in-chief were replaced at *Soviet Screen*.

Despite all the "rehabilitation" measures taken and following all party resolutions, film critic D. Pisarevsky (1912-1990), who broke the record for the length of his tenure as editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen*, was forced to leave his post in February 1974.

It is believed that the trigger for this resignation was the publication of a large article by film critic V. Demin "The Lessons of Moments" in No. 24 for 1973 (Demin, 1973: 4-5) about the very popular Soviet TV series *Seventeen Moments of Spring*.

In this article, in particular, there were such lines: "The most hidden floor of the Nazis' state machine, the wheels and cogs of the backstage mechanism of the Reich, the secrets of the imperial chancellery, the underground bunkers of the Gestapo – all suddenly burst open before our eyes. ... What is there? There are people, crippled by the fascist order. Accustomed to trust the "system" more than themselves. But still people, not monsters and monsters. This is the second intriguing moment, and it should not be underestimated either" (Demin, 1973: 4-5).

Of course, Soviet film criticism of those years could not afford to write directly that the Nazi bureaucratic system shown in *Moments...* could be perceived by an astute part of the audience as a metaphor for the Soviet party-bureaucratic machine, but this "calling", of course, also did not It is worth discounting the reasons for the film's popularity.

But the main thing is that the phrase mentioned above from the article by V. Demin (1937-1993) could well be interpreted by the authorities as ideologically dangerous. And from here conclusions were drawn about the loss of ideological vigilance on the part of the editor-in-chief D. Pisarevsky, all the more so because one of the editorial staff, film critic I. Lishchinsky, who worked in the department of foreign cinema, emigrated to Israel in 1973 ...

The last issue (No. 4 for 1974), signed by the editor-in-chief D. Pisarevsky, was received by

subscribers at the end of February 1974. Further, until the middle of 1978, A. Golubev (1935-2020), a sports journalist and former editor of the *Smena* magazine, was the editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen*.

During the rather short period of A. Golubev's editorship, no special innovations were introduced in the *Soviet Screen* (Golovskoy, 2004; Orlov, 2011), but ideological control undoubtedly intensified.

At the same time, Goskino officials apparently realized that every year professional filmmakers began to accumulate more and more dissatisfaction with A. Golubev, who was incompetent in this area, and in July 1978 he was replaced as chief editor by the former head of the Main Script and Editorial Board of Goskino USSR, member of the collegium of the State Committee for Cinematography of the USSR, film critic D. Orlov (1935-2021).

D. Orlov at first tightened the ideological “nuts” even more strongly: for example, in issues Nos. 14-17 for 1978, not a single article or review was published about Western cinema, but the number of “Communist party” materials increased, including photos and quotes from speeches General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party L. Brezhnev (1906-1982).

Former Goskino official, film critic, screenwriter and TV presenter Dal Orlov became a prominent figure as the editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen*. He held this position from July 1978 to December 1986 and, if not for perestroika, which dismissed many top managers in cinema area of the time, he would have continued to work in the magazine (Golovskoy, 2004; Orlov, 2011).

As in the era of the “thaw”, in the period from 1969 to 1985, the authors of texts about Western cinema in the *Soviet Screen* in most cases were well-known film experts, film critics, some of whom held leading positions in the editorial offices of magazines and newspapers of that period:

Table 8. The main authors of the publications on the subject of Western cinema in the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1969–1985)

No.	Surnames of film critics, film historians who most often published articles on Western cinema in the <i>Soviet Screen</i> magazine	The number of articles published by these film experts in the <i>Soviet Screen</i> magazine on the subject of Western cinema
1	Bogemsky G.D. (1920-1995)	20
2	Chertok S.M. (1931-2006)	11
3	Dmitriev V.Y. (1940-2013)	10
4	Sulkin O.M.	9
5	Shitova V.V. (1927-2002)	9
6	Sobolev R.P. (1926-1991)	8
7	Chernenko M.M. (1931-2004)	8
8	Andreev F.I. (1933-1998)	7
9	Komov Y.A.	7
10	Rubanova I.I. (1933-2024)	7
11	Mikhalkovich V.I. (1937-2006)	6
12	Plakhov A.S.	6
13	Anikst A.A. (1910-1988)	5
14	Braginsky A.V. (1920-2016)	5
15	Demin V.P. (1937-1993)	5
16	Dolmatovskaya G.E. (1939-2021)	5
17.	Razlogov K.E. (1946-2021)	5
18	Solovieva I.N. (1927-2024)	5
19	Khloplyankina T.M. (1937-1993)	5
20	Yurenev R.N. (1912-2002)	5
21	Yampolsky M.B.	5

1. G.D. Bogemsky (1920-1995): film critic and historian, Ph.D. Graduated from Leningrad State University (1941). He was a member of the Union of Writers of the USSR and Russia, the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Worked at the Research Institute of History and Theory of Cinema / Research Institute of Cinematography. Articles published by him in the collections *Myths and Reality* became the basis of his book *Cinema of Italy Today*

(1977). Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, scientific collections, etc. Author of books: *Through the cities of Italy* (1955); *Vittorio De Sica* (1963); *Sophia Loren* (1982); *Actors of Italian cinema* (1986; 1990); *Gian Maria Volonté* (1984), etc.

2. S.M. Chertok (1931-2006): journalist, film critic, editor. Graduated from the Moscow State Law Institute (1953). He was a member of the Union of Journalists of the USSR and the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR. From 1962 he was a correspondent, and from 1966 to 1975 – head of information department in the *Soviet screen* magazine; from 1976 to 1978 – an employee of the Research Institute of Theory and History of Cinema. From 1964 to 1973, he compiled the yearbook *Screen* (from 1964 to 1969, in collaboration with M. Dolinsky). Since 1979 he lived in Israel, where he successfully continued his journalistic activities. Published in newspapers: *Soviet Latvia*, *Soviet culture*, *Literary newspaper*, *Evening Moscow*, in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Spark*, *Youth*, *Change*, *Znamya*, *October*, *Moscow*, *Questions of Literature*, *Soviet Photo*, *Art*, *Theatrical Life*, *Theatre*, etc. Author of books: *Stars meet in Moscow* (1967); *Foreign screen: interview* (1973); *Start. Cinema of Black Africa* (1973), *Tashkent festival* (1975); *There-there of the XX century* (1977); *Festival of the Three Continents* (1978); *About cinema and about myself* (1979); *Freeze frames. Essays on Soviet cinema* (1988) and others.

3. V.Y. Dmitriev (1940-2013): film critic, archivist. Graduated film studies department of VGIK (1962). Honored Worker of Culture of the Russian Federation (1998). He was a member of the Soviet Communist Party (since 1974), the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. After graduating from VGIK, he worked at the State Film Fund (department of scientific processing of a foreign fund), since 1996 he was deputy Director General of the State Film Fund of Russia. Created and became the artistic director of the festival of archival films "White Pillars". Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Film Studies Notes*, *Séance*, etc., in the newspapers: *Independant Paper*, *Culture*, etc. Author of books (together with V. Mikhalkovich): *Alexander Ford* (1968, the monograph was not published due to A. Ford's emigration to the West); *Anatomy of a myth: Brigitte Bardot* (1975). He starred in the films *Mournful insensibility* (1983) and *Down with commerce on the love front* (1988). Co-author of scripts for documentaries *Promised Land. Return* (2000), *Flowers of the Occupation Times* (2003), *Big Holidays of the 30s, Forties* (2004) and others. Laureate of the State Prize of the Russian Federation in the field of literature and art (2007) and the Nika Prize "For contributions to the motion picture sciences, criticism and education" (2013).

4. O.M. Sulkin: film critic, journalist. Graduated from Moscow State University. Member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Worked as head department of foreign cinema in the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1981-1987), editor-in-chief of the magazine *Soviet Film*. Co-author of the project of the film encyclopedia *Video Guide*. Since 1995 he has been living and working in the USA. He lectured at the UN, at a number of US universities. He was a film reviewer and reporter for the *New Russian Word* newspaper, and is currently a correspondent for the *Voice of America* Russian Service. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Itogi*, *New World*, etc., in the newspapers: *Vedomosti*, *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*, *Evening New York*, etc. Author of books: *Natalia Andreichenko* (1984); *Yuri Ozerov* (co-authored with N. Sumenov) (1986); *Oleg Yankovsky* (1987).

5. V.V. Shitova (1927-2002): film and theater critic and historian. Graduated from Moscow State University (1953). She was a member of the scriptwriting and editorial board of the 2nd creative association of the Mosfilm film studio (1962-1967), a member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Film Studies Notes*, *Cinemagoer Companion*, scientific collections, etc. Author of the books: *Luchino Visconti* (1965); *Jean Gabin* (1967) (together with I.N. Soloviova), *Seven years in the theater. Television and us* (1968) (together with V.S. Sappak); *Fourteen sessions* (1981) (together with I.N. Solovieva); *Vakhtang Kikabidze* (1981); *Annie Girardot* (1985); *K.S. Stanislavsky* (1985) (together with I.N. Soloviova).

6. R.P. Sobolev (1926-1991): film critic, PhD (1966). Graduated from the Moscow Library Institute (1955). He was a member of the Soviet Communist Party (since 1958), Union of Cinematographers of the USSR. Articles published by him in the collections *Myths and Reality* and in the *Soviet Screen* became the basis for his monographs: *West. Cinema and youth* (1971), *Hollywood. 60s* (1975). Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Cinemagoer Companion*, scientific collections, etc. Author of books: *People and Films of Pre-Revolutionary*

Cinema. (1961); *Meeting with Polish cinema* (1967); *Cinema of India (first acquaintance)* (1977), etc.

7. M.M. Chernenko (1931-2004): film critic, Ph.D. (1978). Graduated from Kharkov Law Institute (1952) and VGIK (1964). He was a member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. He worked in the *Soviet Screen* magazine, since 1974 – at the Research Institute of Cinematography (head of the sector). For many years he was the President of the Guild of Film Critics of the Russian Federation. Laureate of the Prize of the Guild of Film Critics of Russia (2001), honorary awards of Poland for his contribution to the study and popularization of Polish cinema. He taught at VGIK. Published on film issues since 1956. Published in scientific collections, in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Film Studies Notes*, *Cinemagoer Companion*, in the newspapers *Culture*, *Soviet Cinema*, *Screen and Scene*, *SK-Novosti*, etc. Author of books: *Andrzej Wajda* (1966); *Fernandel* (1968); *Cinema of Mongolia* (1976); *Cinema of Yugoslavia* (1986); *Red star, yellow star* (2001; 2005); *Kazimierz Kutz* (2011, in the *Film Studies Notes* journal).

8. F.I. Andreev (1933-1998): film critic, journalist. He was a member of the Soviet Communist Party and the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR. Worked as a deputy editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1980-1990). From 1990 to 1998 he lived and worked in the USA, where, in particular, he was Executive Director of the Brighton Beach Borough Management Association (New York). Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Crocodile*, in the newspapers *Soviet Culture*, *Soviet Cinema*, etc. Author of books: *Ivan Pereverzev* (1982); *Oleg Tabakov* (1983).

9. Y.A. Komov: journalist, film critic, translator, member of the Union of Journalists of the USSR and Russia. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art* and others. Author of books: *Hollywood without a mask* (1982); *Shadow racing* (1985); *Close avenues of fame* (1991); *Frameless portraits* (1992; 2003).

10. I.I. Rubanova (1933-2024): film critic and historian. Graduated from Moscow State University (1956), Ph.D. (1966). Member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Since 1962, he has been a researcher at the Institute of Art History (now the State Institute of Art Studies). In 1964-1967 she hosted TV programs about Polish cinematography on Moscow television. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Seance*, *Film Studies Notes*, in the newspapers *Izvestia*, *Kommersant-daily*, etc. Author of books: *Cinematography of the countries of socialism* (1963); *Polish cinema. Films about war and occupation. 1945-1965* (1966); *Conrad Wolf* (1973); *Vladimir Vysotsky* (1983). Laureate of the Guild of Film Critics of Russia.

11. V.I. Mikhalkovich (1937-2006): film critic and historian. Graduated from the Belarusian State University (1959) and film history department of VGIK (1968). Ph.D. (1997), professor. He was a member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. He worked as a researcher at the State Film Fund (1963-1966), in office of foreign cinema at VGIK (1966–1968), editor of the foreign department in the journal *Cinema Art* (1968-1970), researcher at the Institute of Art History (1970-1974), researcher at the Research Institute of History and Theory of Cinema (1974-1977), researcher at the State Institute of Art Studies (1977-2006), professor at VGIK (1986-2006) and at the State University of Management (2000-2006). Published in scientific collections, in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Film Studies Notes*, *Literary Review*, etc. Author of books: *Alexander Ford* (1968, together with V. Dmitriev, the book was not published due to A. Ford's emigration to the West); *Anatomy of a myth: Brigitte Bardot* (1975) (together with V. Dmitriev); *Meetings with the X muse* (1981) (together with V. Demin, I. Weisfeld and R. Sobolev); *Barbara Brylska* (1984); *Figurative language of mass media* (1986); *Poetics of photography* (1989) (together with V. Stiginev); *Selected Russian cinemas* (2006). Laureate of the Guild of Film Critics of Russia.

12. A.S. Plakhov (born 1950): film critic and historian. Ph.D. (1982). Graduated from the Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics of the Lviv University (1972) and the Film Studies Faculty of VGIK (1978). Member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Honored Worker of Culture of the Russian Federation (2014). He was a member of the Soviet Communist Party (since 1980), President of FIPRESCI (2005-2010). Worked in the department of culture of the newspaper *Pravda* (1977-1988), taught at VGIK. Browser in newspaper *Kommersant*. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Seance*, *Sight & Sound*, etc. Author of books: *Struggle of ideas in modern Western cinema* (1984); *Western*

screen: the destruction of personality (1985); *Catherine Deneuve* (three editions: 1989; 2005; 2008); *33 in total. Stars of world film directing* (1999); *33 in total. Close-up of the stars* (2004); *Aki Kaurismaki. The last romantic* (2006); *Directors of the present* (2008); *Directors of the future* (2009); *Cinema on the brink of a nervous breakdown* (2014); *Ozone* (2018); *Cinema beyond* (2019); *Visconti. History and myth. Beauty and death* (2022), etc. Laureate of the Guild of Film Critics of Russia, Honorary Diploma of the President of Russia (2014), Nika Prize "For Contribution to Cinematographic Sciences, Criticism and Education" (2017),

13. A.A. Anikst A. (1910-1988): literary and film critic, Ph.D. (1963). Graduated from Moscow State Pedagogical Institute (1933). He was a member of the Soviet Communist Party (since 1942), the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and the Union of Writers of the USSR. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Theater*, *Questions of Literature*, etc. Author of books: *History of English Literature* (1956); *Daniel Defoe* (1957); *6 stories about American theatre* (1963) (together with A. Boyadzhiev); *The work of Shakespeare* (1963). *Shakespeare* (1964); *Shakespeare theater* (1965); *Drama Theory from Aristotle to Lessing* (1967); *Drama Theory in Russia. From Pushkin to Chekhov* (1972); *First Editions of Shakespeare* (1974); *Shakespeare: The Dramatist's Craft* (1974); *Faust Goethe: Literary Commentaries* (1979); *The history of the doctrine of drama: the theory of drama from Hegel to Marx* (1983); *Goethe and Faust: from idea to accomplishment* (1983); *The creative path of Goethe* (1986); *Shakespeare's tragedy "Hamlet"* (1986); *Drama theory in the West in the second half of the 19th century* (1988).

14. A.V. Braginsky (1920-2016): film critic and historian, translator. Graduated from the Moscow Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages (1941). Was a member of the Soviet Communist Party, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Author of many articles and books on French cinema. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, etc. Author of books: *Le Chanois* (1972); *Christian-Jacques* (1981); *Jean-Paul Belmondo. In cinema and in life* (1997); *Gerard Depardieu. Stolen letters* (1998); *Alain Delon. In love and life* (1999); *Catherine Deneuve* (2000), etc. Laureate of the Guild of Film Critics of Russia in the category "Literature about cinema" (for a series of books about French film masters) (1999).

15. V.P. Demin (1937-1993): film critic and historian, editor. Graduated from the Film Studies Department of VGIK (1960). Ph.D. (1973). He was a member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. He worked as an editor in the film department of the Art publishing house (Moscow), a researcher at the State Film Fund and the Research Institute of Art Studies (Moscow). In the last years of his life, he was one of the secretaries of the Union of Cinematographers and the editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen / Screen* magazine. Repeatedly delivered series of lectures on cinema art in various cities of the country. He has been publishing on film issues since 1963. Published in scientific collections of the Research Institute of Art Studies, etc., in the magazines *Soviet Screen / Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Cinemagoer Companion*, *Spark*, *Soviet Film*, *Cinema* (Latvia), *Cinema* (Lithuania), *Filmovi Novini* (Bulgaria), etc., in the newspapers *Soviet Culture*, *Soviet Cinema*, *Teacher's Newspaper*, etc.

In the 1980s – 1990s, he increasingly turned to screenwriting and, in order to feel the filming process from the inside, played several episodic roles in the films of Gennady Poloka, Alexander Itygilov and Leonid Maryagin, who liked his colorful, imposing appearance.

One of the most brilliant film critics of the 1960s – 1980s, Victor Demin had a unique creative style and a unique capacity for work. Being one of the most opposition filmmakers of his era, he skillfully clothed his most "seditious" passages in an ironic and allegorical form. Already his first book *Film without intrigue* (1966) was rightfully recognized as an event in Russian film criticism. With all that, the literary language of V.P. Demin – bright and imaginative – was far from abstruse scientism. He wrote with equal success about Russian and foreign, feature and documentary films. Author of books: *A film without intrigue* (1966); *Jean Marais* (1968) (together with I. Yanushevskaya); *First person* (1976); *Do films get old?* (1978); *Sense education* (1980); *Meetings with the X muse* (1981) (together with I. Weisfeld, R. Sobolev, V. Mikhalkovich); *Man on earth* (1982); *Vytautas Žalakevičius: a portrait of the director* (1982); *Vitaly Melnikov: three conversations with the director* (1984); *Let's talk about cinema*. (1984); *Eldar Ryazanov: creative portrait* (1984); *Meetings on the scorched earth* (1985). (together with V. Ishimov); *George Danelia* (1986); *Gleb Panfilov* (1986); *Sergei Solovyov* (1987); *Victor Proskurin* (1988); *Leonid Maryagin: creative portrait* (1988); *Aloizs Brenčs: creative portrait* (1990); *Leonid Yarmolnik* (1991).

16. G.E. Dolmatovskaya (1939-2021): film critic and historian, Ph.D., screenwriter, director. She was a member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Graduated from the Faculty of Journalism of Moscow State University. She worked for *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. Since 1974 – at Research Institute of History and Theory of Cinema (head of the department of non-fiction films). Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, in scientific collections, etc. In recent years, she lived in France. Book Author: *Rod Steiger* (1976); *Who is who in the Soviet Cinema* (1979) (together with I. Shilova); *France talks about itself* (1980); *Notes on the past* (1983); *Sheets of the lunar calendar*. (1985). Scriptwriter of documentaries: *Somewhere near Tierra del Fuego...* and *Muse of Exile* (1990, directed by M. Litvyakov), *Leave... Stay...* (1992, directed by I. Mordmilovich). Director of documentary films shot according to his own scripts: *Go to Tryokhpрудny lane...* (1992), *Matchmaker* (1993), *To a distant land...* (1995), *Cinema address – Krasnogorsk* (1996), *Ivan Mozzhukhin, or Child of Carnival* (1999), *Serebryakovs. French Studies* (2009), *Lucky 60s* (2012).

17. K.E. Razlogov (1946-2021): film critic and historian, culturologist, educator. Ph.D. (1984), Professor (1988), Honored Art Worker of Russia (1997). He was a member of the Soviet Communist Party (since 1973), the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia, of the Russian Academy of the Internet, the National Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences of Russia, the Russian Academy of Motion Picture Arts "Nika", a member of the Scientific Council of the Russian Academy of Sciences on the complex problem "History of World Culture". Headed the Russian Institute of Cultural Studies (1989-2013). He was a professor at VGIK, director of programs at the Moscow International Film Festival (1999-2021),

Graduated from Moscow State University (1969). From 1969 to 1976 he worked at the State Film Fund. From 1977 to 1988 he was the advisor to the Chairman of the Soviet Goskino. He taught at the Higher Courses for Scriptwriters and Directors (since 1972), at the Film Studies Department of VGIK (since 1988) and at the Institute of European Cultures (since 1999). Author and presenter of television cycles: *Cinema marathon* (RTR, 1993-1995), *Cinema Age* (1st Russian TV channel, 1994-1995), *From avant-garde cinema to video art* (Channel "Culture", 2001-2002), *Cinema cult* (Channel "Culture", 2001-2021).

Published in numerous scientific collections, in the journals *Problems of Philosophy*, *Cinema Art*, *Soviet Screen*, *Film Studies Notes*, *Kinoglaz*, *Media Education*, *Opinions*, *Social Sciences*, *Free Thought*, *Seance*, *Technology of Cinema and Television*, *Reading Room*, etc., in the newspapers *Culture*, *Moskovskaya Pravda*, *Independent Paper*, *Today*, *Screen and Stage*, etc. In total he published (in Russia and abroad) more than 800 articles.

Repeatedly participated in various Russian and international conferences, symposiums and seminars. He has lectured at universities in the USA, Canada, France, Finland, the Netherlands, Costa Rica, Australia and other countries.

Author of books: *Counterculture and the "new" conservatism* (1981) (together with A. Melville); *Disillusionment: The Politicization of the Western Screen* (1982); *Gods and devils in the mirror of the screen* (1982); *Screen Art: Problems of Expression* (1982); *The Dream Conveyor and Psychological Warfare* (1986); *Marilyn Monroe* (1991); *Commerce and art: enemies or allies?* (1992); *Not only about cinema* (2009); *Screen art: from the cinematograph to the Internet* (2010); *World Cinema: A History of Screen Art* (2011; 2013); *Planet Cinema. History of world screen art* (2015); *My festivals* (2015); *Film process of the XX – beginning of the XXI century* (2017); *Harutyun Khachatryan. Eternal return* (2019).

18. I.N. Solovieva (1927-2024) is a literary and theater critic and historian. Ph.D. (1974), professor. Honored Art Worker of the Russian Federation (1993). Laureate of the State Prize of the Russian Federation (2003). Laureate of the Prize of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR (1969). Member of the Union of Writers of the USSR and Russia, the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. She graduated from the theater department of GITIS (1949). From 1982 to 2001, she led a theater criticism workshop at the Russian Academy of Theater Arts. Since 2001, she taught the history of Russian theater at the Moscow Art Theater School, where she was in charge of the scientific sector.

Published in the journals *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Theater*, *Theatre Issues*, in scientific collections, etc. Author of books: *Cinema of Italy (1945-1960)* (1961); *The play is on today* (1966); *Jean Gabin* (1967) (together with V. Shitova); *I.N. Nemirovich-Danchenko* (1979); *K.S. Stanislavsky* (1985) (together with V. Shitova); *Fourteen sessions* (1981) (together with V. Shitova); *Branches and roots* (1998); *First studio. Second Moscow Art Theater: from the*

practice of theatrical ideas of the XX century (2016); *A.S. Suvorin: a portrait against the background of a newspaper* (2017) (together with V. Shitova).

19. T.M. Khlopyankina (1937-1993): film critic, screenwriter, playwright. She was a member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Graduated from VGIK (1959). She worked in the newspaper *Soviet Culture*, in the *Literary Newspaper*. In 1990-1992 she was the first deputy editor-in-chief of the magazine *Soviet Screen / Screen*. She has been published in the magazines *Cinema Art*, *Soviet Screen*, *Soviet Film*, *Cinema* (Riga), *Cinemagoer Companion*, *Theatre*, etc.; newspapers *Soviet Culture*, *Moscow News*, *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (where she was the head of the department of arts), etc. The author of the script for the film *Who is knocking on my door...*, the play *Funny Case*, the story *Hello, dear edition*. Author of books: *Ticket to the cinema* (1981); *Tatyana Dogileva* (1986); *Zastava Ilyicha* (1990).

20. R.N. Yurenev (1912-2002): film critic and historian, screenwriter. Ph.D. (1961), professor (1963). Honored Art Worker of Russia (1969), laureate of the Union of Cinematographers award for film studies and film criticism. He graduated from VGIK (1936). During the Second World War, he was a navigator in military aviation. He was awarded the Orders of the Red Star, the Order of the Patriotic War of the 2nd degree, the Red Banner of Labor, and the Friendship of Peoples. From 1939 to 2002 he taught at VGIK, led the film criticism workshop. He worked in the journal *Cinema Art* (1946-1948), was a senior researcher at the Institute of Art History of the Academy of Sciences (1948-1974), head of the film history department of the Film Research Institute (1974-2002). Wrote scripts for several documentaries, mostly about Russian filmmakers. Repeatedly participated in the work of international film festivals (Cannes, Berlin, Venice, Moscow and others).

In the 1960s – 1980s he was one of the most influential representatives of official film criticism, who received accreditation at major international film festivals. In the 1990s, he was mainly engaged in teaching activities.

He has been publishing on cinema since 1937. Published in numerous scientific collections on the theory and history of domestic and foreign cinematography, in the magazines *Cinema Art*, *Film Scripts*, *Novy Mir*, *Motherland*, *Soviet Screen*, etc., in the newspapers *Vechernyaya Moskva*, *Izvestiya*, *Soviet Cinema*, *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, *Literaturnaya Rossiya*, *Pravda*, *Soviet Art*, *Soviet Culture*, *Trud*, etc. (more than 600 publications).

Author of books: *About the film "Amangeldy"* (1938); *Grigory Alexandrov: the creative path of a film director* (1939); *Alexey Kapler: creative portrait of a screenwriter* (1940); *Academician Ivan Pavlov* (1949); *Soviet biopic* (1949); "Kuban Cossacks". *About the film and its creators* (1950); "Country Doctor". *About the film and its creators* (1952); *Modern Soviet cinema* (1958); *Alexander Dovzhenko* (1959); *Cinema is the most important of the arts* (1959); *At international film festivals* (1959); *Cinema abroad* (1961); *Modern cinema art of the capitalist countries* (1961); "Clear sky". *Film essay* (1961); *Eisenstein* (1962); *Cannes-Moscow-Venice* (1963); *Soviet film comedy* (1964); *Funny on the screen* (1964); *Soviet film comedy* (1964); "Battleship Potemkin" by Sergei Eisenstein (1965); *Innovation and traditions of owls. Movie* (1965); *Tamara Nosova* (1965); *Brief history of Soviet cinema*. Issue. 1. (1917-1941) (1967); *Art born in October* (1968); *Lyubov Orlova* (1968); *Mikhail Zharov* (1971); *Film director Evgeny Chervyakov* (1972); *Serei Eisenstein and the present* (1973); *Soviet cinematography* (1977); *Brief history of Soviet cinema* (1979); *Laughter of the strong* (1979); *Alexander Medvedkin, satirist* (1981); *Film book* (1981); *Miraculous Window: A Brief History of Foreign Cinema* (1983); *Sergei Eisenstein. Ideas. Movies. Method*. In 2 vols. (1985; 1988); *Innovation of the Soviet cinematography* (1986); *L.V. Kuleshov: film theory, directing, pedagogy* (1987); *V. Turkin: criticism, screenwriting, pedagogy* (1989); *Japanese cinema of the post-war years* (1993); *My dear VGIK* (1994); *Films by Gleb Panfilov* (1995); *Poems from the cherished box* (1997); *Soviet cinema of the 30s* (1997); *A Brief History of Cinema* (1997); *To justify this life* (2007).

21. M.B. Yampolsky (born in 1949) is a film critic, culturologist, philosopher, philologist, Ph.D. (1991). Member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Member of the editorial board of the journal *New Literary Review*, advisory councils of the Eisenstein Center and the journal *Film Studies Notes*. Laureate of awards from the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR (1991) and the Guild of Film Critics of Russia (2004). Graduated from the Moscow Pedagogical Institute (1971). Worked as a school teacher, researcher at the Research Institute of Cinematography (1974-1990). He taught at VGIK and at the Higher

Courses for Scriptwriters and Directors (Moscow). Since 1992 he has been a professor at New York University.

Author of numerous works on cinema art, semiotics, visual phenomenology. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Film Studies Notes*, *New Literary Review*, etc. Author of books: *Visible world. Essays on early film phenomenology* (1993); *Memory of Tiresias. Intertextuality and cinema* (1993); *Babel* (1994). (co-authored with Alexander Zholkovskiy); *Demon and labyrinth. Diagrams, deformations, mimesis* (1996); *Recklessness as a source. Reading Kharms*. (1998); *Observer. Essays on the history of vision* (2000); *About close. Essays on non-mimetic vision* (2001; 2012); *Physiology of the symbolic*. Book 1. *Return Leviathan: political theology, representation of power and the endold regime* (2004); *Loner community* (2004); *Language – body – case: Cinematography and the search for meaning* (2004); *Weaver and visionary. Essays on the history of representation, or On the material and ideal in culture* (2007); *Muratova. The experience of film anthropology* (2008); *Through a Glass Darkly: 20 Chapters on Uncertainty* (2010); *Spatial history. Three texts about history* (2013); *Picturesque gnosis. Grisha Bruskin, Alefbet, individual salvation, dual world, eschaton, gnosis* (2015); *Out of chaos (Dragomoshchenko: poetry, photography, philosophy)* (2015); *Prigov: Essays on artistic nominalism* (2016); *Image. Lecture course* (2019).

Receiving a lot of letters from readers regarding the repertoire of Western films on Soviet screens, the editors of the magazine in 1972 decided to give an official explanation on this matter.

Soviet Screen published the answer of the then head of the Directorate of Cinematography and Film Distribution of the Committee on Cinematography under the Council of Ministers of the USSR F. Belov. He emphasized that the cinematography of Western countries is now experiencing a severe crisis of content and form. The film market is flooded with commercial movies of a detective and pseudo-historical character, therefore, Soviet film distribution must be insured against various low-grade crafts, from film production produced by the social order of reactionary circles, propagating bourgeois ideology. As the practice of recent years shows, commissions for the selection of foreign films recommend films that deserve a mostly positive assessment. ... And yet there are still many critical remarks about our foreign repertoire. These remarks often help film distribution authorities correct errors, allowed in the purchase of foreign films (Belov, 1972: 17).

As an example, F. Belov drew the attention of the readers of the *Soviet Screen* to the fact that even “progressive artists of the West”, developing acute social themes, often, for the sake of bad taste, include rough, naturalistic scenes, elements of sex, pathology in films. Films like this hit our screen from time to time. It happens that due to naturalistic episodes in films, individual viewers do not accept the picture as a whole, do not notice its progressive tendencies (Belov, 1972: 17).

But then a caveat followed: “It is, of course, not the spectator who is to blame here. This is the result of the fact that our press, including the *Soviet Screen*, does not yet pay due attention to reviewing foreign films” (Belov, 1972: 17).

Here, in fact, there was a clear dissonance with the recent history of the *Soviet Screen*, since in 1968 in the articles of the philosopher and film critic V. Razumny (1924-2011) (Razumny, 1968) and the famous actor N. Kryuchkov (1915-1993) (Kryuchkov, 1968) and at meetings with managers of Soviet Communist Party, the editors were sharply criticized precisely for the increase (from the point of view of the critics) in the volume of materials on Western cinema.

F. Belov saved the answer to the most pressing question for last: “Why didn’t they buy such and such a film? After all, this is an interesting work. Does the purchasing commission understand this?”. I dare to say: I understand. ... However, the issue of acquiring a particular painting is decided not only by our desire to buy it, but also by the willingness of our partners to sell it. It is no secret that many masters of foreign cinema are dependent on various dealers. And the latter, when it comes to the rental of a film in the USSR, sometimes deliberately raise such a price or put forward such conditions that it becomes impossible to purchase a film. This is the main reason why not everything that we would like gets on our screen. As our international distribution links grow, the number of “unavailable” films is steadily declining. We hope that the hour is not far off, when it is reduced to zero. But this applies only to genuine works of cinema.

As for the ideologically and artistically dubious films of the capitalist countries, the committee takes all measures to ensure that such films cannot penetrate the Soviet screen in any way” (Belov, 1972: 17).

A few years later, the conversation on this topic continued with Vice-Chairman of the USSR Goskino L. Mosin.

To begin with, he once again edifyingly reminded the readers of the magazine that cinema is included in the sphere of global ideological and spiritual confrontation between working people and the bourgeoisie, between socialism and capitalism. It exists and develops in conditions of acute confrontation between the champions of international detente and the instigators of the reckless nuclear arms race (Mosin, 1978: 1).

And then he argued (albeit, as Perestroika soon showed, recklessly) that film works that preach the cult of violence, militarism and cruelty, racism and pornography will never have a way to the Soviet screen, no matter how much our foreign ones hysteria about this (Mosin, 1978: 1).

Like F. Belov (Belov, 1972: 17), L. Mosin emphasized that the Soviet film distribution was open to cinematic works that “display progressive, democratic, freedom-loving ideas”, for films with a distinct social and humanistic sound, opposing everything that that offends the dignity of a person, takes away his strength, deprives him of happiness (Mosin, 1978: 1).

This was followed, however, by the reservation that it is impossible not to take into account the fact that in modern bourgeois society there are many figures of cinema who are, as it were, at a crossroads: they do not accept the ideas of communism, but at the same time, speaking from the positions of anti-fascism and anti-militarism, with positions of protest against reactionary phenomena, albeit half-heartedly and inconsistently, but carry out in their works the ideas of progress, thus objectively linking up with the activities of those who consciously and consistently participate in this struggle. The best films of this type appear on our screens, and the works of Western authors do not appear on them, reminiscent of clan shamanism, rushing about in an atmosphere of disintegration of content and form and seeing in the “mass man” an inert personality, devoid of the ability to think independently, socially and creatively powerless (Mosin, 1978: 1).

In this context, one of the most influential film critics of the 1970s, V. Baskakov (1921-1999), emphasized that in cinematography, as in other forms of art, the process of “polarization” has intensified: on the one hand, the owners of the bourgeois film market are striving to fill the screen with films that oppose socialism, against the progress of humanism, against man; at the same time, those forces that oppose frankly bourgeois, decadent art are sharply identified. Socialist art occupies an increasingly important position on the world screen. ... In a number of capitalist countries, films are being born, the authors of which stand on the positions of critical realism, the process is developing under the direct influence and under the powerful influence of the struggle of fraternal communist parties and the changes that have taken place and are taking place in the world (Baskakov, 1973: 2).

As a positive reaction to the resolutions of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party concerning culture and ideology, in 1974 the All-Union Theoretical Conference "The Movie Screen and the Ideological Struggle" was held in Moscow, organized by the Research Institute of Theory and the history of cinema, Goskino of the USSR and the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR, the course of which was reflected on the pages of the magazine *Soviet Screen* (Kinoekran..., 1975: 2).

Chairman State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for Cinematography F.T. Yermash (1923-2002), who was appointed to this position in August 1972, emphasized in his report the importance of fighting all kinds of bourgeois ideology, actively using the movie screen in their class interests.

Director of the Research Institute of Theory and history of cinema V. Baskakov (1921-1999) made a presentation on his favorite topic: "A Critique of Bourgeois 'Mass Culture' and Decadent Currents in Cinematography". He recalled that the détente of international tension in the world is taking place against the backdrop of an intensification of the struggle in the field of ideology, he analyzed the main processes and trends in Western cinema, which largely accumulates phenomena characteristic of bourgeois ideology as a whole: both extreme forms of anti-communism and propaganda myths about inexhaustible the possibilities of a “free” society, traditional and new philosophical idealistic currents (existentialism, Freudianism, neo-

Freudianism), as well as left-wing extremist and Maoist trends. Today, bourgeois propagandists and film business owners, under the influence of the changes that have taken place in the world, given the growing ideological influence of the forces of socialism and communism on the masses, are forced to abandon the old patterns and clichés, are forced to use sophisticated camouflage to mask their true goals of influencing the public consciousness. The front of the ideological struggle passes not only through the films themselves, but also touches on the fundamental questions of film theory (Kinoekran..., 1975: 2).

Further, the following reports were made by leading film critics (among whom was the famous director S. Yutkevich) on the topic of cinema and ideology: "The main directions of the ideological struggle in cinematography" (R. Yurenev), "Cinematographic process and some problems of film criticism" (A. Karaganov), "Models of political cinema" (S. Yutkevich), "Criticism of reactionary concepts of the history of Soviet cinema" (M. Zak), "Dziga Vertov and the Modern Ideological Struggle" (S. Drobashenko), "The Chapaev Phenomenon and Problems of the Ideological Struggle" (D. Pisarevsky), "Scientific and technological revolution – personality is the future" (Y. Khanyutin), "Cinematography as an object of mass consumption" (I. Turovskaya) and others (Kinoekran ..., 1975: 2).

Many of the theses voiced at this conference were included in the article by F. Yermash "Cinema in the struggle for the ideals of communism" (Yermash, 1979: 1-3).

On the whole, all three editors of the *Soviet Screen*, who succeeded each other in this post in the 1970s, adhered to a single editorial line regarding the irreconcilable ideological struggle against bourgeois cinema.

- ideologized articles emphasizing criticism of bourgeois cinema and its harmful influence on the audience

So, after the beginning of the Czechoslovak events of 1968 and the subsequent series of resolutions of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party (Postanovlenie..., 1969; 1972, etc.), ideologized articles began to appear more often in the *Soviet Screen*, emphasizing criticism of bourgeois cinema and its harmful influence on the audience.

Due to the fact that until the mid-1970s the United States continued to wage an aggressive war in Vietnam, the *Soviet Screen* quite reasonably associated this event with Hollywood productions that glorified the American army.

Thus, in the article "The Truth and Lies about Vietnam on the Screens of America", it was noted that "it is flaring up more and more in USA fight against war in Vietnam. More and more voices are heard demanding an end to this dirty war. That is why the government and the military tend to use every possible means to prove the correctness of their policy. And they attach more and more importance to the enormous impact that the art of "political cinema" has. ... For the US government "watered films" and the shield with which they cover and defend their political line, and the weapon with which they attack those who prevent them from pursuing this policy. ... by order of the US government, a huge number of films are being created that in one way or another promote the war in Vietnam. ... For example, in New York alone, more than ten films glorifying the American military were shown on television during one week. But there is another America that hates war and fights against it" (Yurenev, 1970: 15).

In the second half of the 1970s, this anti-war theme was continued on the pages of the magazine: "When the film *The Green Berets* (USA, 1968) appeared on the screens of the West at the height of American aggression in Vietnam, few people imagined that this one was miserably a failed and booed Hollywood action movie, like a sown dragon's teeth, will give a poisonous growth of frankly militaristic and chauvinistic films. The Pentagon, as you know, lost the "dirty war" in Indochina. Punishers barely took their feet from the territory of freedom-loving heroic Vietnam. And Hollywood, charged with aggressiveness, took the shameful baton from the Pentagon and launched a conveyor belt of frankly false, misanthropic films with full force. ... In the "dream factory" during the year, up to ten action films about the US Indo-Chinese adventure are filmed. Among them there are "leaders", breaking all records for rigging and distorting events ... Thus, the Vietnam War, which caused a deep split in American society, through the efforts of filmmakers, takes on the appearance of a kind of "heroic epic", the participants of which supposedly bravely defended the "free world" from the "red danger". ... Explosions and shots do not subside on the film sets of Hollywood. The extras in the "green berets" go on endless attacks in order to convince the Western layman that under the guise of the "free world" genocide is not genocide, aggression is not aggression, but the United States, which over the

past thirty years has used its armed forces more than two hundred times to achieve political goals, of course, as always right. Specializing in gilding the unsightly facade of the world of capital, Hollywood, as we see, remains true to itself" (Romanov, 1979: 18).

The policy of "détente", which was carried out between the USSR and the USA in the 1970s, did not cancel, as you know, the struggle in the sphere of ideology. Therefore, on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* it was emphasized that imperialism is shaking from class battles... After the Vietnam adventure, Watergate, scandalous cases of corruption in the corridors of power... a campaign for the "protection of human rights" was born in the West. In general, it is rather absurd: how can one expect protection of human rights from those who trample on these rights on a daily basis? Who is throwing millions of unemployed people out onto the street? Who is developing misanthropic plans for the extermination of people? Who deprives the temper of the colored? The purpose of this campaign is also to divert the attention of the masses of the people from the deep crisis of the capitalist system, to discredit socialism, to disorientate and split the progressive social and political forces in the capitalist states. Its peculiarity lies in the fact that it is raised to the government level, the question of alleged violations of human rights in the socialist countries is associated with interstate relations. The ideological struggle, in fact, is turning into a "psychological" one, fraught with serious consequences. In the field of foreign policy, it was decided to replace the bankrupt anti-communism and anti-Sovietism with a crusade for "human rights". But changing signs does not change the essence: there is still the same open anti-communism with attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries (Chernousov, 1979: 17).

Moving further directly to the material of cinematography, the author of the article asked himself the question: "What kind of "legality", what kind of "order" can we talk about in a bourgeois society, where the guardians of law and order themselves violate them at every step? Those who have seen the American film *Serpico* (USA, 1973) could be convinced of this... Such is the cruel truth about human rights in capitalist countries, about "democracy" in the West, expressed in the language of cinema. It is high time for the bourgeois preachers who bawl about "democracy and genuine human rights" in the socialist countries to look at their own countries and finally understand that in order to talk about human rights, one must at least have the right to do so. Not to mention the fact that in relation to the socialist community their complaints and heart-rending cries are pointless" (Chernousov, 1979: 16-18).

In a similar ideological vein, A. Palladin's article titled "The Barriers of Anti-Sovietism" was maintained (Palladin, 1978: 17).

The journalist Y. Komov in a series of his articles in the *Soviet Screen* also spoke sharply against Western commercial cinema and the ideas propagated by it: "What kind of "value criteria" does bourgeois cinema splash out on the audience? Violence, atrocities, pornography, sexual perversions, drug addiction... Moreover, fabulous funds are spent on advertising horror films, disaster movies, paintings that incite the basest instincts. ... And the dumbfounded spectator – old and young – deafened by the noisy pandemonium, dutifully looks at the picture that he did not choose himself, but was slipped to him by those who are trying to distract the masses from the burning problems and contradictions of the capitalist world" (Komov, 1979: 18).

Y. Komov further argued that the American adult and children's audiences have long been accustomed to movie atrocities. They go like hot cakes, bringing huge profits to businessmen. An American from a young age is forced to get used to recreational violence; according to statistics, he spends much more time in front of the TV and in the auditorium than at school at his desk. In front of him are fantastic monsters, gangsters, bandits... Some of them greedily devour people, others terrorize entire cities, others, performing their "exploits", shoot, kill, cut, rape. Children like chases, attacks, gambling fights – they want to be strong, they want to be adults, they want to act. And under the influence of the screen, they become rapists in the jungles of huge American cities. A terrible thing happens: they talk about crimes, they think about them, but they talk and think, as if it were something ordinary. It would seem that murder is a monstrous act of inhumanity. But when there are so many of them... Both in the cinema and in the surrounding reality. ... One way or another, but children and adults in American society consume the same drug (or variations of it) for a long time, they get used to it, they cannot do without it. In fact, violence remains an old concept, but in the age of progress, the rapid development of science and technology, it has become widely available, now it corrupts everyone

without exception, from the cradle to the end of days (Komov, 1979: 18).

In approximately the same vein, Y. Komov wrote on the pages of the magazine about Hollywood science fiction films and disaster films and gangster dramas (Komov, 1977: 20-21; 1980: 17).

One of the main film critics who exposed the negative influence of bourgeois cinema on the mass audience in the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s was the then secretary of the board of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR A. Karaganov (1915-2007).

His articles of this period were sustained in the strict framework of the Soviet Communist party's ideological struggle. Here, for example, is a typical beginning of such texts: "The politics and philosophy of the struggle for peace live on in the decisions of the 26th Congress of Lenin's party, no matter how much militant politicians across the ocean shout about the "Soviet military threat" and world terrorism, allegedly fanned by the Kremlin. The policy and philosophy of the struggle for peace is for us the strategic line, the deepest essence of the creative labor, thoughts and feelings of the builders of communism. That is why the social psychology of the people and the individual psychology of man, his moral world organically unite in support of all new initiatives and actions of the party of the state, the outstanding peace fighter Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, aimed at restoring the development of international detente and strengthening the cause of peace" (Karaganov, 1982: 1).

It was A. Karaganov who drew the attention of the readers of the *Soviet Screen* to the fact that although among the filmmakers of bourgeois countries there have always been many serving the imperialist ideology and propaganda, but these are not only corrupt souls from third-rate artisans ... we know that the famous American actor who became a director, John Wayne directed the film *The Green Berets* (USA, 1968), openly glorifying the "heroes" of American aggression against the Vietnamese people. Billy Wilder staged *One, Two, Three* (USA, 1961), Alfred Hitchcock – *Topaz* (USA, 1969), Henri Verneuil – *Snake (Le Serpent)*. France-FRG-Italy, 1973), films slandering Soviet foreign policy. ... Plots and motifs from the arsenal of screen anti-Sovietism and anti-communism pass from Bondiade into films about catastrophes and Star Wars (Karaganov, 1982: 1).

A. Karaganov saw a rehabilitation trend of whitewashing aggression in Michael Cimino's film *The Deer Hunter* (USA, 1978), in which the misfortunes of three Americans, participants in aggression who were captured by the Vietnamese, are portrayed sentimentally, sympathetically, and the Vietnamese are presented as sophisticated torturers of prisoners of war: racist motives are quite clearly visible in the film (Karaganov, 1982: 1).

And here A. Karaganov recalled that for various reasons, bourgeois filmmakers help the cold and psychological war. Some are by conviction. Others – by cynical calculation: money does not smell. Still others have allowed themselves to be broken... But not only the convinced troubadours of militarism, not only those who have sold themselves out and are broken, participate in the dissemination of ideas favorable to the reaction. It often happens that they are played along by artists who got lost in the labyrinths of false ideas of bourgeois individualism, a bourgeois understanding of democracy, or fell under the influence of propaganda cries about the "Soviet military threat". Not helping, but hindering the moral support of anti-militarist activity are also those artists who believe in concepts that represent life as an insurmountable chaos, man as a hopelessly corrupted being: a philosophy of behavior based on such concepts makes people obedient slaves of circumstances created by the masters of their own society. A cinematographer who has allowed himself to be deceived by false ideas almost inevitably becomes an unwitting but quite dangerous accomplice of the reactionary forces (Karaganov, 1982: 1).

A year later, A. Karaganov returned to the theme of the ideological struggle in cinema, noting that in some cases, market films of an aesthetically lightweight but enticing "cinema" turn to the techniques of "upper floor" cinema, adorn themselves with sparkles of intellectuality and sophistication. However, the traditional lures and traps for the viewer remain almost unchanged – the intricacies of the plot that mythologizes life, frank sex, the aestheticization of cruelty and violence (Karaganov, 1983: 1).

That is why, A. Karaganov continued, one should more effectively oppose films that sow enmity between peoples, spread racial prejudice, promote anti-Sovietism, anti-communism, romanticize the exploits of the aggressors in Vietnam (*The Deer Hunter*. USA, 1978) and white mercenaries in Africa (*The Wild Geese*. USA, 1978). In a number of films, attempts are made to

revise the course of the Second World War, to whitewash Hitler and his army, or to dissolve the social essence of fascism in the problems of sexopathology and Freudian psychoanalysis (Karaganov, 1983: 1).

Hence the previous conclusion was drawn: "The screen remains a field and a weapon of struggle. ... Films that spread fear of life weaken the social and moral stamina of a person in the fight against manifestations of evil; a person struck by such a feeling of fear of life easily falls into total pessimism, which prevents him from becoming an active fighter and simply a fighter against the arms race fanned by the imperialists, against the growing military dangers" (Karaganov, 1983: 1).

In the same 1983, the journalist V. Chernenko clearly (and as it turned out later, quite presciently) identified the "main direction of the ideological attack" that the United States launched against the socialist countries: the desire for ideological and political "erosion", the desire to destabilize the social system of socialism, to destroy its system of moral, moral values and the spiritual world, to the spread of bourgeois and, above all, American norms and views on the way of life – monopolistic capital (Chernenko, 1983: 16).

The article went on to say that many types of ideological influence are carried out, as it were, gradually, unobtrusively, "not on the forehead", when norms and patterns of behavior, value orientations in the field of culture, morality, everyday life are distributed through advertising of technical achievements, fashion standards and etc., consciously and purposefully presented as symbols of the American way of life and the American social system. ... American cinema has developed such a concept of personality, which is designed to have a destructive effect on public consciousness, instill in the masses faith in the bourgeois legal order, the "American way of life", and assert the "moral" values of capitalism (Chernenko, 1983: 16-17).

As examples of this kind of destructive influence, V. Chernenko presented the anti-Soviet films *Firefox* (USA, 1982) and *Steiner – Das Eiserne Kreuz / Cross of Iron* (FRG-UK, 1977). And then it was argued that in Western films of anti-Soviet, anti-humanistic orientation there are motives for the inevitability of war, destruction, all kinds of global cataclysms. The viewer is actively accustomed to the idea that war with the use of atomic weapons, laser and other means of mass destruction of people cannot be avoided. As an alternative, propaganda of "easy war", rehabilitation of militarism, etc. is proposed. ... Eloquent proof of this is a whole series of films about "space wars" that appeared in the late 70s and early 80s ... in which future wars are shown as a kind of attraction. These films are by no means harmless. ... they have the ability to stun, overwhelm and serve the interests of American ideological expansion. ... All these and many other models of cinema spectacles directed against the cause of peace, humanism, like anti-Soviet films, are a reflection of the deep spiritual crisis of modern capitalism (Chernenko, 1983: 16-17).

In a similar vein, the article of the film critic I. Kokorev was sustained. He noted that Hollywood of the early 1980s was characterized by "a more sophisticated method of manipulating public consciousness based on a differentiated approach to the viewer. The old principle of "brainwashing" was replaced by, in the words of the futurologist Alvin Toffler, "de-massification", that is, shooting according to the principle of separating warheads aimed at different audiences – youth, black, women, pensioners, rural, conservative, etc. Thus, the dominant ideology is trying to intercept and neutralize the mass mood of discontent, directing them into channels that are safe for the existing system, gradually controlling the agitated and politically fragmented audience in the interests of the ruling class. This is how the youth get their "rebellious" films, supposedly subverting bourgeois morality, and at the same time family values; participants in the anti-war movement – anti-war films, militarists – militarist films: the women's movement of the 70s has a whole line of so-called women's films: for those who suffer from nostalgia for a "cloudless" past – pictures in the "retro" style and so on, and other ... The social roots of such fragmentation should be sought in the growing polarization of American society in connection with the problems of inflation and unemployment, the threatening rampant crime, the fall in US prestige in the world and the dangerous militarization of foreign policy" (Kokorev, 1983: 17).

Of particular concern to the *Soviet Screen* caused "aggression of violence and sex on the commercial screens of the world".

Film critic I. Weisfeld (1909-2003), for example, wrote in this case we are talking about a phenomenon that has assumed the scale of a moral disaster in the life of modern bourgeois

society. It has an impact not only on aesthetic tastes, demeanor, but also on the spiritual appearance of the audience. ... Of course, the escalation of violence and sex on the screen is directly caused by the laws of commercial filmmaking, the speculative considerations of the producers. They may simply not accept a film from the director if it does not contain erotica and violence (Weisfeld, 1973: 2).

At the same time, a problem arises: Western artists, who sincerely want to expose the vice, to show the inhumanity of imperialist aggression, the hypocrisy of bourgeois morality, often stop in difficulty: where is the line that separates, say, the display of cruelty with the aim of condemning it from such a display that this cruelty aestheticize? But the question of the line separating art from non-art also arises when the artist seeks to show the beauty of human feelings in their entirety, psychological and physical, the happiness of love or its tragedy with striking sharpness, non-trivially, but in any case, in world cinema there is a situation of struggle, and not a passive subordination of art to anti-art, of a progressive principle to a reactionary one. The contamination of the screen with pornography and sadism is strongly protested by honest artists, by critics (Weisfeld 1973: 2-3).

Based on the task of condemning the display of violence on the screen, the *Soviet Screen* published articles on its pages telling about the dangers of horror films (Moroz..., 1969, etc.).

In particular, film critic G. Bogemsky (1920-1995) also wrote about this. He began his article by emphasizing that in Italy in the early 1970s, the most common genre of commercial cinema spectacle remains the homegrown cowboy film, or 'pasta western' as it is derisively called abroad. Much has already been written about these purely conventional films, devoid of any national character and imbued with unbridled cruelty, which unexpectedly received an incredibly wide distribution in Italian cinema about five or six years ago (Bogemsky, 1973: 18).

And then there was a transition to the fact that an Italian horror film uses all the finds, tricks and situations of directors who specialized in this genre – Hitchcock, Clouseau, Polanski. “These films are both “scary”, and detective, and sexy at the same time. And some of them – even with a certain touch of “intellectual” and “psychological” a la Antonioni. ... I would call these films rather drug films. They fool the viewer. To make you afraid means to make you stop thinking. Film product creators often state that their films allegedly stand outside of ideology, that they are a conditional movie spectacle, a kind of “game” between the director and the audience. I agree, it's a game, but the game is dirty enough. It is conducted, undoubtedly, for ideological purposes, in the direct interests of those who want to lull people's mind and conscience” (Bogemsky, 1973: 18).

The article of the journalist V. Reznichenko (1945-2010) was also devoted to the condemnation of Western commercial cinema: “Come to us to freshen up!” movie posters call. But is cinema really “refreshing”? ... Movies – those defined by the prefixes “sex” and “porn” are scattered around the movie poster. All these movies, starting with the pseudo-exotic French *Emmanuelle* (France, 1974) and ending with the Swedish primitives..., are stamped according to the same stencil. The names of the heroines are changing and, of course, the dimensions of the actresses who play their roles. Everything else – situations and plots – is the same, like banknotes, for the sake of which only they are created. “Porn-boom” ... sharply declined: simply the audience was tired. However, advertising persists, promises more and more “hot” spectacles – the film business does not want to back down. Next to the naked flesh, bleeding human flesh appears on the screen. Cannibals chew it with gusto in raw and fried form. They also show a certain medieval countess taking a tonic bath of fresh maiden blood; “donor” girls tear each other to pieces in front of an astonished spectator. ... On the screen they shoot, beat, torture, rape and burn. Monsters are angry, evil spirits are writhing. Both on earth and in space, in the recent past and in the distant future. Always and everywhere, says the commercial screen, vice and animal passion rule the world (Reznichenko, 1976: 16-17).

Of course, in the era of the “sexual revolution” *Soviet Screen* did not get tired of fighting cinematic pornography.

For example, journalist A. Kuleshov (1921-1990) complained that the screens of Paris were filled with porn films, and that even quite decent directors in the past could not resist the temptation to make films of this kind (Kuleshov, 1976: 18-19).

The journalist Y. Komov fully agreed with him (Komov, 1978: 18; 1979: 18), arguing that seducing little girls with firebirds, movie dealers make them undress on the screen, go to bed with men, shout monstrous curses, pretend to be prostitutes, victims of collective rape. The

Soviet Screen introduced its readers to the fate of thirteen-year-old Marilyn Hemingway, who appeared in openly pornographic episodes of the film *Lipstick* (USA, 1976). We can also recall the twelve-year-old Jodie Foster, whom the creators of the film *Taxi Driver* (USA, 1976) in order to "gain experience" and "enter the image" of a juvenile "street girl" before filming drove through the lush areas of New York (Komov, 1979: 18).

Film critic A. Plakhov continued the topic of condemning the sexual exploitation of children in Western cinema on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*: "Respect for the country of childhood, for the moral world of a young person has always been inherent in humanistic cinema. We see something different in today's bourgeois cinema. From the screen they openly preach the false aesthetics of "permissiveness", immorality and lack of spirituality. And increasingly, children are becoming the targets of shameless and cynical commercial exploitation. ... The numbers of child and juvenile delinquency in the West are growing at an alarming rate today. And, as if competing with them, the Western screen demonstrates an unprecedented escalation of immorality and cruelty. The wave of violence, pornography and sexomania that has swept through bourgeois cinema erodes not only the generally accepted age-old concepts of the boundaries of decency, but also the remnants of humanistic values that feed art. ...

Arguments in favor of such plots are also found among those Western ideologists who declare the right and duty of art to interpret the problems of real life. Don't child prostitution, parental sadism, early crime and even child trafficking flourish in Western Europe and the USA? From this it is concluded that these shameful phenomena for a civilized society are quite legitimate to reflect on the screen. Meanwhile, sociologists have long noted the direct impact of cinematic cruelty, the notorious "sexual revolution" on the moral atmosphere of society, especially on young people. It turns out a vicious circle: rampant immorality and violence in life and on the screen mutually stimulate each other. ...

The heroine of the young Linda Blair, who played in William Friedkin's film *The Exorcist* (USA, 1973) ..., appears at first on the screen as a charming girl, and then before our eyes – in the literal sense of the word – turns into a disgusting monster, inside which "settled" the devil. The movie abounds in detail, in detail, shot scenes of rampage of the victim of evil spirits, with curses and beatings...

The most outspoken forms of mysticism and occult hysteria coexist on the bourgeois screen with rehashings of the Christian myth of the Antichrist. The son of Satan is born already in the relatively old film by Roman Polanski *Rosemary's Baby* (USA, 1968), in the film *The Omen* (USA, 1976) (directed by Richard Donner) the offspring of evil spirits appears in the form of an angelic five-year-old boy (Plakhov, 1983: 17).

As a result, A. Plakhov came to the Marxist-Leninist conclusion that "while pseudo-philosophical disputes are being conducted on the screen, whether children's vices are tricks of nature or intrigues of Satan, life gives irrefutable evidence that their real reason is social ill-being, an atmosphere of moral permissiveness and cynicism. In forcing this atmosphere, in closing the vicious circle of spiritual contradictions, Western cinema continues to make its contribution, in which the deepest crisis of bourgeois ideology and bourgeois public consciousness is directly reflected" (Plakhov, 1983: 17).

Responding to the "Star Wars" program put forward by the United States in the early 1980s, the writer E. Parnov (1935-2009) in his article on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* denounced Hollywood space cinema fiction: "The transgalactic field on which *Star Wars* (USA, 1977) is deployed and their sequel – *The Empire Strikes Back* (USA, 1980), socially copies modern capitalist reality. ... And this is no coincidence. Behind the semi-fabulous props, there is a clearly set goal to impose on an audience of one hundred or more million people! – a stereotype of the future, which, in principle, does not differ from the present. ... contemporary American fiction radiates a directed stream of tension and fear. ... There are more than enough sources for fear. Here and uncertainty about the future, and constant inflation, and unemployment, and unrest in Negro neighborhoods, and an increase in crime. ... Such a fantasy ... reflecting the echo of fear spilled in society, softens it, bringing to the fore the fairy-tale hero – a simple American guy... This hero turned out to be a real find for the creators of film adventures in a fantasy world. With its help, masquerading as the most modern genre, lightweight adventure fiction seeks to distract people from serious reflections about the future and from the real battle for their tomorrow (Parnov, 1982: 16-17).

The USSR and the USA met 1984 at the next peak of ideological confrontation, so it is clear that Western media and cinema, in particular, could not get past George Orwell's anti-totalitarian novel *1984*, which was published in 1949, banned in the USSR, but widely discussed in Western countries. A new wave of discussions about this novel logically broke out in 1984.

Film critic O. Sulkin, who worked at that time in the editorial office of the *Soviet Screen*, believed that "the hype around the novel" had "a clear class, political background. The bursting verbal-organizational storm has quite a certain poisonous aftertaste. Reactionaries of all shades are in a hurry to list Orwell as their ally. ... The writer's morbid fantasies ... were included in the asset of the "psychological war" against the USSR and other socialist countries. But time puts a lot in its place. And today, in the "year of Orwell", when it is so tempting to speculate "it came true or it didn't come true", the voices of those who come to the conclusion that the science fiction writer's prophecies are gaining ground, but ... in the world of capital, are getting louder in the West. ... One of the most sinister symbols of the book is the image of "Big Brother", the head of the regime, invisible and omnipotent. The world where he rules seems to be turned upside down: The "Ministry of Truth" sows lies and slander, the "Ministry of Love" spreads terror, the "Ministry of Peace" kindles wars... The parallels suggest themselves. It is no coincidence that in connection with the US aggression against Grenada, *The New York Times* noted, not without sarcasm, that Reagan had surpassed Orwell. The invasion of Grenada by American imperialism is, after all, in the style of "Big Brother", and the thoroughly false arguments in its defense seem to have been cured in the offices of the "Ministry of Truth". And the apocalyptic plans to turn the planet into an atomic cemetery? What about neutron weapons? What about the planned Star Wars?" (Sulkin, 1984: 20-21).

In 1985, the *Soviet Screen* again returned to the condemnation of Western film interpretations of the theme of the Second World War.

Film critic L. Melville recalled that the films *The Night Porter* (*Il portiere di notte*, Italy-France, 1973) and *Lacombe Lucien* (France-Italy-FRG, 1973) caused a heated discussion and sharp protests of veterans of the Resistance, outraged by the hidden justification of both vile servanthood and fascism, which in these movies was explained by the hidden sadomasochistic complex allegedly lurking in the depths of the soul of every person, suggesting the possibility of only two states of the human personality – "executioner" or "victim" (Melville, 1985: 20).

And then it was reasonably noted that film commerce lives according to laws that are very far from moral norms. And the aforementioned movies, tendentious in direction, but performed at a fairly high professional level, were followed by a whole series of disgusting films that received the name "swastika-porn". ... in these movies, leather uniforms, whips and torture served only as an unusual shocking background for trivial pornographic plots. However, in this case, not only the moral sense of the spectators was subjected to corruption, but also their political and historical consciousness, which was inspired by far from harmless examples of the actual apology of fascism (Melville, 1985: 20).

L. Melville also sharply criticized the painting *Patton* (USA, 1970), imbued with a "frankly militaristic spirit", "in the center of which is a general who is infinitely "in love" with the war, one of the commanders of the American troops during World War II. For the authors, the fight against fascism is clearly a secondary concept, just a decoration (Melville, 1985: 20).

Similar examples were cited in the article by V. Ivanov: Film fake *The Bunker* (USA-France, 1980) called it a documentary drama. ... The shameful and pitiful details of the departure of the Fuhrer and his relatives into oblivion are presented as a "pathetic spectacle." ... It is not clear what is more in it – the zoological hatred of the authors of the current muddy brew for the Soviet Union or attempts to slander everyone who took part in the fight against fascism. *The Bunker* deforms the historical truth beyond recognition. Slanderous movies of this kind are actively used in the "psychological warfare" waged by Western propaganda centers against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. ... The movie *Hitler's Career* (*Hitler - Eine Karriere*, FRG, 1977) was staged in Germany. There is not a word about the atrocities of the Nazis, about the anti-fascist struggle. Instead, the audience is regaled with scenes of parades, the combat "exploits" of the Wehrmacht, filmed by order of Goebbels propaganda. ... The "Hitleromania" that has now engulfed the West is a multifaceted phenomenon, and the whitewashing of fascism with the help of the screen is carried out by a variety of methods. ... The viewer is stuffed with rigged footage for the sole purpose of placing the blame for all the horrors of the war unleashed by Hitler's fascism on those who became the object of aggression. The thesis about the "suffering

of the Germans" has long been persistently exaggerated by Western propaganda, which does everything to ensure that the masses do not know the truth about the crimes of the fascist invaders. It is monstrous, but true, four decades after the defeat of fascism in Germany, the Goebbels newsreel of 1941-1942 is again shown. And not at gatherings of Nazi underdogs, but on television, all over the country. Frames are coming: burning cities and villages of Belarus. Ukraine. Russia... And the Nazi announcer goes into a heart-rending cry – about the fight against the "communist threat", the "red danger". The purpose of such blasphemous "retro" is quite obvious. The Nazi chronicle shamelessly mounts an unbridled campaign over the imaginary "Soviet threat" (Ivanov, 1985: 20-21).

The American action movie *Red Dawn* (USA, 1984) was also justifiably criticized in the *Soviet Screen*: "The Hollywood movie-making *Red Dawn* broke all records in terms of piling up absurdities and terry anti-Sovietism. ... And how else would you order to evaluate the plot, where "Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan"(!) paratroopers land in the United States and brutally crack down on American civilians. Of course, they cannot do without a "happy ending" in Hollywood: a handful of American schoolchildren who "went into the partisans" manage to defeat the "occupation troops". The artistic merits of this dirty opus do not deserve any detailed analysis. A very disturbing circumstance forces us to talk about it: this extremely primitive film ... is heavily advertised by American propaganda ... So, strenuously inflating the myth of the "Soviet military threat", the ideologists of aggression and militarism resort to the services of a cinematography mixed with lies and misanthropy. ... The militaristic and chauvinistic movie lie is aimed at sowing enmity and hatred towards the peoples of the socialist countries, serving as a smoke screen for the aggressive plans of the US and NATO administrations, which are fraught with the most dangerous consequences for humanity" (Vasin, 1985: 18-19).

- articles on the history of Western cinema

In general, it can be noted that there were few materials on the history of Western cinematography on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* in the period 1969-1985.

Basically, these were quite positive articles about the work of directors and actors of the era of the Great Mute: Georges Méliès (Yakubovich, 1984: 22); David Griffith (Yutkevich, 1981: 14-15; Yakubovich, 1984: 22); Max Linder (Trauberg, 1982: 18); Greta Garbo (Rubanova, 1982: 16-17); Asta Nielsen (Trauberg, 1983: 18).

In rare cases, these were notes about actors of a relatively recent time period: Gerard Philipe (Amlinsky, 1983: 18-19) and Johnny Weissmuller (Krach..., 1983).

In this regard, the materials of the *Soviet Screen* practically did not differ from those that were published on the pages of the magazine in the 1960s.

- biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors

The principle of choosing cinematographers for writing creative portraits of Western actors and directors in 1969-1985 remained the same in the *Soviet Screen*. One could write mainly about "progressive filmmakers" (almost) unnoticed in negative statements against the USSR and participation in anti-Soviet films. Even better, if these filmmakers came to the Moscow International Film Festival and spoke positively about the Soviet Union.

In this regard, the figure of Charles Chaplin (1889-1977) was still out of competition (Chaplin ..., 1969; Khutsiev, 1976: 20-21; Yakovlev, 1978: 20-21), since a witness to the grandiose changes and cataclysms of modern times, Chaplin was able to see, deeply understand the social processes of our era and reflect them in films (Yakovlev, 1978 20-21). "Chaplin is immortal because he is you and me, that part of our soul where someone else's pain and disorder, human misfortune and sadness will always find a response" (Khutsiev, 1976: 21).

Film critic E. Kartseva (1928-2002) on the whole respectfully spoke on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* about the creative path of the Hollywood classic William Wyler (1902-1981), praising his films *Dead End* (USA, 1937), *The Little Foxes* (USA, 1941), *The Best Years of Our Lives* (USA, 1946). At the same time, the article by E. Kartseva emphasized that the significance of Wyler's work is not limited to the artistic merits of his films. There is one more, extremely important circumstance. Wyler has staged commercial films more than once, but in all his many years of work in the cinema he has not directed a single reactionary or deliberately tendentious work. On the contrary, during the years of the democratization of public life in the United States under Roosevelt, Wyler was one of those who created critical, social films (Kartseva, 1969: 13).

Traditionally, the *Soviet Screen* also had a positive attitude towards "the most progressive" (after Chaplin, of course) of American directors – Stanley Kramer (1913-2001),

since the work of this outstanding master has always permeated and continues to permeate the progressive ideas of humanism, the rejection of cruelty, violence, and the humiliation of human dignity. ... he has always been and remains a decent person and an honest cinematographer, aware of his responsibility to people, to contemporary society (Andreev, 1983: 16-17).

After the drama *The Chase* (USA, 1966) was shown on Soviet screens, its director, Arthur Penn (1922-2010), was also enrolled by the Soviet film press in the ranks of "progressive filmmakers", although the film critic (at that time not yet a professor and culturologist) M. Yampolsky clarified that "here, Penn's realism was shackled by traditional Hollywood thinking. On the one hand, *The Chase*, which tells the tragic story of how Sheriff Calder tries to resist the collective madness of the inhabitants of a small Texas town who lynch a man and fails, the theme of social injustice, the helplessness of the law in a world of cruelty and violence, is loudly stated. On the other hand, the film sings a hymn to a noble loner, ... a servant of the law, so familiar to the audience from the same Hollywood stereotypes" (Yampolsky, 1978: 16).

M. Yampolsky was even more critical of A. Penn's film *Bonnie and Clyde* (USA, 1967): "The movie is complex, contradictory. ... Everything would be simple if the main characters were not bandits, calmly using weapons. Trying to destroy the mythology of gangster cinema, Penn this time quite consciously created a new mythology. This is especially clear in the example of how a director who is not afraid of violent scenes presents scenes of murder. ... The aestheticization of the material is emphasized not only by the cold visual beauty of the film, but also by the special elegance of the clothes of the characters" (Yampolsky, 1978: 16).

As a result, M. Yampolsky concluded that the struggle with the mythology of American cinema eventually turned into a new myth for the director. The fetters of the system, which Arthur Penn wanted but could not break, led this talented American director to a sad conclusion about the inevitability of these fetters (Yampolsky, 1978: 17).

The work of the director Joseph Strick (1923-2010) was highly appreciated in the *Soviet Screen*, as his film *Interviews with My Lai Veterans* (USA, 1971) "is impossible to watch without excitement. In it, American soldiers, participants in the massacre of the civilian population of the village of Song My in Vietnam, tell about their crimes from the screen. ... Joseph Strick, one of the famous American directors, turned to documentaries for a reason. His denunciatory American way of life, sharply critical position was determined ... when the unusual film *The Savage Eye* (USA, 1959) was released on the screens of cinema and television ... The theme of man's loneliness in the bourgeois world ran through the entire film. The cruel world was shown with hatred, bitterness and contempt. ... The active social and critical position that pervades Joseph Strick's work, his desire to make maximum use of the expressive possibilities of fiction and documentary cinema make him one of the most brilliant representatives of the new American cinema art, which entered the struggle against reaction and militarism" (Abramov, 1972: 18).

A completely different assessment on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* was received by the work of director David Cronenberg, so it "reflects the deepest crisis of bourgeois consciousness. In his feverish imagination, monstrous fantasies pass incessantly, interspersed with no less terrifying realities of today. The "free" world is trying to manipulate the feelings and thoughts of millions of viewers. ... Horror films of the "Canadian butcher" are just one of many forms of influence of bourgeois ideology on the mass audience. At all costs, at any cost, they try to distract him from the real problems of the capitalist society of unemployment, social inequality, and the arms race" (Komov, 1982: 18).

The only Western screenwriter about whom two large positive articles were published in the *Soviet Screen* was one of the "fathers of neorealism" Cesare Zavattini (1902-1989): "First of all, we associate with this name Italian films, works of a progressive direction ... In fact, this outstanding screenwriter, both in Italy and abroad, was rightly considered the "brain of neorealism": after all, about fifty films... Together De Sica and Zavattini created masterpieces of Italian cinema" (Bogemsky, 1972: 14-15).

Film critic G. Bogemsky (1920-1995) emphasized with pleasure that C. Zavattini was not only a screenwriter and theorist of the new Italian cinema, not only the author of hundreds of articles, essays, reports, not only the "brain", but also the "hands" of cinema – he, endowed with a sober, truly popular common sense, a practitioner, an indefatigable worker. ... Cesare Zavattini is faithful to the choice he once made – always and everywhere he is on the side of the new, progressive, just (Bogemsky, 1979: 19-20).

Among the Italian directors of creative portraits on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine of the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s, Vittorio De Sica (1901-1974) (Solovieva, Shitova, 1976: 18-19), Luchino Visconti (1906-1976) (Solovieva, Shitova, 1977: 18-19), Francesco Rosi (1922-2015), Federico Fellini (1920-1993) (Bobrova, 1983: 17-18) and Michelangelo Antonioni (1912-2007) (Bogemsky, 1981: 17).

So E. Victorova, logically emphasized the political / ideological component in the work of F. Rosi: “Politics that became cinema. The civic passion that has become cinema – this, I think, is the pathos of Rosie's work. Many of his films have become a model of political cinema, having a lasting transformative impact on other progressive masters of the West, on young Italian directors. ... This and his consistent appeal to the life of the peasants is a deep interest in the historical, spiritual destinies of people from the people. And next to it is a no less consistent exposure of the bourgeois authorities and the mafia. ... The idea of overthrowing the social evil of exposing Italian and international reaction in the name of the triumph of justice and truth, in the name of a future without weapons, without wars, continues to dominate Francesco Rosi, an artist, a man of great civic courage and talent” (Victorova, 1982: 17-18) .

It should be noted here that if the *Soviet Screen* spoke highly of V. De Sica and L. Visconti before (Bozhovich, 1967; Rubanova, 1966: 19; Shitova, 1962), but the frequent criticism of the work of F. Fellini and M. Antonioni, which the magazine allowed itself in the 1960s, was replaced by other trends.

In particular, the film critic G. Bogemsky (1920-1995) wrote about the films of Michelangelo Antonioni in a quite positive way, noting that Antonioni's paintings showed the tragedy of loneliness, spiritual callousness, lack of understanding between people in the bourgeois world. Concepts that only psychologists and sociologists had previously used, such as “human alienation”, “lack of communication” have come into use in film criticism (Bogemsky, 1981: 17).

And film critic O. Bobrova emphasized that “the recognized masterpieces of Fellini ... are not only the stages of his work, but also the stages of the development of language, poetics and even cinema theory. Becoming a phenomenon of world cinematography, each of these films at the same time became an occasion for fierce disputes about the fundamental problems of cinematography, directly or indirectly reflecting certain aspects of modern Italian reality, refracted through the prism of the personality of a very large and original artist. Fellini is one of the most talented, original and one of the most controversial cinematographers of the West: tragic, gloomy, restless and at the same time bright, life-affirming, poetic; complex, confusing and entangled in the contradictions of capitalist reality, but also one of the most implacable critics of capitalism. He combines full-blooded everyday realism with conventionality, symbolism, and the grotesque. Reality is filtered through the lyrical self of the artist, and is colored now with soft humor, then with sincere and warm sympathy for the poor and destitute, then turns into a terrible phantasmagoria of chaos, angrily satirical exposure of the existing order” (Bobrova, 1983: 17-18).

Among the French directors, *Soviet Screen* also tried to choose, first of all, "time-tested" classics.

For example, film critic A. Braginsky (1920-2016) wrote about René Clair (1898-1981) as follows: “We have before us an amazing example of a director who did not succumb to the temptations of a fast-moving fashion, did not repaint from a “conservative” to an “innovator” and vice versa, who managed to maintain throughout his life a sequence of aesthetic tastes dictated not only by his own positions in art ... All the work of René Clair confirms the idea that cinema, even entertaining, should elevate a person, help him understand himself. Isn't it characteristic that in none of his films René Clair ever humiliates a person. He makes fun of negative characters – and nothing more” (Braginsky, 1979: 16-17). At the same time, René Clair was a true artist-creator. It is not only that he united in one person a director and a screenwriter, but also that his films constitute a special world where everything is connected by the unity of outlook and style, an integral, though changing, evolving conception of reality (Braginsky, 1981: 18).

Film critic V. Dmitriev highly praised the work of Alain Resnais (1922-2014), including *My American Uncle* (*Mon oncle d'Amérique*. France, 1980), including this picture among his best works (Dmitriev, 1984: 20). And N. Pankratova spoke warmly about the films of Jacques Demy (1931-1990) (Pankratova, 1977).

In general, the work of Francois Truffaut (1932-1984) was rated quite highly (albeit with reservations) in the *Soviet Screen*:

"Truffaut is reproached: starting with a masterpiece and from the heights of a universally significant theme – *400 blows* (*Les quadrants coups*. France, 1959) are remembered by all – he embarked on the path of concessions. They reproach him: he makes films for the market. This is true. And not so. Films for the market? Certainly. Sensitive and engaging. Welcomingly accessible in its form. Willingly keeping within the limits of traditional "coffee" genres ... There are dangers here, and Truffaut did not escape them. Sometimes he is cutesy; flirting with unpretentiousness. Flaunts the amount of art spent on trifles. But moreover, this art itself is genuine" (Soloviova, Shitova, 1973: 5-6).

400 Blows is his first feature film, "which informed the world about the birth of an outstanding director ... But neither a successful debut nor the opportunity to tell about the sorrows of his childhood in the first work brought complete satisfaction. ... Truffaut said that one must be cunning and dexterous in order to dodge the embrace of sentimentality. But it seems to me that in *Stolen Kisses* (*Baisers volés*. France, 1968) he outwitted himself. In the grace and ease with which the director touches the fate of the young man, there is no pathos, but there is nothing truly touching either. ... *Wild Child* (*L'Enfant sauvage*. France, 1970) seems to be made in opposition to *Stolen Kisses*. There are no smiles in him, no "arts" – he is serious to the point of didacticism, to the point of scientificity. ... Comic form of *Pocket Money* (*L'Argent de Poche*. France, 1976), a seemingly gliding touch on the problem gave some viewers (and experts, perhaps, too) the impression that a kind of bourgeois complacency prevails in the picture ... Truffaut ... shows adults that they, either chuckling or nervously angry, in essence, simply ignore the world of children" (Alexandrov, 1977: 4).

It is interesting to note that the *Soviet Screen* in the first half of the 1980s wrote quite positively about Luis Buñuel (1900-1983), although before the "perestroika" times not a single one of his films appeared in the mass film distribution of the USSR (*The Modest Charm of the Bourgeoisie / Le Charme discret de la bourgeoisie*. France-Italy-Spain, 1972) was only released in Soviet theaters in 1987).

Film expert T. Vetrova reasonably wrote that Buñuel's films resist detailed interpretation, because they embody that magical "secret" in the art of cinema, which, as the director himself repeatedly emphasized, is the essence of poetry for him and is characteristic of every true work of art. ... In his latest films, close in genre to comedies and filled with toxic irony towards the bourgeoisie, the rebellious spirit of denial prevails, however, it does not interfere with a close, vigilant look at things, their essence, their underside. ... Luis Buñuel has a rare gift of constant search, which invariably endows his art with an attractive force. A wise master never teaches with his paintings, using the right of an elder – he simply talks about what worries him in a person, in society, shows what he does not want to put up with, against which he does not get tired of rebelling. His art is imbued with true humanism, although this humanism is expressed, as a rule, in the form of a fierce rejection of the bourgeois world (Vetrova, 1980: 16-17).

In a more traditional for the "ideologically consistent" Soviet film studies, the then editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen* D. Orlov (1935-2021) wrote about L. Buñuel, arguing that this figure is complex, contradictory. His work reflected the dialectics of the time that gave birth to him. It contains the tragedy of skepticism and pessimism, so characteristic of many talented artists of the bourgeois world, but it also contains a vividly expressed protest against everything that prevents a human being from unfolding and blossoming, sincerely expressed compassion, hope, faith in the high ultimate destiny of the individual (Orlov, 1984: 20).

Article by film critic M. Sulkin about the director Wolfgang Staudte (1906-1984) was more ideological. It stated that "The fate of Staudte in Federal Germany was difficult. After all, the main products of German cinema are "commercial films": westerns, erotic paintings, works that poison the viewer with the poison of revanchism. ... In this situation, in order to get at least some opportunity to implement an important topic, Staudte had to make compromises, yielding to the requirements of the producers" (Sulkin, 1984: 21).

Approximately in the same vein, the *Soviet Screen* wrote about the work of another famous German director Kurt Hoffmann (1910-2001): "In the film *We are geeks* (*Wir Wunderkinder*. FRG, 1958), pamphlet and drama, satire and variety art, lyrics and comedy were mixed. ... in the filmmaker's work, films that combine buffoonery and burlesque with sharp political content are replaced by frankly entertaining films. They have the same techniques, the

same brilliant mastery of cinematic form, a cascade of witty tricks, subtle powers of observation. But the object worthy of ridicule disappears, the big social theme, the caustic irony that make up the strength of the director. But in the comedy *Ghosts in the Spessart Castle (Das Spukschloß im Spessart*. FRG, 1960) "different genres are mixed, a musical comedy, political satire, a drama from the "count's life", or, rather, a parody of it, an incredible adventure, an eccentric clowning... But a funny, light and cheerful performance made not only laugh, but also think. what Hoffmann hates and ridicules is burgher complacency, saber-rattling. Kurt Hoffmann once again demonstrated his brilliant ability to talk cheerfully about serious things, funny about sad things, caustically and evilly about, with which it is impossible to put up with" (Vesely ..., 1973: 16).

Thinking about creativity Margaret von Trotta, film critic E. Gromov (1931-2005), noted that she "has a feminine insight, she knows how to look deeply into the essence of the phenomena she depicts and is not in a hurry with conclusions and assessments. ... I am attracted by the seriousness and anxiety that permeate Margareta von Trotta's reflections on the complex, contradictory problems of our time ... It is complex and contradictory, this is her path. And it is not easy for her to resist the pressure of commercial cinema. How difficult it is to win your audience, to achieve wide public recognition. I would very much like her to stay in the saddle, so that her name remains among the names of progressive masters of foreign cinema" (Gromov, 1985: 20-22).

An article about the work of the Swedish director Bo Wiederberg (1930-1997) fully reflected the Soviet ideological demands of the 1970s. It emphasized that Wiederberg became one of the greatest filmmakers in Sweden because his film *Crow's Quarter (Kvarteret Korpen*. Sweden, 1963) described with documentary veracity about the atmosphere that prevails in a family of ordinary workers, *Odalen-31 (Ådalen'31*. Sweden, 1969) is dedicated to one of the most significant episodes in the history of the Swedish labor movement, and *Elvira Madigan* (Sweden, 1967) tells about the tragedy of lovers who find themselves in a hopeless situation from -for the sanctimonious morality of bourgeois society (Alisenin, 1973: 4-5).

One of the favorite plots of the *Soviet Screen* in the framework of foreign topics is Western actors, like "victims of Hollywood", evidence of "the tragedy of the artist in the bourgeois world" (Chto..., 1969: 17). In this vein, the magazine wrote about Judy Garland (1922-1969) and Marilyn Monroe (1926-1962) (Chto..., 1969: 17).

And if any of the Western actors was involved in the creation of anti-Soviet films and / or movies "glorifying the American military", the magazine could strike at him on its pages with "heavy artillery". Such a fate awaited Hollywood actor and director John Wayne (1907-1979), who made "blacklists" of progressive figures in American cinema and did not hesitate to include his personal enemies in them – people, neither which social movements are not involved (Makarov, 1970: 16-17).

A logical condemnation in the magazine received the film by J. Wayne *The Green Berets* (USA, 1968): "The anti-human nature of the militant was so obvious that a sharply negative reaction from the progressive public immediately followed. ... The essence of this dirty film is the glorification of aggression in Vietnam, an attempt to compose an anthem in honor of the killers and saboteurs from the so-called special forces, wearing green berets, thugs whom even bourgeois journalists compare with the SS. ... The film cost the author nothing – the Pentagon provided free military equipment, people, advisers and the territory of the training camp ... for filming. The Pentagon bet on the right horse; Wayne repeatedly declared himself "a soldier you can count on", and once even loudly demanded that an atomic bomb be dropped on the Soviet people" (Makarov, 1970: 16-17).

But the work of another famous Hollywood actor – Charles Bronson (1921-2003) was not so unambiguously assessed in the *Soviet Screen*.

On the one hand, it was noted that Charles Bronson's stunning triumph was brought by the lead role in the film *Death Wish* (USA, 1974). But *Death Wish* "impresses fans who like to surround cars crashing into each other in a tight ring and stare at people sprawled on the pavement. ... But with the growth of products like *Death Wish*, the audience with such tastes is becoming more and more" (Chudov, 1975: 13).

But on the other hand, it was emphasized that moviegoers willingly watch movies with the participation of Bronson, because they are waiting for obligatory sharp spectacles, when in the center of everything there is a hero who is fluent in karate or kung fu, throwing a knife with

equal dexterity or doing dizzying tricks by helicopter... Yes, Bronson's films did not become an art phenomenon, they did not go beyond genre stereotypes. And yet let us look again at that tired, intelligent face. Behind narrowed eyes, a firm gaze, there is undoubtedly something more than what can be seen in the image of Bronson's hero (Avdeenko, 1979: 18).

But still, as before, the main stake of the foreign department of the magazine *Soviet Screen* was made on the so-called "progressive filmmakers" who were not seen in films that were undesirable for Soviet ideology.

So on the pages of the magazine it was stated that Laurence Olivier (1907-1989) undoubtedly has the reputation of a great artist. Excellent technique, impeccable command of the voice, unusually beautiful and strong. Perfected plasticity of movement. ... The talent of reincarnation. An unlimited range of roles... He is a living classic (Slova..., 1969).

Approximately in the same positive spirit, the articles about Burt Lancaster (1913-1994) were sustained (Kartseva, 1970: 16-17; Frolov, 1979: 18): Lancaster creates a whole gallery of portraits, almost always they are people of active action, strong, courageous: they uncompromisingly defend the ideals of goodness and justice. The actor prefers films that make viewers seriously think about the most burning problems, and in the first place – war and peace. ... The persistence with which Lancaster developed the key theme of his work, anti-war, for many years is truly worthy of admiration and respect (Frolov, 1979: 18).

Anti-war sentiments were also accentuated in the creative portrait of Marlon Brando (1924-2004), who, in the role of the sheriff in *The Chase* (USA, 1966) expressed moods of discontent and protest against the ugly phenomena of American reality (Lyndina, 1972: 16).

Film critic E. Lyndina (1933-2022) further wrote with admiration that in 1969, Brando publicly expressed his protest against the attitude towards blacks that was established in America ... Marlon Brando is not limited to speaking from the podium. He openly participated in Negro demonstrations. He called the assassination of Martin Luther King "the most vile atrocity of the century." He was among the participants in the anti-war campaign against Washington. He starred in *Queimada* (Italy-France, 1969) by Gillo Pontecorvo, a film dedicated to the problems of the national liberation movement. He opposes films that glorify the Vietnam War. Remaining a bourgeois artist, ... he expresses in his works and public speeches the anxieties of today's America, the pain for people maimed by a world of evil and violence, the disappointment in ideals that have proven false and fake (Lyndina, 1972: 16-17).

Recognizing that the singer and actor Dean Reed (1938-1986) was significantly inferior to Hollywood stars in skill, N. Lagina wrote in the *Soviet Screen* that following Pete Seeger, Joan Baez and other singers who gave their talent to the fight for peace, Dean Reed became a frequent visitor to various American (and later not only American) prisons. But it was not possible to hide him in prison for a long time – his courageous art evokes too wide a response (Lagina, 1972: 14).

An active democratic civic position and anti-war activity came to the fore in the materials of the magazine about the actress Jane Fonda (Frolov, 1980; Rezinkov, 1973).

Here it was noted with satisfaction that although Fonda at first fell into the plan of the bourgeois aesthetic concepts of Roger Vadim, who considers cinema a means of emancipating viewers from traditional morality and therefore frankly showing sexual scenes in his films, but then she changed her mind and joined the movement for rights Indians and Negroes, for ending the war in Vietnam (Rezinkov, 1973).

In a very positive and again clearly "ideologically consistent" manner, the *Soviet Screen* also analyzed the creative path of another famous Hollywood actor – Kirk Douglas (1916-2020), one of whose most famous characters is the legendary Spartak, withfighting with society, he does not seek contacts with lies, he denies society, confident that it can become different and will someday become better, more righteous. That is why he is able to rally the people humiliated and crushed by slavery (Lyndina, 1971: 16-17).

Film critic R. Sobolev (1926-1991) also highly appreciated the work of another Hollywood star – George Scott (1927-1999), the greatest actor of contemporary cinema in the USA: the connection with time, the interest in the problems that American society lives in, characteristic of Scott's work, completely reveal the secret of his success. But Scott's exceptional professionalism cannot be underestimated (Sobolev, 1974: 16-17).

In connection with the release of the large-scale production of S. Bondarchuk's *Waterloo* (Italy-USSR, 1969), the *Soviet Screen* turned on its pages to the work of the American actor Rod Steiger (1925-2002), who brilliantly played a role in this drama Napoleon: "Turning, turning

points of human destinies – this is Rod Steiger's favorite topic. ... In Napoleon, as Steiger paints him, there is no aristocracy, even more so, "gentlemanship". A heavy body, an unshaven face, a filthy overcoat, heavy boots – all this would fit a soldier more than an emperor. He is impatient, impulsive and passionate. He does not want to wait, he is used to quick and brilliant victories. ... At the same time, the actor shows that the dictator is already internally broken. He is no longer the same as he was during the victorious march through Europe. ... Steiger also avoids another extreme in the depiction of Bonaparte, also quite common – the desire to belittle this image. Steiger is not trying to make a great man small. On the contrary, Rod Steiger's Napoleon is a strong man who survived the inevitable collapse” (Zhezhelenko, 1973: 14-15).

Laudatory articles in the *Soviet Screen* were devoted to the famous actor Dustin Hoffman, whose characters are more likely victims of bourgeois society, rather than fighters against its injustices (Barabanova, 1971: 17). At the same time, about very different in design, Hoffman's best roles are united by a subtle penetration into the spiritual world of the "little man", with his defenselessness and cunning, nobility and courage, with his indestructible hope for the future (Shaternikova, 1984: 18-19).

Positive articles in the *Soviet Screen* were also devoted to other English-speaking actors popular in the 1970s: Paul Newman (1925-2008) (Doroshevich, 1984: 18-19), Robert Redford (Avdeenko, 1977: 14-15), Jack Nicholson (Antonov, 1977), Peter O'Toole (1932-2013) (Belyaeva, 1976: 16-17) and Peter Ustinov (1921-2004) (Tirdatova, 1985: 21).

Among the Hollywood actresses, film critics of the *Soviet Screen* singled out Elizabeth Taylor (1932-2011) (Bereznitsky, 1975: 16-17), Audrey Hepburn (1929-1993) (Dularidze, 1975: 16-17), Barbara Streisand (Avdeenko, 1978: 18-19), Jessica Lange (Glazkov, 1983: 9), Judy Davis (Sulkin, 1983: 9) and Faye Dunaway (Sobolev, 1974: 16-17).

At the same time, for example, it was emphasized that Faye Dunaway is a talented actress, capable of amazing transformations, able to create deep, psychologically complex images, that perhaps one of the most outstanding actresses in the history of American cinema (Sobolev, 1974: 16-17). And the rise of Jessica Lange's career is gratifying also because the actress disposed of her talent not in the way the movie businessmen “programmed” but as her civic conscience tells her” (Glazkov, 1983: 9).

The same "progressive" principle of selecting people for the publication of their creative portraits was observed in the *Soviet Screen* in relation to French actors.

Of course, about some French actors and actresses (for example, about Yves Montand (1921-1991) and Simone Signoret (1921-1985) who “fined themselves” after the Czechoslovak events of 1968), the *Soviet Screen* could not write anything positive.

But there were relatively many completely or less politicized articles about actors.

So film critic I. Yanushevskaya (1925-1989), co-author of V. Demin wrote in the book *Jean Marais* that "a man of great artistic taste", Jean Marais (1913-1998) understood that the time of his romantic heroes, knights without fear and the reproach passed, and he decided to remain in the memory of the audience the way the screen captured him (Yanushevskaya, 1983: 18-19).

The article about another patriarch of French cinematography, Jean Gabin (1904-1976), was also very positive: “Gabin of the thirties returned to the viewer of pre-war Europe a condensed reflection of his anxieties, his sense of life under threat, and this was the high meaning of poetic realism, of which Gabin was the first actor. ... the current hero of Gabin is a living, in the flesh manifestation of that very “senior”, “superior”, father and boss, who should be more visible, whom you can rely on – he knows how to do it. He will tell you what to do, and you just do it. This myth has its own charm and its own temptation” (Solovieva, Shitova, 1972: 14-15).

With great respect for the talent of Lino Ventura (1919-1987), an article by film critic V. Demin (1937-1993) was also written: “The previous roles of this famous actor have created a solid pattern in our perception, we are used to seeing him in the guise of a thug and a gangster. Meanwhile, today's Ventura is not at all what he was just recently, and in general, over the twenty years of his work in the cinema, he has experienced a rather serious creative evolution. ... At first he played the pure incarnation of evil, then strong, but doomed, lost people, and in the most recent years he became the character of a farce comedy, almost a hell, where the figure of a superhuman bandit is ingeniously ridiculed and ridiculed” (Demin, 1975: 16-17).

One of the favorites of the *Soviet Screen* was undoubtedly Jean-Louis Trintignant (1930-2022). Film expert I. Rubanova (1933-2024) noted that this actor likes to play modesty on the

screen, guessing in it unspent kindness, bitterness of loneliness, hidden romanticism, and sometimes carefully hidden complexes. “Modesty, which this actor understands so well, is unequal to dull ordinaryness or dull colorlessness. Behind the inconspicuous, moreover, fundamentally ordinary appearance of his heroes, hidden dramas rage, enthusiastic dreams flare up, and bold claims boil. ... [but] the role of Marcello Clerici in the film by the Italian Bernardo Bertolucci *The Conformist* (*Il Conformista*. Italy-France-FRG, 1970) based on the novel by Alberto Moravia, Trintignant proved that he was able to rise above soothing illusions. ... Previously, the actor played those who, sentenced to conformity by class, were torn from the fetters of conformism. ...

Trintignant's Clerici is not a man who has become a fascist, which in the context of the film is equivalent to a murderer, but a man who aspires to be a fascist, who plays a fascist” (Rubanova 1972: 16-17).

And, of course, I. Solovieva (1927-2024) and V. Shitova (1927-2002) are right: Trintignant had his “finest hour” when Claude Lelouch shot him in *A Man and a Woman* (*Un homme et une femme*. France, 1966): it would seem that the actor, who started slowly and modestly, should have finally missed the chance. In *A Man and a Woman* he was received in great demand: the audience, especially the spectators, he gave what they wanted and lacked. He was a “star” – a personalization of the dream of reliability, which enters into your everyday life in the guise of a real man: strong, kind, patient, understanding, with a light and firm character. ... The artist did not take a chance: it's good or bad, but he is not from the material from which “stars” are obtained (Solovieva, Shitova, 1973: 5-6).

At the same time, “if you isolate from the excessively complex and talented picture of Bernardo Bertolucci *The Conformist*... the large, tough and simple thought present in it, if you think about what exactly Trintignant plays in it, you will hear all the same reasoning about reliability. Reasoning from the opposite. Trintignant plays here a traitor and the logic of betrayal. The hero betrays out of fear, out of self-interest, but above all, he, a liberal living under fascism, betrays out of fear of being “not like everyone else.” For fear of being left alone, not betraying where it was supposed to, Trintignant played it, conveying the ferocious “black humor” of such a turn” (Solovieva, Shitova, 1973: 5-6).

Warmly and respectfully, I. Solovieva and V. Shitova also wrote about Alain Delon (Solovieva, Shitova, 1976: 18-19). To some extent, we can agree with the fact that the hero of Alain Delon most often turned out to be a modern individualist who challenged society only in order to take a more prosperous place in this society, a man with a double bottom and double morals, an eternal opportunist, so impudent and reckless that this excitement often fails him, he is so carried away by the game itself, directly by the race, that it often rushes past the prey, unable to stop until the opponent's bullet or the iron hand of the law catches up with him, until he fails to run, to limit of car speed his own heart (Makarov, 1981: 18-19).

Very positively was presented in the *Soviet Screen* and creativity Philipp Noiret (1930-2006) (Polikhikh, 1977), Jean Rochefort (1930-2017) (Soviet..., 1976), Michel Piccoli (1925-2020) (Dularidze 1975: 19); Michel Bouquet (1925-2022) (Soviet..., 1976), Victor Lanoux (1936-2017) (Braginsky, 1982: 18), Jean-Pierre Léaud (Chertok, 1973: 15), and Gerard Depardieu (Braginsky, 1981: 17).

In particular, film critic A. Braginsky (1920-2016) perspicaciously argued that in the person of Gerard Depardieu a bright, original actor of a purely modern warehouse appeared on the film horizon of France. An actor in whom young people saw the typical features, signs of today's hero, who outwardly may seem rude, mundane, “simple”, but spiritually sensitive, often easily hurt, deeply experiencing the contradictions and ugliness of the reality surrounding him (Braginsky, 1981: 17).

But about the work of Jean-Paul Belmondo (1933-2021), a kind of discussion arose on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*.

In 1975, film critic Y. Bogomolov (1937-2023) wrote approvingly that one of the most famous French film actors of the post-war generation, Jean-Paul Belmondo, is finally presented in our box office with a picture that, for a first acquaintance, is called promisingly: *Magnificent* (*Le Magnifique*. France-Italy, 1973). And if the epithet given in the title does not fully correspond to the merits of the film itself, then at least it can be attributed to the actor who played the main role (Bogomolov, 1975: 3-4).

A year later, journalist A. Makarov also positively assessed Belmondo's work: “What

explains the truly worldwide popularity of Jean-Paul Belmondo? Everywhere he is perceived as one of his own, that's probably the point. ... For all the incomprehensibility of his on-screen exploits, Belmondo is simple and accessible, he is the same person from a legend as the hero of large-circulation comics or grandmother's fairy tales. ... Belmondo is an actor capable of subtle and unobtrusive reincarnation. ... However, Belmondo carries a certain unified atmosphere of his personality through all his films. That is why even his invulnerable adventurers do not irritate him, a constantly living soul shines through the mask of luck and complacency. Which, by the way, often puts the qualities mentioned at the beginning into doubt, in any case, gives them additional psychological complexity. ... In his work, Belmondo brought to the screen the authenticity of the national character, the visible and tangible concreteness of the street, in the pathos of its ordinary, clueless, eternal life" (Makarov, 1976: 16-17).

In a similar vein, an article by film critic A. Braginsky, published in the magazine in 1979, was sustained: Jean-Paul Belmondo: an oblong face with sharply defined lips, a broken "boxing" nose. But the expressive dark eyes of the actor can be both sly, and formidable, and tender, and mocking – in a word, to express the whole gamut of human feelings and moods. Belmondo moves beautifully, his body is trained, he gladly shows his biceps and muscular torso. But there is also "something" in him that Gabin saw, and this "something" makes Jean-Paul a favorite of the audience – he is talented (Braginsky, 1979: 16-17).

But in 1983, the *Soviet Screen* (unexpectedly for Belmondo fans) published an article by film critic A. Plakhov with a telling title "What is "belmondism"?", where the basic statement reflecting the negative perception of the actor's film images was the following: "I can't help but say what worries me. Increasingly, in films of this kind, we meet the cult of a muscular superman hero, not burdened with either conscience or compassion. Vulgarity, admiration of brute force, and sometimes very sophisticated cruelty characterize a number of other paintings with Belmondo's participation" (Plakhov, 1983: 17).

And here (albeit in 1985), film critic M. Chernenko (1931-2004) entered into a polemic with A. Plakhov with very convincing arguments: don't bother yourself. The mill of commercial plots is spinning – after all, Belmondo plays, with insignificant exceptions, and even then at the beginning of the journey, in the films of commonplace, "popular", "mass", in other words, undisguisedly entertaining, the same role – a man in danger, one and the same conflict – a man against fate, the same character – a man who can trust only himself, his reaction, his dexterity, his common sense, his muscles. At the same time, it doesn't matter which side of the law his hero is on – and Belmondo in the vast majority of his films plays either a policeman or a criminal. And, a strange thing, if you just put all these different films side by side ... if you peer at them, it turns out suddenly that the hero of Belmondo is not a superman at all, then he is very atypical, losing too often. In other words, a superman inside out, who is extremely uncomfortable in a strange world where good diligently imitates evil, and evil deftly pretends to be good. Moreover, if we ignore the stunning dizziness of chases and shootouts, the abundance of corpses and blood, then it may turn out to be no less unexpected that the hero Belmondo is "burdened" with both conscience and conscience, that somewhere deep inside lives in him an indestructible moral code that from time to time breaks through to the surface of the plot with an instant gesture of compassion, pity, inept and hasty nobility. Breaks through only occasionally – because the hero acts in situations where there is simply no one to turn to with this gesture, no one to give even a small fraction of humanity, kindness, attention. Occasionally – and also because just at such moments the hero of Belmondo is a loser, in a literal and figurative knockdown, because then he is waiting for him, defenseless, forgotten, another blow to the jaw, another pistol bullet, another gangster knife or, at best, police handcuffs, in the most cruel way reminding him that all these sentiments, all these spiritual "oddities" are punishable in the most direct and immediate sense (Chernenko, 1985: 20-21).

The film critics of the *Soviet Screen* and the work of the famous French comedian Louis de Funes (1914-1983) were ambiguous.

Film critic I. Lishchinsky in an article entitled "The path of finds, the path of loss" wrote that Louis de Funes firmly occupied the comedy of France, making it more ridiculous and ... more monotonous (Lishchinsky, 1972: 18-19).

But for all that, behind the mask of de Funes, the audience discovered a figure – a dynamic entrepreneur of the so-called era of consumption, a person not only businesslike, but also intoxicated with efficiency. Everything in this world for him is just a stepping stone to fame,

success, wealth. All kinds of plans ripen in his brain with extraordinary and, of course, excessive speed. Here he narrowed his eyes, smiled victoriously, his thin lips stretched to his ears, and he triumphantly looks at the enemy. The plan is ready – whether it is about a profitable marriage for a daughter, about a legitimate commercial operation or illegal transportation of jewelry and drugs. By the way, it does not matter whether de Funes plays a respectable businessman or the leader of a gang of gangsters. In any case, he is exactly adventurous and equally respectable. ... Louis de Funes turned out to be a comedic mirror of another phenomenon, about which Western politicians, sociologists, and journalists write so much today. The cult of things and the pursuit of things – these main features of the "era of consumption" are inseparable from the comic hero de Funes (Lishchinsky, 1972: 18-19).

Even more critical of the work of Louis de Funes was an article by film critic M. Yampolsky: "His hero is small, antipathetic, unkind, stupid, sometimes cruel. The plasticity of the actor is emphatically caricatured. Such a character does not at all seek to evoke even a shadow of sympathy. Of all the comic masks, he most resembles Pantalone from the Italian folk comedy – a smug rich old man, mean, evil, unscrupulous and always making a fool of himself. ... Funes introduced into the cinema and for a long time fixed in it a "one-dimensional" comic mask in its configuration. The laughter caused by the actor is laughter at the grotesque conceit and its constant fiasco. ... From the films with his participation, any warmth, humanity disappears, his roles become more and more buffoon, turn into a stream of unrestrained self-singing. An uncharismatic, pretentious character endlessly flickers on the screen, trying hard to make you laugh. Characteristically, that in the last films of Funes, that supply of satirical laughter, which caused the image of this narcissistic bourgeois, is almost completely depleted. External, eccentric comedy obscures the social content that was partly inherent in the work of this actor before. The artistic fate of Louis de Funes is interesting and instructive. The unusual mask created by this magnificent master has certainly contributed to the arsenal of world cinema comedy. But the initial limitations of the image created by the actor also contained the sources of his failures" (Yampolsky, 1978: 18-19).

But another French comedian – Pierre Richard, – according to A. Makarov, in any, the most incredible plot, he is certainly authentic and internally, in the sense that even his eccentric antics are always precisely motivated, and in terms of a purely worldly, one might say, everyday. ... He is ridiculous more than anything because, under the most incredible conditions, he does what he should have done, that he remains true to his human calling, his spiritual type and his spiritual disposition. The notorious softness of the intelligentsia, the anecdotal inability of a book reader and the humanist suddenly turn out to be not such weaknesses, they do not betray our hero, but rather strengthen him in his vitality, they do not serve as his vulnerable spot, but, on the contrary, the weapon with which the hero unconsciously defends his living soul (Makarov, 1983: 18).

Annie Girardot (1931-2011) was the favorite of the *Soviet Screen* in the 1970s, and four (!!!) articles were devoted to her work at once (Alexandrov, 1978: 5; Bernadsky, 1978: 16-17; Rubanova, 1973; Solovieva, Shitova, 1973: 5-6).

I. Solovieva and V. Shitova, in our opinion, rightly noted that Annie Girardot did not create what is called a "permanent actor character" on the screen, as did, say, Brigitte Bardot or Marilyn Monroe. She played women not only of different fates – they are different in her nature ... But every time she respects and conveys the independence of the character of her heroines, as she respects the laws of the genre, whether it be a tragedy or an everyday comic film. There is one thing in common in her heroines: the natural ability and willingness to understand. And one more thing in common in the heroines of the artist: each has its own spiritual self-active force. In a situation where it is easy to become a puppet, a victim of passions, a victim of circumstances, they are not puppets and not victims. Understanding and clarity hold them (Solovieva, Shitova, 1973: 5-6).

Indeed, comedy *Acquaintance by marriage announcement (Run for me so that I catch you / Cours après moi que je t'attrape*. France, 1976) could be classified as mediocre without hesitation, if not for one circumstance. ... Annie Girardot managed to not only entertain us, but also captivate us. Without diminishing either the comedy or the cascade of the on-screen plot, she brought to her role something that marks almost every image she created – sometimes not even visible, but quite clearly tangible human authenticity. ... The vital authenticity of the images of Annie Girardot was clarified here by the features of the national folk character

(Alexandrov, 1978: 5).

And indeed, very often Girardot is thinner, smarter, more significant than the material offered to her. ... endowing the widespread female type with the features of her individuality, she helps the viewer, who identifies himself with the movie character, to believe in the prevalence, universality of “extraordinary”. Ultimately, grow up in your own eyes. Add to this the amazing skill of the actress, her looseness, naturalness, absolute freedom of existence in the image – without any “gaps” between the performer and the character (Bernadsky, 1978: 16-17).

Romy Schneider (1938-1982) was another famous actress of French cinema, whose work was favorably evaluated by the *Soviet Screen*.

So on the pages of the magazine it was emphasized that this actress owes her success to her own originality, skill and, of course, spectacular appearance. ... The heroines of Romy Schneider, as a rule, fit perfectly within the boundaries of the average person's idea of life and happiness. ... The flowering of Romy Schneider's talent successfully coincided with the appearance of a series of films like *Love Story*, in which purity of feelings, sincerity, some sentimentality and nostalgia for lost ideals are very appealing to the Western audience, tired of both physical and moral nudity (Fomichev, 1978: 20-21).

And film critic I. Rubanova (1933-2024) reasonably believed that Schneider's cinematic images from film to film became bolder, richer, more dramatic. ... Radiant beauty, lively and intelligent talent, impeccable professionalism... Romy Schneider deserved great fame, heartfelt veneration and deep respect. ... Morality is the word that best defines the art of Romy Schneider (Rubanova, 1982: 17-18).

The work of another star of French cinema, Catherine Deneuve, was also highly appreciated in the *Soviet Screen*: deep lyricism, acting intuition and an innate sense of beauty are noted in Catherine Deneuve by many directors with whom the actress has to work. It is this quality that clearly distinguishes Deneuve's individuality from the rich scattering of stars of the French screen (Abdrashitov, 1978: 20-21).

Due to the fact that several films with the participation of Mireille Darc (1938-2017) were released at once in the Soviet film distribution of the 1970s, the *Soviet Screen* found a place on its pages for a creative portrait of this talented actress: Mireille Darc is devoid of a halo, advantages and shortcomings of the acting “myth” – she has nothing to learn from. She is an ordinary pretty woman, elegant, graceful and intelligent. As an example of an ordinary pretty French woman, she is calm, smart, independent, knows her own worth and knows what she needs from life, while she knows how to avoid rational, boring businesslikeness and be extremely natural in her feelings, behavior, movement, tone. ... In essence, Mireille Darc from film to film, regardless of its genre and artistic level, plays variations of one image. Always identical in appearance, with the same short haircut and unchanging bangs, soft, traditionally feminine, she emphasizes the constancy of her heroine (Levashova, 1975: 18-19).

The works of Anna Karina (1940-2019) (Anna..., 1975: 16-17), Marie-José Nat (1940-2019) (Karlov, 1975: 14-15) and Nathalie Baye (Plakhov, 1985: 20-21).

In particular, film critic A. Plakhov wrote that “in the roles of her full dignity, uncompromising provincials, Nathalie Baye comes to one of the central themes of all Western cinema. We are talking about the position of a woman who tries to be independent in everything, but inevitably turns out to be dependent on social conditions and the moral atmosphere of society. ... The drama that colors the best roles of Nathalie Baye is hidden and spills out only at moments of high tension. ... Perhaps, even in the roles of her modest provincials, Nathalie Baye remains romantic – if only because her heroines do not become obedient victims of circumstances, but retain ideals and concepts of honor that seem hopelessly old-fashioned to others...” (Plakhov, 1985: 20-21).

Publishing creative portraits of actors and actresses of Italian cinema, *Soviet Screen* was true to tradition, giving priority to the classics.

In particular, film critic I. Rubanova (1933-2024) argued that the legendary Anna Magnani (1908-1973) “became a heroine of the screen when, theoretically, she could least of all become one. Post-war Italian cinema, in the name of truth, abandoned the canons of traditional cinema, its “stars” and its actors. The creators of the first post-war paintings called themselves neo-realists. They wanted to tell the truth, only the truth, nothing but the truth... Anna Magnani was not inferior to non-professionals in the life and everyday authenticity of her incarnations. Her appearance, gestures, reactions on the screen were exactly like their “raw emotionality”. ... In

fact, in almost all films she played the care of daily bread, the care of children, the care of her husband. For some reason, in the movies where Magnani starred, the man always needed her support. ... Beloved, her main motive – the motive of motherhood – acquired from Magnani such a wealth of psychological nuances. The second reality was the beginning of a second reality without ceasing to characterize a particular person” (Rubanova, 1975: 18-19).

Quite a lot of materials of different genres were devoted to the *Soviet Screen* and another star of Italian and world cinema – Sophia Loren. It was noted that she often had to play the character of a woman is somewhat vulgar and hectic, simple-hearted and treacherous, vengeful, faithful, sinful, but invariably attractive. ... in these works, Loren managed to demonstrate the mastery of disguise, comedic lightness, tact and great taste ... But, perhaps more importantly, they served as a kind of warm-up before taking off, which ensured Loren's place among the largest dramatic actresses in world cinema (Bernadsky, 1978: 16 -17).

One can also agree that in the first role, Lucia Bosè (1931-2020) albeit half a hint, she stated the main feature of her manner: the more tense the situation, the more restrained the reaction. Bosè's characters always, as it were, "remain silent", do not allow themselves to fully reveal themselves, and this imposes on them the stamp of significance, forcing them to assume an intense inner life. ... The acting "texture" of Bosè naturally attracted the directors of the "hard style". But ... she was often invited to comedy roles in simple pictures telling about “beautiful but poor”, “poor but happy”, where the same image of a nice girl with honest aspirations and a small dream of marrying a good guy varied” (Kopylova, 1972: 16).

As in the 1960s, *Soviet Screen* continued to write about the roles of Stefania Sandrelli (Basmanov, 1976; Bogemsky, 1979: 16-17).

Film critic G. Bogemsky, in our opinion, very accurately noted that Sandrelli had neither the aggressive beauty of Sophia Loren, nor the soft femininity of Gina Lollobrigida, nor the exotic charm of Claudia Cardinale, but somehow quietly, gradually it was she who became the expressor of the main features modern Italian on the screen... Each meeting with Stefania Sandrelli on the screen is interesting, but “I especially want to see her again in the image of an Italian contemporary – a simple woman with a difficult character and a difficult fate” (Bogemsky, 1979: 16-17).

He positively assessed the *Soviet Screen* and the work of younger Italian movie stars at that time: Florinda Bolkan (Florinda..., 1976: 18), Ornella Muti (Bogolepova, 1984: 18) and Eleanora Giorgi (Bogolepova, 1984: 18).

Among the actors of the Italian cinema of the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s, *Soviet Screen*, of course, relied on a prominent representative of the progressive "political cinema" – Gian Maria Volonté (1933-1994).

Film expert E. Victorova wrote about this outstanding actor as follows: “Volonté – communist, actor, fighter. He is hated by neo-fascists – they do not forgive him for participating in the class struggle of the proletariat. ... Gifted with a bright stage appearance, an exceptional talent for impersonation, penetration into the depths of the human psyche, the art of facial expressions, it was in the cinema that he managed to realize his enormous potential as an artist, able to move from heroism and romantic pathos to grotesque, satire, caricature, recreate on the screen authentic, reliable, psychologically accurate characters of people and, above all, images of fighters and rebels against social injustice, violence and evil. ... In the difficult conditions of the aggravation of ideological and class battles in the capitalist world, in the context of the crisis of leftist trends in politics, ideology, culture in Italy, the communist Volonté demonstrates the maturity of civic ideals in art through his life practice, his creative destiny” (Victorova, 1979: 16-17).

There were similar political accents in the article by the film critic G. Bogemsky (1920-1995) about the work of another Italian star, Franco Nero. It was stated here that this one of the most significant and serious actors of the Italian screen. ... It seems to us that the role of Matteotti is a kind of ideological program for a young actor and his success in it is a guarantee of further disclosure of the richest possibilities inherent in this interesting, thoughtful artist, who felt the urgent need that the progressive cinema of Italy feels in a positive hero. ... Italian progressive cinema has acquired another gifted actor capable of embodying the image of an active and conscious fighter for justice (Bogemsky, 1974: 14-15).

At the same time, of course, the *Soviet Screen* did not forget to tell its readers about the work of famous Italian actors who specialized in comedy and tragicomedy in the 1970s: Alberto

Sordi (1920-2003) (Lesovoy, 1969; Poklonov, 1976: 18-19), Nino Manfredi (1921-2004) (Bogemsky, 1983: 19-20; Yampolsky, 1977); Ugo Tognazzi (1922-1990) (Yampolsky, 1977: 14-15), Giancarlo Giannini (Bogemsky, 1983: 16-17).

In particular, film critic G. Bogemsky wrote that Manfredi's talent combines elements of sad and funny, tragic and comic, intertwined closely, as in life. Perhaps the main feature of Manfredi's characters is the human warmth they radiate. The heroes of Manfredi are humane, sometimes somewhat simple-hearted, they are distinguished by inner decency and purity, even when they are not perfect in their relations with society, law, and those around them. They are deeply democratic, truly people, they are able to believe in something (with a complete rejection of religion, we note), fantasize, live a dream (Bogemsky, 1983: 19-20).

And the film critic (at that time) M. Yampolsky, in our opinion, reasonably noted that "the ability to turn mediocrity into an object of close study is an unusually rare phenomenon in the world of cinema, because it contradicts the very concept of a movie star. ... The active, dynamic, sharp, almost clownish character of Tognazzi is empty and empty at the same time. Its external activity does not express anything – it is a roaring volcano charged with straw, spiritual amorphousness is hidden under a temperamental gesture" (Yampolsky, 1977: 14-15).

The *Soviet Screen* could not pass by the work of the extremely popular Italian singer and actor Adriano Celentano (Bogemsky, 1979: 18; Mudrov, 1984: 22).

In his article, G. Bogemsky wrote that Adriano is surprisingly plastic, as if thousands of elastic little springs are embedded in it. And this is explained by his innate musicality, which he is all imbued with: even when Celentano does not sing, but only moves around the screen or on stage, he seems to be subject to some kind of internal rhythm, some kind of melody living in him ... A significant event was for Adriano participated in the film *Serafino* (Italy-France, 1968) directed by Pietro Germi. ... he got the opportunity to work under a big director, playing the title role. And the results were significant: Adriano created a kind of comedic image of a country boy, hiding under the feigned rudeness, uncouth natural sharp mind, nobility, rejection of lies, greed and money-grubbing (Bogemsky, 1979: 18).

So, referring to the cinematography of Western countries, *Soviet Screen* in the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s, for the most part, wrote about American, French and Italian actors.

The *Soviet Screen* wrote little about actors from other Western countries. In particular, positive portraits of actors can be mentioned here: Max von Sydow (1929-2020) (Michalkovich, 1983: 17), Harriet Anderson (Surkova, 1975: 6-7), Irene Papas (1926-2022) (Chernenko, 1985: 21) and Fernando Rey (1917-1994) (Belenky, 1976: 17).

- interviews with Western filmmakers

As in previous years, in the *Soviet Screen*, as a rule, interlocutors were selected from among the most "progressive artists".

Among American filmmakers, the first place was given to Stanley Kramer (1913-2001) (Bobikov, 1973; Chertok, 1971: 14-15).

The "progressive" political position was also emphasized in an interview with Sidney Pollack (1934-2008) (Chertok, 1972: 14), Norman Jewison (Andreev, 1985: 20-21), Ellen Burstyn (Ellen..., 1977: 16), Jessica Lange (Salner, 1985: 20-21).

And, of course, in an interview with Kevin Brownlow, one of the directors of the anti-Nazi film *It Happened Here* (UK, 1965): "Instead of a historical film from the Second World War, we began to make an anti-fascist grotesque film. In this film, outwardly objective, fascism was supposed to expose itself. But the main theme of the film is not fascists, but collaborators. The picture is addressed mainly to those "passive" people who flaunt that they are, they say, "not interested in politics" (Quoted in: Markov, 1972: 15).

A similar approach was taken to the choice of interviewed French, Italian, Spanish and West German filmmakers.

So the famous director Marcel Carné (1906-1996) told the correspondents of the *Soviet Screen* that "those who take on serious political topics open the way for the revival of French cinema. More recently, French producers did not even want to hear about a political film, but if the commercial success of some of these films opens a new, political direction in our cinema, this will enable many directors to express themselves and their time" (Quoted by: Chernenko, Chertok, 1972: 17-18).

Politics and anti-fascist themes also came to the fore in an interview with Juan Antonio Bardem (1922-2002) (Gerber, 1978: 16-17; Vetrova, 1981: 18), Yves Boisset (Chertok, 1974: 12-

13), Ivo Gorani (1924-2015) (Markova, 1971), Florestano Vancini (1926-2008) (Khovrin, 1974: 16), Giuseppe De Santis (1917-1997) (De Santis, 1980), Valerio Zurlini (1926-1982) (Chernenko, 1969: 16), René Clement (1913-1996) (Ignatov, 1983: 18-19), Ricardo Cucciolla (1924-1999) (Chertok, 1975: 12-13), Giuliano Montaldo (Montaldo, 1971), Franco Nero (Sulkin, 1982: 16-17), Francesco Rosi (1922-2015) (Talov, 1979: 15), Peter Fleishman (1937-2021) (Krasnova, 1984: 18-19), Volker Schlöndorff (Nadezhdy..., 1973: 17).

In particular, the *Soviet Screen* quoted the words actor Ricardo Cucciolla: "I wanted to convey to my contemporaries the greatness of the spirit of Gramsci, one of the founders of the Italian Communist Party" (Quoted from: Chertok, 1975: 12-13).

Even in an interview with Sophia Loren, the main focus was on her story about how the Italian fascists opposed the melodrama *Sunflowers (I Girasoli)*. Italy-France-USSR, 1970), in which the actress played the main role: "The film is a huge success. True, there were dissatisfied voices. They belong to those who cannot like the story of simple and honest people torn apart by war. These are the voices of the fascists. Did you know that in 1966 the Italian security service uncovered a conspiracy of South Tyrolean fascists? Hitler's successors marked their plan with the cipher "Sophie Loren" and planned the murder of the most prominent Italian actors and actresses as revenge for their participation in Italian anti-fascist films. They were going to start with me..." (Quoted from: Senin, 1971: 18).

But, of course, there were also benevolent interviews on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* without accentuated politicization: with Claude Jade (1948-2006) (Jade ..., 1981: 17), Annie Girardot (1931-2011) (Karaseva, 1984: 20-21), Gina Lollobrigida (1927-2023) (Markov, 1974: 19-20), Claudia Cardinale (Cardinale, 1980: 17-18), Marcello Mastroianni (1924-1996) (Two..., 1969), Sara Montiel (1928-2013) (Kudrin, 1984: 19-20), Michelle Morgan (1920-2016) (Lipkov, 1972: 17), Alberto Sordi (1920-2003) (Galina, 1985: 20-22) and others.

- reviews of Western films, which in the period of the 1970s – 1980s were in Soviet film distribution and / or were shown on television in the USSR

As before, the *Soviet Screen* willingly and very positively reviewed Stanley Kramer's (1913-2001) films that were regularly released: *Bless the Beasts & Children* (USA, 1971) (Lvov, 1971: 14-15; Shcherbakov, 1971), *Oklahoma Crude* (USA, 1973) (Warsawsky, 1973: 3), *The Domino Principle* (USA-UK, 1977) (Andreev, 1979: 14), emphasizing their "progressive anti-bourgeois significance".

So the film critic Y. Warsawsky (1911-2000) wrote that in *Oklahoma Crude* the motives familiar to his work sound: disgust for cruelty and indifference, for cruelty and loneliness, to which acquisitiveness, which has become a passion, dooms (Warsawsky, 1973: 3).

And the film critic F. Andreev (1933-1998) pathetically asserted that contrary to the newfangled frills in the field of either demonology or erotica, *The Domino Principle*, through the medium of feature films, thoughtfully explores serious problems. ... Artistic generalizations helped the authors to create ... collective images of great explosive power, to rise to very disturbing realistic generalizations (Andreev, 1979: 14).

The position of the *Soviet Screen* was similar in relation to the drama of Sydney Pollack (1934-2008) *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?* (USA, 1969) (Rakoviny..., 1970: 14; Shcherbakov, 1971), as rare in power accusatory document.

As is well known, from a wide range of Hollywood and British films, the Soviet film distribution in the period we are analyzing mostly films with a sharp social sound, critically showing Western realities.

Therefore, it is not at all surprising that it was these movies that received the maximum support in the *Soviet Screen*: *A Soldier's Story* (USA, 1984) (Esina, 1985: 10-11), *Absence of Malice* (USA, 1981) (Ivanova, 1985: 22; Razlogov, 1983: 14-15; Savitsky, 1985: 18-19), *West Side Story* (USA, 1961) (Sobolev, 1980: 5), *The Day the Fish Came Out* (UK-Greece, 1966) (Khloplyankina, 1972: 15), *The China Syndrome* (USA, 1979) (Khojaev, 1979: 7; Shaternikova, 1982: 17-18; Shitova, 1979: 16-17), *Capricorn One* (USA-UK, 1977) (Shaternikova, 1982: 17-18), *Conrack* (USA, 1974) (Chertok, 1974: 18; Ivanova, 1976: 8-9), *O Lucky Man!* (UK-USA, 1973) (Doroshevich, 1976), *The Front* (USA, 1976) (Andreev, 1978: 6-7), *...And Justice for All* (USA, 1979) (Dmitriev, 1983: 8-9), *Missing* (USA, 1982) (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17), *Requiem for a Heavyweight* (USA, 1962) (Mikhalkovich, 1978: 3-4), *3 Days of the Condor* (USA, 1975) (Savitsky, 1985: 18-19; Shaternikova, 1982: 17-18), *Frances* (USA, 1982) (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17), etc.

So in the movie review *The Day the Fish Came Out* (UK-Greece, 1966) emphasized that the object of ridicule in it turned out to be rabid militarism, militarism, inhumanity (Khlopyankina, 1972: 15).

In an article about the film *The Front* (USA, 1976), film critic F. Andreev (1933-1998) reminded the readers of the magazine that there is a real danger of even greater persecution of genuine fighters for civil rights, opponents of foreign policy adventures into which the reactionaries dream of dragging the country of all stripes, a powerful military-industrial complex (Andreev, 1978: 6-7).

And film critic O. Sulkin praised the drama *Frances* (USA, 1982), noting that it exposes to the utmost the monstrous mechanism of spiritual violence in a 'free' society (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17).

A very positive review in the *Soviet Screen* was also awarded to *A Soldier's Story* (USA, 1984): "So, racism is in the dock. Racism in a new guise, often demagogically hiding behind the 'interests of civilization', 'concern for ordinary people.' But, one way or another, we recognize him in any camouflage. According to its anti-human essence, it does not change" (Esina, 1985: 10-11).

Film critic N. Savitsky wrote that in *3 Days of the Condor* (USA, 1975) S. Pollack, shed light on the dirty methods that the US intelligence agencies constantly resort to, not stopping at gross violations of constitutional norms and the criminal code in order to achieve the hidden strategic goals of the imperialist state", and in the drama *Absence of Malice* shows the "kitchen" of the bourgeois press, and the work of the American police, using techniques even more unscrupulous than those used by newspapermen. ... In both cases, imaginary and essentially anti-social, inhuman goals are pursued (Savitsky, 1985: 18-19).

Analyzing the film *The China Syndrome* (USA, 1979), film critic and theater critic V. Shitova (1927-2002) wrote: "Honor and praise here to the famous Jane Fonda, who played surprisingly modestly in her sense of self, resolutely discarding the halo of a movie star ... This Fonda's role is directly related to the social position of the actress, who consistently and bravely enters into political battles on the side of peace and a fair solution to social problems" (Shitova, 1979: 16-17).

And indeed, film critic N. Shaternikova (1934-2028) acted as a Soviet political observer on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*, arguing that social and political life of America so often resembles a gloomy adventure scenario, replete with episodes of assassination attempts, murders, unsolved plots to eliminate unwanted witnesses, that it can compete on equal terms with the most daring fiction (Shaternikova, 1982: 17-18). And there fore movies *Capricorn One* (USA-UK, 1977) and *3 Days of the Condor* (USA, 1975) turned out to be truly prophetic. Before our eyes, what they warned against is coming true. "In the Near and Middle East, American militarism is increasingly openly demonstrating its aggressive intentions. The Pentagon is no longer shy about openly revealing its interest in space programs – they plan to use flights under the Shuttle program for military purposes. And all this is covered up with lies about the "external threat", about the need to protect the vital interests of the American people. ... *The China Syndrom* also turned out to be prophetic. ... But it's not just about actual coincidences. All three films are true in the main – they accurately recreate the atmosphere of the "crisis of confidence" in the American "top": monopolies in the apparatus of political power, which is generated by the general crisis of capitalism" (Shaternikova, 1982: 17-18).

True, another film critic, R. Yurenev (1912-2002), was much more critical of the film *Capricorn One* (USA-UK, 1977). He wrote that the desire to set up a topical topic and then exchange it in entertaining situations was clearly demonstrated by the American director Peter Hyams in his film *Capricorn One*. The beginning is exciting. American cosmonauts going to Mars are stolen from the rocket and hidden in an abandoned hangar: the flight is unprepared, and it was decided to "stage" it with the help of movie and TV stunts. This is where the social drama about the conflict between science and the capitalist world would unfold. But the director is not interested in social problems. He literally stuns the viewer with a cascade of stunts... The stunt technique is great, but the idea? (Yurenev, 1978: 6-7).

The *Soviet Screen* treated the film *The New Centurions* (USA, 1972) rather reservedly, since, according to reviewer A. Doroshevich, it is designed for those who are frightened by the steady increase in crime in the United States and at that At the same time, it is well known that only positive emotions are by no means associated with the figure of a policeman, ... [but] the

plot moves are indicated in the picture too schematically for artistically convincing characters to grow out of them (Doroshevich, 1975: 5).

It is quite significant that even when reviewing American films, which seemed to be absolutely far from politics, the reviewers of the *Soviet Screen* demonstrated ideological approaches. Eg, in a melodrama review *Kramer vs. Kramer* (USA, 1979) noted that the success of the movie is also due to the fact that, against the backdrop of unbridled cruelty and violence reigning on the screens of the United States, attempts to interpret family life exclusively in the spirit of Freudian and other “fashionable” concepts, the film *Kramer vs. Kramer* compares favorably with noble restraint, modesty, depth of penetration into the human soul. And this person is considered by the authors quite multifaceted. ... the film is a visible desire for aesthetic integrity and authenticity, the fullness of life, the indestructibility of good human emotions in relation to everything that mass bourgeois cinema has been trying in vain to eradicate from the minds of the audience for many decades (Chernenko, 1981: 16).

Of course, among the reviews of American and British films in the *Soviet Screen* there were also texts devoid of a direct appeal to politics.

So V. Ivanova wrote about *Bobby Deerfield* (USA, 1977), that in this film a constant theme of Sydney Pollack arises, which runs through his films, well known to us. It turns out that he and Remarque have a common theme – the theme of human loneliness, struggle and overcoming it (Ivanova, 1983: 9).

The “apoliticality” was especially pronounced in reviews of film adaptations of classic works, the action of which often took place in the 19th century and earlier: *Jane Eyre* (UK-USA, 1970) (Doroshevich, 1973), *David Copperfield* (UK, 1974) (Anikst, 1975: 4), *The Moonstone* (UK, 1972) (Anikst, 1975: 4), *A Tale of Two Cities* (UK, 1958) (Shemyakin, 1985: 10), *Murder on the Orient Express* (UK, 1974) (Dmitriev, 1978: 5).

Discussions of Western films unfolded on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* in the analyzed period extremely rarely.

For example, the editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen* D. Orlov (1935-2021) considered that film *Gloria* (USA, 1980) is another version of a noble killer, in this case it turns out to be a woman, a representative of the mafia, overwhelmed by a sentimental attachment to a boy ... There is nothing to be surprised about – we have before us another example of a stereotypical, not even marked by a spark of talent bourgeois, in this case American, film production (Orlov, 1981: 16-18).

But film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) did not agree with him, noting in *Gloria* (USA, 1980) the moral sense of artists, rarely found in our pragmatic age, faith in the beauty of a senseless act, verification of what turns out to be the only guarantee of a high human destiny (Dmitriev, 1981: 16-17).

Frankly entertaining Hollywood and British films were quite rare in the Soviet distribution of the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s.

Many of them were reviewed by film critic and archivist V. Dmitriev. In his articles, he, as a rule, sought to distance himself from instructive political and ideological assessments, concentrating on a professional analysis of the artistic quality of the work.

He wrote that director Michael Anderson's *Orca* (*Orca: Killer Whale*. U.S.-British-Italian, 1977) was almost defenseless against criticism. Extremely non-self-sufficient in its problems and stylistics, it can and does cause irritation with its genre heterogeneity, incorporating elements of western, melodrama, horror film as well as science-fiction and species tape. All this is justified not so much by its naive anthology, though it is explicitly stated, as by a certain ... simple-mindedness that allows you to use the findings of others, inserting extensive cinematic quotations into your work, not being afraid of bloody or sentimentalized stamps. One could even say that in *Orca* the animal takes revenge for all the desecration by man to which it has been subjected in numerous other films. The problem of the animal's rightness, or rather the rightness of nature before man, was not born now, but in recent years it has taken on an exhilarated, almost hysterical character in Western art, as evidenced, in particular, by *Orca*, which is interesting not so much as an expression of a certain social trend. And in this respect, familiarity with the film is useful and necessary, even if the issues raised in it are addressed at a very superficial level (Dmitriev, 1982: 8-9).

B. Dmitriev regretted that the release of John Ford's western *My Darling Clementine* (USA, 1946) in Soviet distribution was delayed by almost 30 years, and, according to present-

day views, it is just an old film, black and white, a bit monotonous, slightly slow in pace, with too much unnecessary dialogue and fabulist explanations. ... But even after 30 years one feels that it is a masterful film, with no plot or pictorial seams, and a bias toward excessive touching is immediately counterbalanced by a comedy trick (Dmitriev, 1975: 5).

About one of the Soviet box office hits, *Mackenna's Gold* (USA, 1968), V. Dmitriev very convincingly wrote that this is a fairly typical example of a late western, the plot side of which, moving from adventure to adventure, prevails over the psychological specificity of the characters Jack Lee Thompson, who shot the picture, belongs to the type of artists who are above all afraid of untested solutions. ... A high-class professional, Lee Thompson tries not to repeat himself either in the ways of mise-en-scene or in the principles of editing. One cannot help but pay tribute to him in his skillful sense of the spectacularity of cinema (Dmitriev, 1974: 5-6).

But the *Soviet Screen* treated Hollywood film musicals much more strictly.

If the literary critic A. Anikst (1910-1988) wrote that *My Fair Lady* (USA, 1964): that is great entertainment. The film has humor, grace, and for lovers of sentiment – a little bit of theatrical love – in a word, everything that is supposed to be pleasant.pastime. ... In general, there are many times more successes in this film than shortcomings (Anikst, 1970: 14-15).

That film critic N. Lagina, based on extra-genre requirements for a clear designation of sociality and political position, literally crushed another famous musical on the pages of the magazine – *The Sound of Music* (USA, 1965), arguing that almost all the characters in the film are unambiguous and very schematic. ... Yes, the sounds of music remain from *The Sound of Music*. But not the echoes of history, characters, nor the more important socio-political background that the screenwriter and director claim. ... We leave the cinema with the beautiful and catchy melodies of Richard Rodgers, the charm of music and acting. ... But there remains annoyance from far-fetched situations (Lagina, 1972: 14-15).

Film critic V. Ivanova (1937-2008) was even stricter about the musical *Funny Girl* (USA, 1968): “For some reason, this *Funny Girl* is not funny. Rather boring, honestly. There's a moment of overeating... The screen is so densely populated... with poker issues and the trappings of a sophisticated bourgeois life, that there's simply no room for anything else. The screen hits on the spot with tracer volleys of colors, the toilets are becoming more and more refined, the film is becoming more and more boring and petty-bourgeois. Once Wyler made a fairy tale called *Roman Holiday* (USA, 1953), which is well known to our viewers. ... *Roman Holiday*, however, was not a musical, but next to *Funny Girl* they seem almost a masterpiece of taste and elegance” (Ivanova, 1972: 14-15).

So strictly treated the comedy of W. Wyler *How To Steal a Million* (USA, 1966) film critic Y. Bereznitsky (1922-2005): “The trouble with the movie is not so much in its diversity, but in its facelessness” (Bereznitsky, 1975: 4-5).

But the film critic V. Revich (1929-1997) appreciated another film popular in the Soviet box office *One Million Years BC* (UK, 1966) is significantly warmer (perhaps due to the complete absence in the plot of the movie of the bourgeoisie and other undesirable factors for the ideologized Soviet film criticism): “The technique of combined filming in the picture is quite high, especially in the earthquake scene, when people, distraught with fear, rush along the slopes of the mountain and fall into the abysses opening before them. The most accurate way to define the genre nature of the film is the word “comic”, which is not very popular with us - a complex combination of reality, fairy tale, fantasy, incredible adventures and parodies of the same adventures, that is, we have cinema entertainment in its purest form. But pictures of this kind deserve criticism if they carry some harmful charge. And so ... Probably, *A Million Years BC* will be a success with viewers who intend to relax and have fun for an hour and a half in the cinema. Especially in young people. But it would be good if, when they returned home, they looked at the book and added to their knowledge of dinosaurs, which had become extinct seventy million years before the advent of man...” (Revich, 1969).

On the other hand, recalling the “Tarzaniada”, film critic E. Gromov (1931-2005) instructively reminded the readers of the magazine that prhythmic films about the “man from the jungle” have repeatedly provoked sharp criticism from film experts, and indeed from all people with a good artistic taste. The falsity of the Tarzan films was felt by the vast majority of viewers. And although the last films of this series were made at a fairly high technical level, they were shown in half-empty cinema halls. ... These days Tarzan films are perceived as artistically helpless. That is why *Tarzan* left the screen in all countries long ago (Gromov, 1975: 19).

In the Italian cinema of the 1970s, *Soviet Screen* consistently gave preference to political films that "expose capitalist reality."

In this context, film critic V. Demin (1937-1993) quite convincingly wrote that until quite recently, the rise of "political cinema" seemed strange, mysterious, and perhaps not accidental. A few years ago, a serious and objective observer, noting even the stunning success of Italian or Swedish films directly devoted to famous political trials, would still not dare to authoritatively predict that this cinematic line would soon evoke a response literally in all countries of the world. ... The second half of the twentieth century, with persuasiveness unknown to previous times, demonstrated the direct connection and dependence of the fate of man, society and politics. ... And in *Sacco and Vanzetti* (*Sacco e Vanzetti*. Italy, 1970) ... it was not only about the clash of pure souls with the world of bribery and betrayal, the individual – with the machine of capitalist statehood. No, the hero turned out to be, first of all, a politician, the conflict – a political conflict, and its solution, according to the artist, required active political actions.

At first it seemed that the "political film" irresistibly gravitates towards the form of a documentary detective close to it. Filmmakers diligently reconstructed the facts, revealed the secret springs of events, brought out the circumstances hidden for the time being. What happened, how it happened, who is to blame – it seemed that this is the most important thing. However, over time, it became clear that the study of the actual plot of the murder for political reasons is not the most important thing in a film of this kind. It is much more interesting and tempting to reveal indirect springs, distant connections, to comprehend what happened not at the level of the first, direct culprits, but against the broad background of modern and historical political reality" (Demin, 1973: 4).

More traditionally (for Soviet film studies) film critic R. Sobolev (1926-1991) approached the subject of political cinema: the beginning of the 1970s in the West was marked by the flourishing of the so-called "political film", where traditional psychological collisions were replaced by clashes of ideas and political views. In the best "political films" of Italy, France, Sweden and some other bourgeois countries, the images of the communists are quite clearly outlined, though not always acting in the foreground. But this is no longer the fault, but the misfortune of the progressive artists of the West, who work under difficult conditions of pressure and daily control from monopoly capital. Let us be clear that the appearance on Western screens of every film that truthfully shows some facet of the labor movement and the images of its leaders is always an expression of the civic courage of its authors. And yet the dictates of time cannot be stopped. Even 10-15 years ago, talking about the image of a communist in Western cinema would have been impossible - such films simply did not exist. Today, no matter how difficult the path of art raising acute social problems is, we can name films that are well known to us... Of course, we are especially interested in and close to films created by masters whose life and work are firmly connected with the labor movement. The films of such directors show not only today's class struggles, but also the optimistic prospects of the social movement (Sobolev, 1976: 18-19).

Film critic B. Kokorevich was just as ideologically charged: "Progressive Italian cinema has repeatedly addressed the theme of the mafia. The neo-realists were the instigators of the anti-Mafist trend in the progressive cinema of Italy. ... The first big and significant victory of Italian filmmakers on the front of the fight against the mafia by means of art should be called the film directed by Francesco Rosi *Salvatore Giuliano* (Italy, 1962) – a passionate and bitter accusation not only of the mafia, but of the entire Italian bourgeois society, through and through rotten, affected by the malignant tumor of corruption. ... And a few years later, progressive Italian cinema releases a whole clip of anti-Mafist films ... However, progressive filmmakers in Italy are increasingly coming to the conclusion that it is not enough just to denounce this syndicate of criminals. Other means of dealing with them are also needed. And they can be found only by clearly imagining that the mafia will cease to exist only when the roots that gave rise to it – social injustice, blatant inequality, corruption, corrupt bureaucracy and police apparatus – disappear" (Kokorevich, 1978: 12).

Equally "politically correct" was the film critic S. Asenin (1922-2008), who emphasized that director Giuliano Montaldo belongs to that progressive wing of Italian directors who are true to the precepts and traditions of neorealism ... With his film *Sacco and Vanzetti* (Italy, 1970), he put himself in the first a number of masters of "attacking" political cinema, the art of uncompromising class positions (Asenin, 1971: 17).

The same S. Asenin argued that among the sharp socio-critical films, there is also Damiano Damiani's film *Investigation is over, forget it* (*L'Istruttoria è chiusa: dimentichi*. Italy, 1971), which is merciless in its close revealing analysis, continuing and deepening the theme his *Recognition of the Commissioner of Police to the Prosecutor of the Republic* (*Confessione di un commissario di polizia al procuratore della repubblica*. Italy, 1970). The action takes place in a prison, which is shown both as an instrument of power and as a "continuation", a cell of bourgeois society infected with all its diseases and vices. Bribery, lawlessness and arbitrariness reign here, and the mafia stretches its tentacles here almost more confidently than in other areas of state life (Asenin, 1972: 17).

Highly, first of all, from a political point of view, other films by Damiano Damiani (1922-2013) were also rated: *I'm afraid* (*Io ho paura*. Italy, 1977) (Filatova, 1981: 4-5) and *Man on his knees* (*Un Uomo in ginocchio*. Italy, 1978) (Plakhov, 1983: 5-6).

So it was emphasized that in the film *I'm afraid* the author indomitably believes that it is in the power of people to change all this, stubbornly and furiously appeals to the viewer, prompting him to think, decide, act. The political cinema of Italy inherited the best features of Italian neo-realism. Faithful to his principles and Damiano Damiani ... The dramaturgy of his films is constructive and clear, understandable to any viewer, it does not contain excessive plot intricacies, too complex psychological dramas, intricate love affairs. A simple plot unfolds rapidly, replete with unexpected twists and turns, the "shooting" dialogue is clear and precise (Filatova, 1981: 4-5).

In general, other Italian films of "political cinema" also deserved a positive assessment from the reviewers of the *Soviet Screen*: *Metello* (Italy, 1969) (Anninsky, 1972: 16), *The Day of the Owl* (*Il Giorno della civetta*. Italy-France, 1967) (Zorkaya, 1968), *In the name of the Italian people* (*In nome del popolo italiano*. Italy, 1971) (Dularidze, 1974: 4), *Respectable People* (*Gente di rispetto*. Italy, 1975) (Bachelis, 1978: 4), *San Babila Square: 20 hours* (*San Babila ore 20 un delitto inutile*. Italy, 1976) (Mikhalkovich, 1977: 4-5), *The Case of Matei* (*Il caso Mattei*. Italy, 1971) (Prozhogin, 1972: 17), *The Investigation into the case of a citizen beyond all suspicion* (*Indagine su un cittadino al di sopra di ogni sospetto*. Italy, 1969) (Bogemsky, 1971: 16-17),

In particular, it was emphasized that the drama *The Case of Matei* shows how Mattei's activities restore the forces of international and internal Italian reaction against him. The invisible, but clearly tangible ring of intrigues weaving against him shrinks, and now comes the tragic denouement. ... And yet the end of the film is optimistic. Mattei, of course, was not a revolutionary, but the cause for which he fought and died was of progressive importance for Italy (Prozhogin, 1972: 17).

Referring to the analysis of the sharply political film *The Investigation into the case of a citizen beyond all suspicion*, film critic G. Bogemsky (1920-1995) wrote that the irony of the film is that the killer is the guardian of law and order himself, who, it turns out, can commit crimes with impunity. It is on this paradox that Petri's caustic, sarcastic film is built – a satirical "black" comedy, a grotesque, a political pamphlet – all together, and at the same time a work very strictly sustained in style, thorough and at the same time ironic through and through, sometimes mischievous "psychoanalysis" and ridiculed nor any particular case, but the entire system of police arbitrariness and power in a bourgeois state, which gives rise to this arbitrariness, without lawnah, violence. ... Gian Maria Volonté plays the role of a murderous policeman... Volonté is the No. 1 actor of the left political cinema and of the entire Italian cinema. ... This role is one of his brightest. The furious, sharply ironic style of play and the temperament of this great actor appeared in all its splendor (Bogemsky, 1971: 16-17).

Film critic E. Bauman (1932-2017) wrote that director Francesco Rosi (1922-2015), skillfully filming the book *Christ Stopped at Eboli* by Carlo Levi (*Cristo si è fermato a Eboli*. Italy-France, 1979), addresses the acute socio-political issues reflected in the mirror of history. This picture, amazing in its picturesqueness, subtle psychologism, deeply lyrical intonation, is filled with a truly civic temperament in exposing fascism, in sympathy for the peasant poor, in protest against the lack of spiritual freedom. ... Rosie's folk fresco is a broad social canvas that continues the best traditions of Italian progressive cinema (Bauman, 1979: 6).

Film historian S. Freilich (1920-2005) (Freilich 1980: 17) and journalist A. Makarov (Makarov 1982: 8) also praised the film.

Film critic G. Bogemsky was delighted with the picture Brothers Taviani's *Father-master* (*Padre padrone*. Italy, 1977): the realities of folk life, the very theme of the film emphasizes the

directors' loyalty to the traditions of neo-realism as much as possible in the 70s. But along with this, there are many signs of a new political cinema, its expressive means and language. For example, irony is the favorite weapon of the Taviani brothers... *Father-Master* is, in a sense, a return to the roots and at the same time the ideological and artistic pinnacle of their work. This is a significant contribution to the meridionalist culture of Italy, a passionate and sincere protest against age-old poverty (Bogemsky, 1980: 4-5).

But the literary scholar and film critic L. Anninsky (1934-2019) took a rather harsh view of *Metello* (Italy, 1969), which was praised by the Italian press, reproaching it for "calligraphy" and excessive picturesqueness. He admitted that the film is politically sharp enough, and the class battles of the workers of the late 19th and early 20th centuries are shown here in all their clarity.

L. Anninsky wrote that faithfulness to social problems, which returns the viewer to the simple and clear truth of neo-realism, to the truth of social struggle and civic activism, is the very thing that has been picked up by the Italian critics who contrast *Metello* with commercial cinematography as an example of meaningful art. "This aspect is undoubtedly decisive for the success of *Metello* on the Italian screen... However, it is interesting to consider *Metello* from another perspective – from the point of view of the stylistic quest of contemporary cinema. ... While watching (with one half of my mind) the development of the social plot, with the other half I was catching the picturesque associations: the misty river reminded me of Claude Monet, the bright yellow colors of the theater performance – of Toulouse-Lautrec, the group of strikers on the sun-drenched grass of the park – of Renoir. ... As for *Metello* himself... I can't name any associations, but I must confess: here one can admire the plastic sculpture of the face, the "completeness of the image" in general, but by no means feel that intense will, that fiery fire, that obsession with an idea which is typical for a working man in the cinema of the 20s. These traits are still present in such "political films" of modern Italy as *Sacco e Vanzetti* by G. Montaldo. Such "political" films of modern Italy as G. Montaldo's and F. Rosi's *People Against Uomini contro*. (Italy-Yugoslavia, 1970) – their harsh black-and-white (here L. Anninsky makes a mistake: both these films are in color) "chronicle" stylistics are still closer to the material... The director's solution of the film is built upon counterpoint: on the one hand – the passionate class psychology of an Italian worker-socialist of the early century; on the other – subtle tints and colors, the play of sunlight on the hero's face, the velvet depths of the gardens, the merry illumination of the market. ... How do I feel about the film *Metello*? It's complicated. It's a beautiful film. Beautiful red and black, cream and yellow, green and sunny. One word: Italy. But, apparently, I am used to a different language in depicting the class battles that defined the face of our century" (Anninsky, 1972: 16).

Of course, the *Soviet Screen*, as before, could not ignore the works of Federico Fellini (1920-1993), Luchino Visconti (1906-1976) and Michelangelo Antonioni (1912-2007).

So the film critic G. Bogemsky (1920-1995) in his positive review wrote that the film by Federico Fellini, *Amarcord* (Italy-France, 1973) has the character of a film-memories: its director draws material not from historical chronicles and documents and not from the boiling cauldron of life around, but from the pantry of his memory. ... In Fellini's film, everything is dominated by irony and humor. And the humor here is mischievous, biting. ... The anti-fascist theme sounded in Fellini in this film for the first time, and with the same passion with which he used to sound anti-clerical motives. So, the desire for simplicity, humanity, love of life, a truly popular atmosphere, an anti-fascist spirit – all this allows us to say that *Amarcord*, despite the "familiarity" of the material, represents a new stage in Fellini's work, *Roma* (Italy-France, 1972) (Bogemsky, 1974: 14).

The film critic S. Freilich (1920-2005) also highly appreciated another outstanding work of F. Fellini – a philosophical parable *Orchestra Rehearsal* (*Prova d'orchestra*. Italy-Germany, 1978), in which a troupe of musicians is considered as a model of society. As always with Fellini, there is no predeterminedness and schematism here. He sees the problems of democracy and power in the relations between the musicians and the conductor. Relations between the musicians themselves are also complex: by analyzing them, the director finds out the causes of fear and confusion that haunt people and prevent them from uniting their efforts. ... In "Orchestra Rehearsal" the grin of fascism flashed as a modern danger: the film is a warning to humanity and a desire to instill a sense of shame and guilt for passivity (Freilich, 1980: 16-17).

Another story F. Fellini's *And the Ship Sails On* (*E la nave va*. Italy-France, 1983) was regarded by G. Bogemsky as a metaphor for today's Western world, and partly for the work of

the most outstanding artist, one of the patriarchs of Italian cinema. ... Fellini's anxiety for his creative destiny, for the destiny of art, inseparably merged with anxiety for the destiny of the world, for the very existence of mankind (Bogemsky, 1985: 20-21).

To the drama by L. Visconti *Conversation Piece (Gruppo di famiglia in un interno*. Italy-France, 1974) *Soviet Screen* returned twice (Prozhogin, 1975: 15; Zorkaya, 1978: 4-5).

And here the film critic N. Zorkaya (1924-2006) was right: made by a seriously ill and doomed to death master, *Gruppo di famiglia...* once again and, perhaps, with some kind of young frankness and clarity unprecedented before, demonstrated an amazing artistic phenomenon, called "Visconti cinematography" ... And the later creation of Luchino Visconti *Gruppo di famiglia in un interno*, with all its deep personality, with open and ringing confession, bears the stamp of actual topicality, is full of echoes of the real political struggle unfolding in Italian society. The place of the intellectual in today's Western life, in its complex, vague, disturbing spiritual situation – so a little straightforward, but still exactly, the theme of the film should have been defined. ... the deep moralism of the artist gives rise in the *Gruppo di famiglia...* to the theme of a person's responsibility to his neighbor. The spectacle, recreated more with pain and sorrow than with the pathos of denunciation, calls for a more complex analysis of the reasons, one of which for Visconti is the position of non-intervention, egoistic peace detached from the world with its passions and sufferings (Zorkaya, 1978: 4-5) .

But the drama of M. Antonioni *Profession: reporter (Professione: reporter*. Italy-France-USA-Spain, 1975) *Soviet Screen* even devoted four articles (Chernenko, 1976: 16-17; Nedelin, 1977; Prozhogin, 1975: 14-15; Svobodin, 1975 : 16-17).

But if the film critic A. Svobodin (1922-1999) appreciated this work of Antonioni very highly, then his colleague M. Chernenko was more restrained: "I am not one of her admirers, the picture seems to me mannered, pretentious, and in its moral message it's simply not new, but it's not a matter of personal opinion, but that one of the largest masters of world cinema in his conversation about the human soul is trying to get out from a closed world to a wide expanse of political, social, ideological conditions and motivations" (Chernenko, 1976: 16-17).

Quite a mixed critic Valery Geydeko (1940-1979) reacted to the adaptation of Shakespeare's famous tragedy *Romeo and Juliet* directed by Franco Zeffirelli (1923-2019). On the one hand, he noted that the picture is far from theatrical, the film is dynamic, expressive, made in an emphatically modern manner. But on the other hand, some scenes shot in a fairly familiar and traditional manner, there are episodes that are probably obviously uninteresting to the director and therefore executed superficially and hastily. ... Zeffirelli consciously sharpens some motives, consciously, sometimes defiantly muffles and omits others. And it is precisely from here that some of the costs and losses of this original, polemically sharp, talented and bright film (Geydeko, 1972: 15).

But about the film by Ettore Scola *We All Loved Each Other So Much (C'eravamo tanto amati*. Italy, 1974) from three reviewers of the *Soviet Screen* (Bozhovich, 1977: 5; Demin, 1975: 8-9; Prozhogin, 1975: 14) there were essentially no disagreements. All of them noted the high artistic level taken in this picture by its authors.

So film critic V. Bozhovich (1932-2001) wrote about this uncommon in its artistic merits picture like this: cinematic analogies, quotations and half-quotes that fill the film by Ettore Scola are not at all the amusements of a film library scholar, they have a dual function: on the one hand, they convey the atmosphere of the time, and on the other, they confirm the connection of the film with the best traditions of Italian cinema. Following the example of his famous predecessors, director Ettore Scola strives to tell the bitter truth about the state of Italian society. But his film is warmed by sympathy for a person, and it cannot be called pessimistic in any way (Bozhovich, 1977: 5).

With a certain touch of excessive politicization, but on the whole quite adequately assessed on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* film critic G. Bogemsky another outstanding film – *The Desert of the Tartars (Il Deserto dei Tartari*. Italy-France-Germany, 1976) by Valerio Zurlini (1926-1982): the director managed to achieve complete identity between the literary fundamental principle and the film, which truly complement each other, managed to convey the gloomy, oppressive atmosphere of the novel. ... in philosophical metaphors and fantastic images, the anti-militarist spirit, the condemnation of military psychosis, is clearly read. It is precisely this that primarily attracts Zurlini's film, a parable film that sounds so modern today, when certain circles in the West are again whipping up military hysteria. ... So, what we have here is a

film that, although not easy to perceive, reveals to an attentive viewer all the richness of its content, standing out among others for its genuine artistry and high professionalism (Bogemsky, 1980: 4-5).

The attention of the reviewers of the *Soviet Screen* was also attracted by films dedicated to two outstanding Italian scientists: *Galileo Galilei* (Italy-Bulgaria, 1968) (Vasilyeva, 1970: 15) and *Giordano Bruno* (Italy-France, 1973) (Bogemsky, 1974: 16-17; Chudov, 1974: 17).

But if in a review about Galileo Galilei emphasized that an interesting general idea of the film in the incarnation significantly suffers from excessive rationalism, from straightforwardness in this analysis of vices and evil (Vasilyeva, 1970: 15), that the film *Giordano Bruno* was perceived absolutely positively, as it is permeated with a fierce passion for the struggle of reason, knowledge, striving for the happiness of people on earth, against religious dogmas and canons, against the cold cruelty and arbitrariness of the Vatican – the eternal guardian of the inviolability of social foundations, the power of the most conservative forces (Bogemsky, 1974: 16-17).

Among the Italian melodramas, the *Soviet Screen* undoubtedly preferred the work of the classics of neorealism: “Italian director Vittorio de Sica told a wonderful love story in the film *A Brief Vacation* (*Una breve vacanza*. Italy-Spain, 1973) ... De Sica and screenwriter Cesare Zavattini... made the film sincere and pure. ... The film lacks the austerity, harshness and uncompromising nature of De Sica and Zavattini's early work. This work is brilliant, artistic, but it has in common with neorealist films the truth of life, especially in the depiction of the life of a working family. *A Brief Vacation* is like a song with a well-known melody, but performed masterfully, with impeccable artistic taste” (Chertok, 1974: 18).

Analyzing another Italian melodrama – *Crime in the name of love* (*Delitto d'amore*. Italy, 1974) – film critic V. Demin (1937-1993) presented to the readers of the magazine her formula for success: Comencini openly emulates another, state-of-the-art superfilm model, combining sensitivity to the changing tastes of the public at once with strong, unchanging techniques that always and everywhere guarantee success. This model, this latest formula, was promulgated by the Americans in *Love Story*. The formula is simple, like all ingenious. It is necessary that there be two young people who romantically love each other, pure in heart and ardent in soul, and that there is a callous world around them that does not understand them. The hero's parents are infected with the selfishness of the rich, the heroine's relatives are endowed with the pride of the poor. There is no one to rely on, and inexperienced, touching heroes must endure in complete solitude, one after another, the terrible blows of fate, up to the fatal, inevitable illness of the girl ... Comencini produced the most social, most "neorealist" version of the *Love story* formula. ... Everything is filmed soundly, solidly, diligently, and only genre fluctuations confuse – from the impassive fixation of an uncombed nature to openly farcical, conditional tones. ... The shot puts an end to this film, which at first had all the features of a social study, but in the main it remained a melodrama (Demin, 1976: 4-5).

Even stricter approached another melodrama – *The True Story of the Lady with the Camellias* (*La Storia vera della signora delle camelie*. Italy-France-Germany, 1981) – film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013), so, in his opinion, the picture as a whole is so aestheticized. that in the exhausting slowness of her action, there was almost no room left for a glimpse of a living feeling, and even the blood clots that the unfortunate heroine coughed up from her destroyed lungs looked here simply as bright spots of a colorful ornament (Dmitriev, 1981: 16-17).

From the rather variegated spectrum of Italian comedies, the *Soviet Screen* singled out Pietro Germi's *Serafino* (Italy-France, 1968), awarded at the Moscow Film Festival (Bogemsky, 1972: 14-15; Galanov, 1969).

Noting in his review that this work by Germi is rough, harsh, sometimes imbued with too salty peasant jokes, G. Bogemsky was convinced that the film distribution, which we so often and quite reasonably criticize for releasing second-rate foreign films on the screen, acquiring *Serafino*, he did the right thing. The film is not as simple as it might seem at first glance. ... *Serafino* is a cheerful, cheerful comedy, full of folk humor, although it sometimes involves bitterness and mockery inherent in the talent of this director. ... The anti-bourgeoisness of *Serafino*, which laughed evilly at the money-grubbers and philistines, was not forgiven by the entire bourgeois press of Italy... However, a wide audience in Italy accepted the picture. ... Against the background of the gloomy movies that filled the Western screen, imbued with aching melancholy and despair or inhuman cruelty, murders and robberies, cheerful, the spiky,

life-loving *Serafino* is by no means a negative phenomenon: it is controversial, one may like it or not, but it does its job of ridiculing bourgeois morality and mores. ... “Is it so scary that our children and grandchildren will see this comedy, as one of the readers worries about this? If they are 16 years old, if their family and school have taught them to look at life, sweeping aside everything superficial and dirty, instilled in them a sense of justice and morality, introduced them to the classics of world literature, then, I think, nothing terrible will happen” (Bogemsky, 1972: 14-15).

Approximately in the same vein, he assessed the comedy *Romanzo popolare* (Italy-France, 1974) film critic A. Svobodin (1922-1999): the film is filled to the brim with coarse folk humor, splashing health, everyday scenes and scenes of love, taking place both in reality and in the imagination. Here are Italian folk types, here is the director's emphasized – even too emphasized – attention to the everyday joys of ordinary people, to the everyday events of their lives. ... *Romanzo popolare* is in many ways an epigone of the neo-realist films of the fifties (Svobodin, 1975: 17).

Quite benevolently were reviewed in the *Soviet Screen* and two very popular comedies in the Soviet film distribution with the participation of Adriano Celentano: *Bluff (Bluff storia di truffe e di imbroglioni)*. Italy, 1975) (Bogemsky, 1979: 12-13) and *The Taming of the Scoundrel (Is Bisbetico domato)*. Italy, 1980) (Dmitriev, 1981: 16-17).

Film critic G. Bogemsky wrote that in *Bluff* directed by Sergio Corbucci (1926-1990) showed himself to be a master of bluffing: the lack of originality, fresh, thought, he replaces with varying success with a cascade of tricks, an inexhaustible fiction for more and more fraudulent tricks, deceptions of all calibers... It's all about the performers of the roles: here the director of *Bluff* has real, genuine trump cards, or rather, aces... These aces are Anthony Quinn and Adriano Celentano. ... Adriano Celentano attracts, although, as always, he hardly sings in the film. He is amazingly plastic, his movements, gestures, grimaces are unexpected, unusual, conveying as well as his jokes, all the peculiarity of his own system of humor. This "system" is a complex mixture of folk, purely Roman humor with classical clowning and modern, slightly absurd humor in the spirit of the so-called "English"... We must also admit that Corbucci leads his rogue narrative with a certain amount of irony, with a smile, with a certain self-exclusion, sometimes even a little parody. The stylization of the film of the '30s also gives the film a certain conventionality. And what also saves *Bluff* is its supple, genuinely cinematic, old comic pace. What more could one demand from a blatantly entertaining movie?" (Bogemsky, 1979: 12-13).

And film critic V. Dmitriev rightly considered that in *The Taming of the Scoundrel (Is Bisbetico domato)*. Italy, 1980) the unpretentious story was played very well, with a precise sense of the genre and with maximum inner freedom played by Adriano Celentano and Ornella Muti (Dmitriev, 1981: 16-17).

There were noticeably fewer “progressive political films” in France in the 1970s than in Italy, but the *Soviet Screen* tried to support this particular direction in cinema on its pages.

So the drama of Bernard Paul *Time to Live (Le Temps de vivre)*. France, 1968) was noted in the magazine as the beginning of a truly social cinema in France, as one of the first films about the working class, about the problems associated with the position of the proletariat during scientific and technological revolution in the West (Bocharov, 1972: 15).

For the same reasons, Michel Drash's film *Élise or Real Life (Élise ou la vraie vie)*. France-Algeria, 1970), dedicated to the exploitation of Arab workers in France, the solidarity of ordinary people in the struggle for equality and human dignity (Bocharov, 1972: 15).

Moreover, the assumption was even made (reckless, as it turned out very soon) that these few shoots of a truly democratic French culture will merge in the near future with a “workers’ cinema” created by the working people themselves – about their own problems and for themselves ... To be perhaps this is the key to the future of French cinema (Bocharov, 1972: 15).

From the same ideologized position films such as *Assassination / The French Conspiracy (L'Attentat)*. France-Italy-FRG, 1972) were evaluated in the *Soviet Screen*, as he told about the massacre of the reaction over one of the leaders of the national liberation movement (Bozhovich, 1979: 18; Braginsky, 1973: 13) and *Judge Fayard Called the Sheriff (Le Juge Fayard dit Le Shériff)*. France, 1977) (Bozhovich, 1979: 18).

Film critic G. Dolmatovskaya (1939-2021) noted that not being free from some clichés of the political-detective genre, Yves Boisset made a film that is extremely important for today's French cinema, a film imbued with the director's political temperament (Dolmatovskaya, 1973:

12- 13).

And film critic V. Bozhovich (1932-2021) wrote that bourgeois society and the state are nothing but a system of organized crime – Yves Boisset returns to this idea again in the film *Judge Fayard Called the Sheriff...* The picture of bourgeois society painted by Yves Boisset in the film is quite real (Bozhovich, 1979: 18).

Other socio-critical films were also highly appreciated in the *Soviet Screen: Professional risk* (*Les risques du métier*. France, 1967) (Shcherbakov, 1969), *Direct report on death / Death Watch* (*La Mort en direct*. France-Germany, 1980) (Dolmatovskaya, 1981: 16; Razlogov, 1981: 18), *Order and security in the world* (*L'Ordre et la securite du monde*. France-USA, 1978) (Razlogov, 1981: 18), *The Prize of Peril* (*Le Prix du danger*. France, 1983) (Shitova, 1984: 10-11).

At the same time, it was emphasized that political analysis ... is much less accurate in the French painting by Laurent Heynemann *Birgit Haas Must Be Killed* (*Il faut tuer Birgitt Haas*. France-Germany, 1981), but and here the story of the romantic passion of an unemployed man who was tried to be used to kill a terrorist objectionable to the authorities, and his potential victim contains a call for the victory of sincere human feelings over ruthless criminal machinations (Razlogov, 1983: 14-15). But gradually the film deviates from the rails of a political detective story, as it seemed at the beginning... worse, but that the actions and feelings of the characters are more and more decisively ruled by melodrama (Plakhov, 1985: 10).

Approximately from the same position, the film critic V. Dmitriev assessed the “revealing potential” of the film *A Thousand Billion Dollars* (*Mille milliards de dollars*. France, 1982), since this picture for all the nobility of the original message cannot be compared with the best of these films, replacing artistic research with straightforwardness and dissolving revealing pathos in the intricacies of a criminal plot that begins to live its own life according to the laws of the genre (Dmitriev, 1984: 10-11).

Analyzing the film André Cayatte *Where There's Smoke* (*Il n'y a pas de fumée sans feu*. France-Italy, 1972; in the Soviet film distribution: *Blackmail*), film critic G. Dolmatovskaya complained about the simplified interpretation of the revealing subject: “This film leaves a feeling of some awkwardness, as if the motif of a frivolous song was inserted into a classical symphony. This happens because the director, apparently, fears that the social line of the film in its purest form will not attract the viewer. And now the picture is "enriched" with many juicy details. Beautiful details, admiring exquisite interiors, luxurious swimming pools... in a number of scenes become self-sufficient, and, naturally, the civic pathos of the film is muffled” (Dolmatovskaya, 1973: 12-13).

With respect to film adaptations of French literary classics *The Thibault Family* (*Les Thibault*. France, 1973), *Les Misérables* (France, 1972) the tone of the reviewers of the *Soviet Screen*, as it happened more than once before, was devoid of politicization (Krechetova, 1975: 6; Mikhalkovich, 1974: 4-5).

During the analyzed period, several notable French and Swiss francophone films appeared on the Soviet screen, addressed to modern everyday topics, with vivid female images played by Annie Girardot, Natalie Bay and Isabelle Huppert.

In particular, film critic G. Dolmatovskaya enthusiastically praised the film Jean-Pierre Blanc's *The Old Maid* (*La Vieille fille*. France-Italy, 1971) where the brilliant Annie Girardot plays the role of an unusual after recent spectacular and eccentric roles. ... The charm of this simple film lies in humanity, subtle, clever humor (Dolmatovskaya, 1972: 14).

And the film critic K. Razlogov (1946-2021) wrote very warmly about the *Week of Vacation* (*Une semaine de vacances*. France, 1980) that one of the strongest aspects of B. Tavernier's talent is respect for his characters, the accuracy and depth of understanding of the nature of the character and the individuality of the actor playing this or that role (Razlogov, 1983: 18-19), the desire for realism also distinguishes the *Week of Vacation* is the story of a Lyon teacher who suddenly doubted her vocation. Again, the focus of the author's view is a way out of the rut, an internal crisis, but finding resolution not in a crime or passive surrender, but in a return to normal life and to one's work, which is so necessary for oneself and others (Razlogov, 1981: 18) .

The journalist A. Makarov, in our opinion, very correctly noted that the film *The Lacemaker* (*La Dentellière*. France-Switzerland, 1976) seems to be a *Boring story* in Chekhov's merciless sense of the word. That is, tragically terrible and at the same time ordinary and familiar, sometimes even not attracting special attention to itself. ... Ordinary for everyone,

except for the one whose heart breaks (Makarov, 1985: 10).

Film critic V. Ivanova (1937-2008) wrote that the movies of Claude Goretta (1929-2019) – *The Lacemaker* (*La Dentellière*. France-Switzerland, 1976) and *The Girl from Lorraine* (*La Provinciale*. France-Switzerland, 1980) – captivate with noble restraint in expressing feelings, which might seem to someone a fashionable detachment, if not for the general intensity of the artistic temperament. Two perhaps the most popular actresses in France now – Isabelle Huppert and Natalie Bay – embody, as it were, opposite facets of the character of a modern young French woman. The property that unites them and, perhaps, the only one they have in common is “provincialism”, a clear rejection of the spirit and essence of the modern capitalist city with its crazy rhythm, cynical pursuit of success and prosperity, mania of irrepressible consumption (Ivanova, 1985: 22).

The more politicized film critic N. Savitsky believed that *The Girl from Lorraine* (*La Provinciale*. France-Switzerland, 1980) provides an example of a deep and artistically convincing study of acute social problems of the modern West – unemployment, alienation of a person in a capitalist society, all-pervading amorality. ... Claude Goretta, an honest and observant artist, speaks from the screen calmly, without affectation. But under this apparent dispassion, the unimagined drama of a typical fate and true circumstances inherent in a privately owned society clearly emerges: an image of a cold and ruthless world, indifferent to human suffering and hostile to natural human aspirations, emerges (Savitsky, 1985: 18-19).

An unexpectedly sharp reception was received on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* by the philosophical parable of the classic of French cinema art Alain Resnais *My American Uncle* (*Mon oncle d'Amérique*. France, 1980), whose undisguised irony and parody for some reason were not noticed by reviewers.

Film expert V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) wrote that he was upset by this picture, where an extremely gifted artist, blindly trusting a controversial biological theory, maximally schematized the complex relationship between human character, the possibility of an act and the world around (Dmitriev, 1981: 16-17).

Film critic R. Yurenev (1912-2002) echoed him: direct transfer of conclusions from rats to people seemed to me too straightforward. ... To be honest, all this is done chaotically and boringly. ... And the episodes where the director put rat heads on the characters - masks, thereby resorting to direct analogies between rats and people, seemed not only vulgar, but also tasteless (Yurenev, 1984: 8-9).

As we have already mentioned, the *Soviet Screen* extremely rarely deployed polemics about Western films on its pages.

But in the mid-1980s, Ettore Scola's outstanding film *Le Bal* (France-Italy-Algeria, 1983) received this kind of controversy.

First, the magazine published a review of the famous writer Y. Nagibin (1920-1994), where he spoke of *Le Bal* sharply negatively: “The film, where not a word is spoken, but only dancing and gesticulating, where beautiful music sounds, deeply disappointed me. I did not find almost any innovations in it and very little simply human worse – it seemed to me professionally sloppy, hastily worked out, thoughtless and, most importantly, not experienced by its main creator – the director, although he has a big name. The device on which the film is based and which for some reason shocked my acquaintances so much has a long beard. Alas, this is not at all, not at all new: to show the movement of time, the change of eras through music, dance and simple pantomime. ... For the grotesque, there is not enough wit for satire – evil humor. It turned out to be a humorous spectacle, sluggish and cumbersome” (Nagibin, 1985: 18-19).

This was followed by a review by musicologist I. Taimanov, who wrote that Y. Nagibin's negative approach to *Le Bal* raises serious objections, and then dwelled in detail on the artistic merits of this film, its historical and cinematic references: “For Ettore Scola, *Le Bal* is not only the history of France, but also the history of French, more broadly, of world cinema. Or more precisely: *Le Bal* for him is the history of France through the prism of cinematic history. This important layer of the picture was completely bypassed by Nagibin. But to fully feel the film of Scola (and its poetics, we object to the reviewer, just requires empathy) can only be plunged after the director into the world of his memories – the world of cinema. ... if we agree that any work of art experienced and suffered by a talented artist is already a miracle, then *Le Bal* can certainly claim such an assessment” (Taimanov, 1986: 19).

As before, *Soviet Screen* published articles about French entertainment films.

Here the literary critic and film critic L. Anninsky (1934-2019), reviewing *Black Tulip* (*La Tulipe Noire*. France-Italy-Spain, 1964) Christian-Jacques (1904-1994), wrote that the authors of the film either try to seriously hurt important ideas along the way for entertainment, or, on the contrary, use these ideas for entertainment purposes, which, of course, is no better. ... As for the dances and final kisses with which the main characters (he and she) crown their activities near the gallows, this, in my opinion, is not just bad taste. ... It is a pity that Tulip has faded, blackened. He did not become sinister, of course, although he was put on a frightening black mask. Alas, we are not afraid. We are sorry ([Anninsky, 1970: 15](#)).

Film critic L. Dularidze reviewed even more “sour”, indeed, a weak film *The Royal Chase* (*La Chasse royale*. France-Czechoslovakia, 1969): Francois Leterrier is a student of Bresson, but, alas, a student who inherited little from him. In Leterrier's paintings ... the psychologism and philosophy of Bresson's work acquire the character of pretentiousness and idle talk. In *The Royal Chase*, claims are multiple ([Dularidze, 1972: 19](#)).

A sharp rejection of the reviewer of the *Soviet Screen* was caused by Georges Lautner's film *Cop or Hood* (*Flic ou voyou*. France, 1978): “For all his supermanship, the hero Belmondo is extremely uncharismatic. ... I don't want to “cheer” for Stan Borowitz. Everything human seems to be alien to him. Well, except for the love of his daughter. But this line is perceived as alien, unable to convince and truly excite. However, leaving the hall, you will think about the ease with which the guardians of the law turn into gangsters. Such “reincarnations” are apparently inherent in a sick society in which heroes like Stan Borowitz and his opponents thrive” ([Kovshov, 1981: 4-5](#)).

Another film by Georges Lautner (1926-2013) – *No Problems* (*Pas de problème!* France, 1975) did not please the *Soviet Screen*. Film critic A. Svobodin (1922-1999) wrote about him like this: “At the risk of remaining old-fashioned, the author of these lines must confess that playing with a corpse did not seem very appetizing to him” ([Svobodin, 1975: 17](#)).

Film critic G. Dolmatovskaya did not like the musical comedy *All are Stars* (*Tous vedettes!* France, 1980) by Michel Lang (1939-2014), because in it, according to the reviewer, humor recedes before the pressure of vulgarity ([Dolmatovskaya, 1981 : 16](#)).

More benevolent, but generally rather skeptical, were the *Soviet Screen* reviews of other well-known French comedies.

Film critic I. Lishchinsky wrote that in *The Big Runaround* (*La Grande vadrouille*. France-Great Britain, 1966) “the plot, and the whole atmosphere of what is happening, in fact, does not bother the director much. War and occupation, English pilots and German SS men – all this is quite arbitrary ... At the same time, you cannot refuse the director either in ingenuity or in professionalism. He knows his business. Ouri is staging, so to speak, a “pure” comedy, a comedy without any extraneous impurities ... But still, as you can see, a comedy that is too pure every now and then turns out to be a comedy on idle. Something is missing. From time to time you catch yourself thinking that you are both funny and bored at the same time” ([Lishchinsky, 1971: 16-17](#)).

It would seem infunny film adaptation of the play by Claude Magnier *Oscar* (France, 1967), director Édouard Molinaro (1928-2013) made full use of the comedic gift of Louis de Funes (1914-1983). The audience in the cinemas (as well as at the *The Big Runaround*) laughed with might and main, but the harsh Soviet film critics reproached the director that in the movie *Oscar*, in a work of banal and low taste, he surrounds his manufacturer with some kind of egg-shaped chairs, fantastic floor lamps, fills the house with ceramics, abstract structures, trellises, aquariums and an aviary with pheasants. ... Acting so much and so often, Louis de Funes, of course, hardly develops his already established image ([Lishchinsky, 1972: 18-19](#)).

Well, the reviews of I. Lishchinsky have long been forgotten, but the audience continues to laugh in the vastness of these funny and temperamental comedies...

But here Pierre Étaix's comedy *Big Love* (*Le Grand amour*. France, 1968) was praised by the *Soviet Screen*. Film critic Y. Bogomolov (1937-2023) wrote that this movie at first should produce a strange impression of slowness of pace, poverty of events, lack of adventure. ... If you look at an object for a long time, it may seem ridiculous. This is how Pierre Étaix uses a movie lens. ... Étaix in his film not only tells love stories, but shares some impressions about this love. He shares some of his observations and counts on the viewer's powers of observation. Monsieur Pierre is very cautious, thoughtfulness is his friend. Thought must become the friend of the spectator. Monsieur Pierre was in no hurry to go anywhere, and yet he made me laugh

(Bogomolov, 1972: 15).

The parody comedy *Blond Man with One Black Shoe* (*Le Grand blond avec une chaussure noire*. France, 1972), popular with Soviet viewers, was also received favorably by the *Soviet Screen*. Film critic T. Khloplyankina (1937-1993) wrote that *Blond Man with One Black Shoe* is one of the films that critics are much more willing to watch than discuss. The goals set by the authors in this case are so obvious and this comedy looks so fun that there is no need to think anything. ... Isn't this why you appreciate the moments when the movement along the rut of the plot suddenly stops and you suddenly get a chance to be surprised anew that the fantastic situation of the film is ordinary, almost ordinary, because it is born of reality, and the people brought together on the screen by the conventional plot live this way in reality and consider this monstrous life quite normal (Khloplyankina, 1975: 9).

However, the continuation of this comedy – *The Return of the Tall Blond Man with One Black Shoe* (*Le Retour du grand blond*. France, 1974) – was received much colder in the *Soviet Screen*: film critics wrote that the material looks already worked out (Dolmatovskaya, 1975: 18-19), without revealing anything fundamentally new to us, neither in life nor in art (Bozhovich, 1976: 4).

Édouard Molinaro's comedy *A Pain in the A...* (*L'Emmerdeur*. France-Italy, 1973) was clearly more fortunate in the *Soviet Screen*: the actors make this film a comedy of characters. Their choice is paradoxical, but accurate... Before us is not an eccentricity of the "de-Funesian" sense, but a story dressed in the form of a comedy about a kind man who did not allow a murder to be committed (Sergeev, 1975: 2-3).

Film critic V. Gulchenko (1944–2018) gave a fair assessment to the comedy *The Toy* (*Le Jouet*. France, 1976), emphasizing that Pierre Richard discovered there a rare and deep comedic gift – a fusion of the lyrical and the eccentric, declaring himself as a screen successor of the culture that shows the world as the protagonist of the "little man", not skimping on all sorts of paradoxes and deliberate absurdity of situations. ... The creators of the film *The Toy* are concerned that everything human in a person does not die out (Gulchenko, 1978. 11: 4-5).

Following its rule, the *Soviet Screen* also supported politically biased films in Spanish cinema. So film critic E. Bauman (1932-2017) wrote that, with the picture *Seven Days in January* (*7 días de enero*. Spain-France, 1979) is an example of militant, incendiary journalism that passionately invades reality. The name of its author, the master of Spanish cinema, Juan Antonio Bardem, is well known to Soviet viewers... The director seeks to involve the viewer in violent socio-political battles. The plot of the picture, made with documentary persuasiveness and fiery pathos, is based on a real event: the villainous murder of a group of lawyers who fought for the rights of workers' trade unions, a murder committed in January 1977 by savage terrorists and directed by the supporters of the fallen Francoist regime. The film, merciless in exposing neo-fascist groups, conquers with its energy and pathos in depicting the masses (Bauman, 1979: 5).

Film expert V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) noted that behind the Spanish film *The Nest* (*El Nido*. Spain-Argentina, 1980) there are long-standing cultural traditions of the country and which cannot be unambiguously explained. It can be read simply as a strange and sad story about the friendship-love of an old man and a teenage girl, and as a metaphor for post-Franco Spain, and as an anti-feminist work that sees in the heroine of the film some kind of modern Lady Macbeth, ready to commit a crime in order to achieve her goals. In *The Nest*, there are preconditions for each of these interpretations. But the main thing in it is still human readiness for help, imprudent and doomed to failure, quixoticism lost in advance, which cannot bring visible results (Dmitriev, 1981: 16-17).

But entertainment films of Spanish production *Soviet Screen* liked to ridicule.

So the film critic A. Zorky (1935-2006) published an ironic review of the musical melodrama, which had a huge audience success in the USSR *Let Them Talk* (*Digan lo que digan*. Spain-Argentina, 1967), simulating two opposite opinions: "Like" and "Dislike": Like: the romantic plot of the film. It is played out on great passions, which we, perhaps, lack in our current life. ... This is a film about songs and love, suffering and fidelity. Dislikes: The fact that the authors tell this hilarious story without any humor. ... It is clear that the authors needed the entire plot to connect purely pop numbers. But why, in general, pleasant, expressive singing should be wrapped in a heap of platitudes and utter fiction? (Zorky, 1970: 13).

Just as ironically finished with the Spanish melodrama *Magical Love* (*El amor brujo*.

Spain, 1967) film critic F. Frantsuzov: Instead of the beauty of dances, the annoying flickering of the Navahs, humor gave way to the ominous aspirations of cheap romance, lightness and grace were replaced by the heavy pace of “realistic” passions ... Everything is serious , and everything is fake (Frantsuzov, 1971: 12).

The Spanish musical melodrama *My Last Tango* (*Mi último tango*. Spain, 1960) was released in Soviet distribution with a big delay: 11 years after its creation. But this did not in the least prevent more than thirty dozen spectators from watching and rewatching it in cinema halls.

But the Soviet film press reacted to this film very dismissively.

Film expert Victor Demin (1937-1993) wrote in the *Soviet Screen* that Sara Montiel is a good singer, and Maurice Ronet is a first-class theater and cinema actor. But the more they try to put on a cloak of plausibility over their experiences, the clearer it becomes that we are facing mannequins. ... Watching all this is very embarrassing. The laws of the genre make it difficult to believe that this is serious, that the happy ending will not take place. And if so, then the heartbreaking suffering of the heroine, who allegedly became blind and allegedly drove her lover away from herself, looks like blasphemous antics. So at the carnival, well-fed and happy people put on freak masks ... There are things that are unworthy to play with. In recent years, domestic cinema has not spoiled us with musical films. Naturally, the emptiness yearns to be filled, and some viewers, in the simplicity of their hearts, may mistake a speculative and untalented craft for "living life." That would be the most distressing thing (Demin, 1972: 19).

Victor Demin also tried to explain the reasons for the popularity of *My Last Tango*: Such films have their own charm, their own fabulous, ingenuous world, with songs, jokes, flowers and applause, with picturesque poverty and even more picturesque luxury, with tears in the penultimate part and with an indispensable final kiss on the so-called diaphragm. It's easy to say, "That doesn't happen in real life." And if the film is staged not according to life, but according to a dream? ... "Make us beautiful!" ... Life flies, anxious, difficult, stormy, to match the age. But another viewer still prefers to go to the cinema oasis. Everything is there as you want, there is the sea, the sun, youth, love, there a charming artist looks with a bewitching look and gently kisses – if not you, but your full-fledged representative Maurice Ronet, who perfectly showed what you would like to be. It is a painkiller film, a healing film, and even with the guarantee of the most charming reveries (Demin 1972: 19).

Despite this, three years later, another article appeared in the *Soviet Screen*, designed to educate the audience in “good taste” and reveal the mechanisms of the mass success of such melodramas.

Film critic Y. Smelkov (1934-1996) wrote that it is very easy to be ironic about films like *The Queen of Chanticleer* (*La Reina del Chantecler*. Spain, 1962), *Let Them Talk* (*Digan lo que digan*. Spain-Argentina, 1967) and *Yesenia* (Mexico, 1971), and it is very easy to explain that [these movies] are lifeless, artistically primitive and made from ready-made stamps. But the irony seems inappropriate to me, because the tears in the cinema were sincere ...

Lifeless? And if a person wants it to be not like in life, but “like in a movie”? ... It is not difficult and even pleasant to prove the lack of content and artistic inconsistency of such paintings, but the trouble is that it can be proved only to those who themselves think so. ...

Therefore, it makes sense to take out, so to speak, the conversation about the level and quality of such films and try to look at them from the point of view of box office success and the reasons for it.

At first glance, these reasons are simple and understandable. He loves her, she loves him, there are obstacles on the way to their happiness... At the same time, one film containing all these indispensable elements is a noisy and stormy success, and the other is not exactly a failure, but collects, say, several hundred films in Moscow. Thousands of viewers, while the first – millions. There are, therefore, some qualities, seasonings to the mandatory set, without which everything depreciates.

It seems to me that there are two such qualities: the absolute seriousness of intonation and the equally absolute isolation, the tightness of the plot conflict, the absence of any correlation with real life. ... – no motivations, but a lot of passions. And the viewer's empathy arises, since the film appeals to simple and eternal human emotions, and it is quite clear who to sympathize with and who to resent. The simplicity of the plot and the seriousness of intonation open up scope for emotional perception; they go to such films "to worry" and after the session they say:

"Good movie – I cried to my heart's content." ...

To reinforce these considerations, we can cite an example – the rolling fate of the film *The Married Couple of Year Two* (*Les Maries De L'An Deux*. France-Italy-Romania, 1972). It did not work out as well as that of *Yesenia*, the box office success turned out to be smaller and short-lived. But what actors: Belmondo, Brassler, what fights, what chases! It was irony, in my opinion...

I am not against melodrama films or entertainment films, I am against them being recognized as the only ones worthy of attention and entitled to the title of works of art. Let there be a movie in which everything is "like in a movie", but it hardly makes sense to fence it off from real cinema, which tells deeply and truthfully about real, unimagined life! (Smelkov, 1975: 8-9).

However, the majority of viewers either did not read such critical articles or did not pay any attention to them. And they got into such melodramas exactly what the Soviet film press so stubbornly criticized.

For the analysis of West German films in the *Soviet Screen* were chosen, first of all, "progressive works".

For example, the drama of R.W. Fassbinder *The Marriage of Maria Braun* (*Die Ehe der Maria Braun*. FRG, 1978) (Krasnova, 1981: 16; Zorkaya, 1983: 8-9).

Film critic G. Krasnova wrote that this was "not only and not so much a study of the psychology of a female entrepreneur ... Fassbinder sought to reflect some of the patterns of the first post-war decade of the country, which went down in history under the name of the "Adenauer economic miracle." And if in this picture Fassbinder managed to reach broad social generalizations, then, first of all, because he was interested not only in the heroine herself with her ambitions, but in Maria Braun as a typical character of the era" (Krasnova, 1981: 16).

Film critic N. Zorkaya (1924-2006) echoed her: Before us is the story of another female biography, mutilated by fascism, another victim of the war. ... Fassbinder's cinematic heritage is uneven, along with deep, serious, socially significant films, there were also trick films, paradox films. *The Marriage of Maria Braun* is one of the best works of the talented cinematographer (Zorkaya, 1983: 8-9).

In a review of the drama *Mephisto* (Hungary-Austria-FRG, 1981), film critic V. Dmitriev wrote that this story of a talented actor who sold his soul to the devil and became the official artist of Nazi Germany, despite the fact that many of the realities of Nazi law and order were deeply disgusting, has a documentary basis ... But it's not about the authenticity of the source material. This picture is a merciless study of the fate of a person who does not have a moral core, who put his professional development at the forefront and naively believed that he could deceive the state machine of the Third Reich (Dmitriev, 1981: 16-17).

And the film critic A. Troshin (1942-2008) reminded the readers of the *Soviet Screen* that this socio-political and moral problems, tightly tied into a tragic knot, the temperamental, masterfully staged, filmed and played picture of István Szabó was provided, of course, by the primary source. Klaus Mann's novel shows how far an artist's willingness to pay any price for success, willingness for the sake of success can take him! – sell your soul to the devil (Troshin, 1982: 14-15).

An in-depth analysis of another notable film – *Fedora* (FRG-France, 1978) – film critic and historian V. Dmitriev suggested in the *Soviet Screen: Sunset Boulevard* (USA, 1950), if its design is slightly coarsened, is built on a simple antithesis of winning Hollywood – losing artists. In *Fedora*, the situation becomes more complicated: the concrete mechanism of Hollywood is taken out of action, the artist (in the film, a famous movie star) gets the right to independently play out his fate and try to win it, but, and this is the main bitter conclusion of the picture, it turns out that you can win only in the traditional Hollywood manner – by renouncing oneself, on someone else's happiness and on "foreign bones." ... Maybe here is a memory of unproduced films, of failures, of working for the needs of the public, of endless self-repetitions, of the fear of new decisions, of his own great talent, largely wasted on trifles, – after all, all this was in the life of the director, and you can't get away from it anywhere. Here analysis gives way to conjecture, but one does not want to abandon it. It seems that there is some truth in it (Dmitriev, 1981: 5).

It is curious that, proceeding from the considerations of "progressive criticism of bourgeois society", *Soviet Screen* could present even weak films from an artistic point of view on its pages worthy of the attention of readers.

For example, here is the text published on the pages of the magazine about the film *The*

Mystery of the Honeymoon Motel (*Meat / Fleisch*. FRG, 1979): Unheard of, fantastic experiments that turn people into robots, into an instrument of someone else's will! This is done by "specialists" in the secret laboratories of the CIA and the Pentagon. Psychotropic, biological, narcotic drugs were tested on unsuspecting Americans – students, athletes, military personnel, hospital patients – without their knowledge, without their consent. ... In [the film] it is precisely the power of the underground business that is shown – whether it trades in people, pornography or drugs. It shows the impotence of the victim, and the collapse of hopes for the law, for the forces of order. ... In the finale of the painting *Mystery of the Honeymoon Motel* with its dizzying flashing in the order of an intricate plot kaleidoscope, the sense of proportion betrayed the authors. This, in my opinion, from distrust of the audience, from the indestructible desire for proven commercial stereotypes: not sparing blood, breaking through to a happy ending. However, all these flaws are excusable, because the picture, made in accordance with all the laws of the adventure genre, turned out to be generally emotionally strong and, most importantly, true, accurate in displaying the signs of the “American way of life” (Dunaev, 1983: 17).

Film critic V. Revich (1929-1997) tried to isolate a serious political meaning even in the parody film *Agent reluctantly* (*Es Muß nicht immer kaviar sein / Diesmal muß es Kaviar sein / Top secret – C'est pas toujours du caviar*. Germany–France, 1961): Comedies are: a) serious works of art, b) cute little things, and c) not cute little things. Between these three types there are hybrid phenomena, lyrical comedy, suppose. The West German movie *Agent involuntarily* combines all three points at once. ... The theme of the lack of rights of a small person who accidentally fell into the game of alien and most often hostile “higher” forces is not resolved in the picture too deeply, but it is there. However, the authors of the film somewhat complicated the matter. ... Liven did not complete a single task of any intelligence, which also required considerable abilities and efforts from him. Indeed, a very small step is needed for him to turn into a real positive hero, even into an anti-fascist fighter (the film takes place in 1939-1945). But the authors did not take this step. ... No, he will not be burdened with heavy thoughts, the most natural comedy awaits him, at times almost eccentric. ... However, the authors seem to have overdone their diligence. At times, not only the endless leapfrog of intelligence and counterintelligence bothers. Interest in the film itself is blunted (Revich, 1970: 14-15).

Among the films of the Scandinavian cinematography, the *Soviet Screen* has traditionally positively singled out the works of the most famous masters. For example, *Autumn Sonata* (*Höstsonaten*. Sweden, 1978) by Ingmar Bergman (Rubanova, 1982: 9).

However, to pass by the popular music movie *ABBA* (*ABBA: The Movie*. Sweden-Australia, 1977) the magazine also could not get through, noting that the music of this quartet attracted millions of fans in many countries with its undeniable merits. It is melodic, singsong, rich in various moods from playfully cheerful to romantic nostalgic. There is in it captivating lyricism, sweet sincerity, sincerity of intonation. The secret of success lies in the unique coherence of the four, their perfected vocal technique. ... The filmmakers deliberately idealize their characters, wrapping them in a veil of musical selflessness, omitting those details and worldly touches that might seem prosaic. Such idealization and mythologization are generally characteristic of the wave of musical films about pop and disco stars (Sulkin, 1981: 20).

- reviews of Western films that were not shown in the Soviet film distribution in the period of the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s

Of course, the range of Western films, for one reason or another, which did not reach the Soviet mass audience, was much wider than the film distribution. And here the editors of the magazine year by year chose anti-communist and anti-Soviet films as examples for criticism of bourgeois society and imperialism, as well as films that “glorify the American military” and “whitewash the Nazis”.

So film critic R. Sobolev (1926-1991) did not get tired of repeating that for a long time now, Hollywood has been conducting in films a crude and persistent operation to reassess the history of the Second World War, rehabilitating the Wehrmacht for this purpose, placing the blame for the well-known facts of crimes against humanity solely on the SS and Gestapo. ... Hitler's warriors are shown as honest and noble soldiers; they tortured people, killed and robbed only supposedly SS men. But no less cynical are some European films, especially those in which an attempt is made, if not to shift, then to share the blame for all the horrors of the occupation between the conquerors and the conquered. Cynicism was most often covered up by the demands for “psychologization” of films about the Resistance, the need to “expand the view” of

the past, and similar quite respectable words (Sobolev, 1975: 1-2).

Particularly negative (and we must say, from a political point of view, quite natural) reaction was caused by the Soviet Screen Michael Cimino's drama *The Deer Hunter* (USA-UK, 1978).

Film critic R. Yurenev (1912-2002) was convinced that this work is a vivid example of a reactionary, slanderous film is *The Deer Hunter* – an American film directed by Michael Cimino. ... Let's leave aside the mysterious circumstance that the heroes of this film are Russian by origin. ... Apparently, all this was needed to demonstrate the notorious "secrets of the Slavic soul." Or to explain the characters' innate, so to speak, interest in Russian roulette. ... The just war waged by the heroic people against the French and American imperialists for forty years is shown [in this film] only in a monstrous episode where a Vietnamese blows up Vietnamese women and children. The Vietnamese woman is shown as a prostitute who is not ashamed of her own child. ... And most importantly, the heroic Vietnamese warriors, whose courage and military prowess the Americans were given to experience to their fullest, are shown as savages torturing prisoners! And the justice of the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese, who defended their homeland, freedom, unity. But in *The Deer Hunter* it's the other way around. The Vietnamese are shown as fanatics, executioners, and the American interventionists are shown as innocent victims and invincible supermen. What kind of pacifism is this! This is undisguised racism, an insulting slander against a people who have won worldwide sympathy for their heroism! (Yurenev, 1979: 19).

No less negative reaction was caused by the Soviet Screen drama *Nicholas and Alexandra* (Great Britain, 1971), which tells about Emperor Nicholas II and his family.

In full accordance with the then Soviet textbooks, journalist V. Vasilets wrote that it is best to watch this film without knowing Russian history at all. Maybe then the story of two loving spouses and their sick heir would be able to arouse sympathy. One could believe in the anger of the tsar when he learns about "Bloody Sunday" and asks his prime minister who gave the order to shoot. It turns out no one. Just one soldier was frightened by the approaching crowd and fired, and after him others began to shoot. The story in *Nicholas and Alexandra* is distorted not out of ignorance, but for a specific purpose, and the last, deliberately detailed scene of the execution of the royal family puts an end to it: look, they say, look what lovely, innocently suffering people were killed by an inhuman revolution. This scene is not at least in contrast to the drama of Bloody Sunday and many other tragedies of Nicholas's Russia, for which this mild and sweet – according to the film – man was nicknamed "bloody" by the people (Vasilets, 1972: 18).

The magazine's reaction to another Western film on the Russian theme, *Great Catherine* (UK, 1968), was rather ironic: The film was based on a little-known play by Bernard Shaw, and the authors managed to free themselves from all the advantages of the original. ... Going to the film, I tried to imagine in advance that "Russian cranberry" that almost inevitably accompanies such works, and I guessed something. Of course, there is a lot of snow (artificial, really), and all Russians without exception drink vodka from decanters. However, I underestimated the imagination of the director and his consultants. It turns out that in the Winter Palace, apart from the Empress and the courtiers, there lived... chickens, pigs and piglets; Potemkin had not shaved for months... dirty Cossacks in shaggy fur masks danced at balls... It is a shame about the actors who have to make faces in this vulgar, chauvinistic film, whose release coincided not by chance with the unfriendly campaign against our country unleashed recently in England (Khodjaev, 1969: 15).

The Soviet Screen also reacted quite actively to the youth theme that was gaining momentum in the West by the early 1970s (Sobolev, 1972: 16-17; Yakovlev, 1970: 14), while positively emphasizing that "with the desire of the authors to uncover the social roots that push the youth of America to violence and cruelty", gives these films a special relevance (Yakovlev, 1970: 14).

However, R. Sobolev wrote that the film *The Born Losers* (USA, 1967) by Tom Laughlin (1931-2013) (in the credits he is under the pseudonym T.S. Frank), tells about a youth motorcycle gang "wild angels", does not possess any special artistic merits ... Here the truth is cleverly mixed with lies. ... The film, in fact, shows such vile things that if it had not been filmed by the Americans, one would think: this is an anti-American work. After all, if what is shown in the film can happen in any society, then it means that this is already a stinking corpse, and not a

society. ... [But everything] ends happily. There was a man in a frightened town who was not afraid of the "angels". It is characteristic that the "green beret" is presented in the role of this "hero", which, remembering the training received in Vietnam, picked up a carbine and ... opened fire on the gang. ... The film ... contains two conflicting thoughts. On the one hand, he condemns violence, on the other hand, he shows the hero of yesterday's rapist who returned from Vietnam ... Some publicists argue that the "angels" are potential fascists. Director Roger Corman depicted them in the film *The Wild Angels* (USA, 1966) (where the name came from) – with swastikas, iron crosses and other attributes of stormtroopers (Sobolev, 1972: 16-17).

At the same time, the same R. Sobolev noted that director Dennis Hopper (1936-2010) in *Easy Rider* (USA, 1969) showed another version of motorized vagrants – it's just young people who refused to live in American society, who left on their motorcycles about a kind of hermitage and social non-existence. They are not enemies or friends of modern America, they are "strangers", but true Americans, intuitively feeling their denial of the "American paradise", are really hunting for them. ... They shoot, despite the fact that one of them has a star-striped US flag on his chest ... in any case, the "angels" are evidence of the deepest crisis in American society (Sobolev, 1972: 16-17).

R. Sobolev argued that about the youth actively participating in political life, Hollywood is diligently silent. Only strata of declassed youth, by no means the most important in the social system, were shown in Hollywood films due, obviously, to their exoticism. This is, first of all, hippies, whose protest took the ugly, in fact, suicidal form of leaving society for the world of voluntary begging and drug hallucinations. Such a protest does not threaten the system in any way (Sobolev, 1972: 16-17).

However, film critic E. Kartseva (1928-2002) believed that We saw those who protest in *Punishment Park* (USA, 1971) by Peter Watkins... The picture of the massacre of dissidents painted here is so reminiscent of today's America that many viewers mistook the director's fantasy for a documentary. Indeed, only the punishment park is fantastic in the picture – this prototype of the concentration camp of the future. Everything else is a true reflection of US life in the early seventies. In the same way, participants of all kinds of progressive movements are seized there, they are judged in the same way, they are thrown into prisons in the same way, from which many no longer come out. What is projected on the screen here is what worries and torments Americans today (Kartseva, 8: 16-17).

The *Soviet Screen* wrote very approvingly about the drama *Rage* (USA, 1972) by George Scott (1927-1999), where the protagonist's combat with the monstrous machine of militarism aroused sympathy (Alexandrov, 1974: 16-17).

And, of course, the magazine wrote very warmly (Moikin, 1974: 20; Sobolev, 1976: 18-19) about Sydney Pollack's drama *The Way We Were* (USA, 1973), where the main characters – american communists – were shown very sympathetically.

R. Sobolev did not hide his joy because in this film among the complex everyday situations and vicissitudes caused by McCarthyism, the idea of communists as people of the highest moral standards is clearly drawn. In this film, one of the most exciting was the scene in which a person who has achieved material well-being, but mentally broken during the time of the "witch hunt", betrayed the ideals of youth, realizes that he was happy only in that short period when friends were standing next to him were communists (Sobolev, 1976: 18-19).

R. Sobolev was pleased and (as it turned out, very quickly stalled) a new and interesting and characteristic phenomenon in the West – the beginning of filming by the workers themselves, supported by many major masters of professional cinema, including one of the founders of Italian neorealism, C. Zavattini, an outstanding French documentary filmmaker C. Marker and others. Film groups of workers shoot films about the political and economic struggle of the proletariat, about the activities of party and trade union activists. ... It is also clear that these films are hushed up by the bourgeois film press. However, for example, Zavattini believes that today, when the culture of the ruling class is collapsing, a culture that is still resisting, using even its teeth", the only alternative to bourgeois art is folk art, in particular workers' cinema (Sobolev, 1976: 18-19).

A positive reaction from the film critic R. Yurenev caused serious, realistic, socially deep film *Bound for Glory* (USA, 1976) directed by Hal Ashby (1929-1988), where the traditions of American realistic cinema are clearly visible. The film critic saw in this film the features of socialist realism: truthfulness, nationality, political sharpness (Yurenev, 1978: 6-7).

Criticism of the capitalist society, to one degree or another seen in the films *Scarecrow* (USA, 1973), *The Effect of Gamma Rays on Man-in-the-Moon Marigolds* (USA, 1972), *The Great Gatsby* (USA, 1974), *Hammett* (USA, 1982), *Sleeper* (USA, 1973), etc., were approved by other reviewers of the *Soviet Screen* (Chudov, 1975: 17; Moikin, 1974: 18; Pogožheva, 1973: 16-17; Razlogov, 1983: 14-15).

Journalist V. Chudov wrote, for example, that let the picture of Woody Allen *Sleeper* (USA, 1973) does not rise to expose the foundations of a 'sick society', but Allen's diagnosis of this society is accurate and uncompromising (Chudov, 1975: 17).

The *Soviet Screen* devoted two articles (Kapralov 1972: 15-16; Vasilets 1972: 18) to Stanley Kubrick's much acclaimed film *A Clockwork Orange* (UK-USA, 1971), which mercilessly explored the nature of violence.

V. Vasilets believed that the author of the novel based on which the film is based believes that evil cannot be corrected with good. But Kubrick claims with his film that nothing can fix it at all. Such a view of a person is incredibly gloomy. This is a cry of horror (Vasilets, 1972: 18).

Film critic G. Kapralov (1921-2010) agreed with this in principle. He noted that although *A Clockwork Orange* (UK-USA, 1971) shone with a rainbow of colors, rumbled with bravura music and went at a frantic pace. He parodied, sneered, prophesied, predicting to the modern capitalist world a further escalation of violence, immorality, permissiveness, its creator wandered in the darkness of modern bourgeois so-called civilization and saw no way out of its gloomy dead ends (Kapralov, 1972: 15-16).

Recognizing the high artistic level of the film F.F. Coppola's *Apocalypse now* (USA, 1979), reviewers of the *Soviet Screen* assessed its anti-war pathos ambiguously.

So the poet R. Rozhdestvensky (1932-1994) wrote that this is a powerful and violent film. The cruel madness and some kind of planned senselessness of the actions of the Americans in the Vietnam War are shown here so accurately, summarized so passionately that it becomes chilly and disturbing. You watch two-thirds of the film excitedly, in one breath. But the last third of it is clearly worse. The film stops moving, stops living. There is a feeling of conventionality, a hoarse false note begins to sound. On this very note the film ends (Rozhdestvensky, 1979: 21).

And the film critic S. Freilich (1920-2005) emphasized that the title of the picture corresponds to its style: the American aggression in Vietnam is shown as a tragedy of the human spirit, as the destruction of morality. ... How does Coppola achieve this? He tames horror, aestheticizing it. But this, in my opinion, is the contradiction of the picture: Coppola aestheticizes the evil he opposes. The social conflict is resolved aesthetically, and therefore the artist passes by the tragedy of the Vietnamese people. But what and how is shown on the screen - the dehumanization of the aggressor, his moral collapse, inspires respect for the picture, made with the latest cinematic technology (Freilikh, 1980: 16).

On the pages of *Soviet Screen*, the film critic G. Kapralov rather superficially assessed B. Fosse's masterpiece *Cabaret* (USA, 1971) (this musical came out in the Soviet distribution only in the era of "perestroika"). Kapralov, arguing that this film, created in the variety-spectacular style, entertained the viewer with the love affairs of a frivolous cabaret singer, through the "prism" of life which, according to the authors, supposedly viewed the years when fascism came to power in Germany. But, in fact, a few cleverly presented slips and dashing danced and sung numbers by Liza Minnelli made up the content of this feature film (Kapralov, 1972: 15-16).

Reviewers of such notable films as *The Hireling* (UK, 1973), *The Triple Echo* (UK, 1972), *The Romantic Englishwoman* (UK-France, 1975), *Airport-75* (USA, 1974), *The Godfather, Part II* (USA, 1974), *Nickelodeon* (USA, 1976), *An Unsuitable Job for a Woman* (UK, 1982), *The Return of the Soldier* (UK, 1982), *Heat and Dust* (UK, 1983), *The King of Comedy* (USA, 1983), *One from the Heart* (USA, 1982), *The Outsiders* (USA, 1983) (Bauman, 1983: 1-2; Chernenko, 1976: 16-17; Ivanova, 1975: 16-17; Khloplyankina, 1973: 4-5; 1977: 1-2; Razlogov, 1983: 14-15; Svobodin, 1975: 16-17 and others).

In particular, film critic A. Svobodin (1922-1999) wrote that monotony, repetitiveness, a sense of emptiness, meaninglessness – this whole complex of states of a person in the Western world became the subject of analysis in Joseph Losey's *The Romantic Englishwoman...* The film is internally ironic, the acting is full of psychological paradoxes (Svobodin, 1975: 16-17).

Film critic V. Ivanova (1937-2008) noted that *The Romantic Englishwoman* is a very English film, that is, everything in it is as ironic as it is bitter, as frivolous as it is wise. ...

Everything is very vague, unfinished, unsaid, everything in English is restrained and ironic. And... so endlessly dramatic. Because there is all this, it all lives in the souls of people – and the cage, and nightmares, and the bitterness of resentment, and the tragedy of misunderstanding. And a fierce desire for protest – spontaneous, senseless, desperate. And all these abysses are not at all terrible, it would seem, the abysses of a comfortable world (Ivanova, 1975: 16-17).

And the film critic and screenwriter T. Khlopyankina (1937-1993) was, of course, right that the picture of Peter Bogdanovich *Nickelodeon* (USA, 1976) does not at all aim to document the history of the formation of cinematography. Rather, it is a stylization, a sly fantasy on the theme of silent films. All the heroes of *Nickelodeon* live in the rhythm of silent comic movies. Endless falls, slaps in the face follow one after another, creating on the screen an atmosphere of funny and absurd fuss, which is now so striking to us when we watch old films (Khlopyankina, 1977: 1-2).

And here is another cinephilic declaration of love to Hollywood cinema – F. Coppola's melodrama *One from the Heart* (USA, 1982) film critic K. Razlogov, alas, did not like it: "An attempt to restore traditions on a new basis of video technology characterizes Coppola's painting *One from the Heart*. The combination of a banal tear-jerking plot with the refined formalism of electronic special effects and deliberately archaic pavilion shooting led to the appearance of a picture that is strange, aesthetically interesting in its own way, but essentially stillborn" (Razlogov, 1983: 14-15).

Was negatively evaluated in the *Soviet Screen* and *The Tragedy of Macbeth* (UK, 1971) by Roman Polanski, as the bloody tragedy of Shakespeare became bloody in the literal sense of the word. And yet the film leaves the viewer cold. Spectacularly impressive scenes have become an end in themselves, overshadowed the characters. The screen shows a terrible story rather than a great human tragedy – the tragedy of passions and delusions (Vasilets, 1972: 18).

The frankly entertaining part of Hollywood and British film production has traditionally been viewed by the magazine in a largely negative way.

Thus, a review of Hollywood science fiction films emphasized their stampede from reality, or rather, from the bleeding American reality, with its rampant crime and rampant devastating inflation, with rising unemployment and exacerbation of class and racial contradictions. In a word, this is a traditional for Hollywood immersion in the world of dreams, illusions, carried out today with the involvement of the broadest technical innovations. ... Modern Hollywood science fiction presents the past, present and future in the form of fairy tales, legends, comics. Old fairy tales, well known to everyone and having a happy ending, are dressed up in futurological attire. ... *Superman* does not know defeat and is called to personify the "American way of life". The spectators are hammered into the idea that the American superman "can do anything" (Romanov, 1982: 18).

The same negative attitude was applied to such sensational films as *Raiders of the Lost Ark* (USA, 1981), *Clash of the Titans* (USA, 1981), *Star Wars, Episode IV – A New Hope* (USA, 1977), *Excalibur* (USA-UK, 1981), etc: Hollywood has nothing to say to American moviegoers, the only thing left to do is to dazzle their imagination with intricate stunts, the splendor of 'special effects' and the opportunity to escape for at least two hours into a world of illusion and fairy tale from the bleak reality, from the restless contemporary issues (Romanov, 1982: 18).

Film critic M. Chernenko (1931-2004) reviewed S. Spielberg's film *Jaws* (USA, 1975) quite ironically (Chernenko, 1976: 16-17).

The films *Cat People* (USA, 1982), *Class of 1984* (Canada, 1982), and even *Blade Runner* (USA, 1982), which has now become a classic of the sci-fi genre, received negative attention from the *Soviet Screen* (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17).

In particular, film critic O. Sulkin wrote that in the "cold phantasmagoria" of *Blade Runner* by Ridley Scott could not overcome "and the taste of commercialism" and "relishes the bloodbath perpetrated by his hero, without stinting on disgusting details" (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17).

Much warmer O. Sulkin spoke about *ET (The Extra-Terrestrial)*. USA, 1982) "The Western viewer is tired of the massive attack on his mind with the help of unbridled violence, pornography, pathology. Isn't this the reason for the audience success of the next movie of the American director Steven Spielberg – *ET*? In the story of the touching friendship between Los Angeles kids and a harmless creature with sad eyes that has strayed from the starship, there is a clear echo of the ethics of the famous Disney cartoons. Children, as it were, cleanse civilization from the filth of cynicism and fear. ... The author of recent box office record holders ... Spielberg

knows how to choose a "sure" plot. Intuition did not disappoint this time either. *ET* beats all previously registered attendance figures" (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17).

Of course, the Italian cinema of the 1970s gave *Soviet Screen* much more reason to write about "progressive political" and anti-bourgeois cinema.

The film critic R. Sobolev (1926-1991) once again reminded readers that the militant tradition of neo-realism lives on and develops in Italian cinema. There, in the atmosphere of the intensification of neo-fascism, documentaries and historical films were given priority... Using film archives and actual events, they remind us of the past and passionately urge people to be vigilant. ... The debate on the screen about the Resistance continues. The decisive role in the defeat of fascism was played by the Soviet Army. ... The significance of the Resistance, among other things, is in establishing the people as the driving force of history, in establishing the organizing role of communist and workers' parties (Sobolev, 1975: 1-2).

In an article with the characteristic title "Tent on the square. The working class on the screen of Italy" film critic G. Bogemsky, that although there are a lot of costs on the way of the Italian "workers' cinema", such films as *The Working Class Goes to Paradise (La Classe operaia va in paradiso*. Italy, 1971) by Elio Petri (1929-1982), *The Seduction of Mimi (Mimi metallurgico ferito nell'onore*. Italy, 1972) by Lina Wertmüller (1928-2021), *Trevico-Torino* (Italy, 1973) by Ettore Scola (1931-2016), documentaries shot by Ugo Grigoretti (1930-2019) and others brave, unusual for Western art, films about workers are made under difficult, sometimes dramatic conditions. All the more valuable are these attempts to "master" the acute working-class subject matter, to reveal it in the complex context of contemporary social reality. And with each film, "workers' cinema" becomes an increasingly important aspect of the progressive direction of Italian political cinema (Bogemsky, 1973: 14-15).

True, some of the "progressive and anti-bourgeois" Italian films about the working class were cautiously criticized in the *Soviet Screen*. This applied, for example, to the movies *The Secret of N.P. (NP il segreto*. Italy, 1971) by Silvano Agosti and *The Working Class Goes to Paradise (La Classe operaia va in paradiso*. Italy, 1971) by Elio Petri.

For example, the journalist N. Prozhogin (1928-2012) believed that E. Petri's film far from everything can be agreed, it rather one-sidedly touches on the problems of the labor movement, but he touches on the burning issues of Italian reality, shows the contradictions in modern the labor movement of the capitalist countries and does not hide its difficulties, in particular, both the threat of reformism of the social democratic persuasion, and the objectively provocative role of leftist groups. From this followed a very optimistic (but in reality not justified) conclusion that, "returning to the themes dictated by life itself, Italian cinema again rises, as it did in the first post-war years, on fertile ground (Prozhogin, 1972: 20).

The Abuse of Power (Abuso di potere. Italy-France-FRG, 1972), quite traditional for Italian political detectives of the 1970s, told the story of a young police commissioner who "too" conscientiously undertook the investigation of the circumstances of the murder committed by the mafia entrusted to him, however, N. Prozhogin emphasized that using the example of Badzoni's film, one can trace the danger that constantly threatens art with a commercial approach to it on the part of producers (Prozhogin, 1972: 17).

But the strongest satire on the morals of the upper strata of Italian society seemed to N. Prozhogin of the film *Respectable Rome (Roma bene*. Italy-France-FRG, 1971) by Carlo Lidzani (1922-2013). He also praised the movies *Let me introduce myself: Rocco Palaleo (Permette? Rocco Papaleo*. Italy, 1971) and *A beautiful, honest immigrant from Australia would like to marry a pure girl, my compatriot, (Bello onesto emigrato Australia sposerebbe compaesana illibata*. Italy-Australia, 1971) because they told about the sad life of Italian emigrants in the USA and Australia (Prozhogin, 1972: 17).

Film critic G. Bogemsky (1920-1995) spoke warmly about another Italian film, where the charactersthe characters were revealed in the unusual conditions of a foreign country – *I will put things in order in America and return (Sistemo l'America e torno*. Italy, 1974) (Bogemsky, 1974: 16-17).

But in the political position of the authors of the film *Lucky Luciano* (Italy-France-USA, 1973), G. Bogemsky discovered a significant flaw, since the documentary style in itself does not yet fully provide either artistic or historical truth. Francesco Rosi, focusing on the machinations of American politicians who use the mafia for their own purposes, wittingly or unwittingly makes Luciano, the king of drugs, almost a victim of "big politics" (Bogemsky, 1974: 16-17).

Another picture of the cruel world of mafia and gangsters *The Valachi Papers* (*Cosa Nostra / Le dossier Valachi*. Italy-France, 1972) was accused in the *Soviet Screen* of promoting violence, because murder and violence are the essence of the film (Moikin, 1973).

Among the Italian films about the war, the *Soviet Screen* responded positively to the drama *Men Against...* (*Uomini contro*. Italy-Yugoslavia, 1970) (Lipkov, 1971: 15). But about the film *Mussolini: the last act* (*Mussolini: ultimo atto*. Italy, 1974), film critic G. Bogemsky responded rather negatively, noting that in the performance of Rod Steiger, the Duce is a sick, crushed man – a victim of his own ambition, past mistakes, betrayal of his accomplices and, in general, historically unconvincing (Bogemsky, 1974: 16-17).

G. Bogemsky also reacted ambiguously to two dramas about the life of prominent scientists – E. Galois – *I have no time* (*Non ho tempo*. Italy, 1973) by Ansano Giannarelli (1933-2011) and *Socrates* (Italy-France-Spain, 1971) by Roberto Rossellini (1906-1977).

He reproached the film *I have no time* for an avalanche of endless monologues, popular lectures, because of which for all the nobility of the idea, the film becomes boring and tedious (Bogemsky, 1974: 16-17). And in the work of R. Rossellini he was completely disappointed: Perhaps, in short-term television programs, “in portions”, the viewer can withstand the popular film presentation of the teachings of Socrates, his disputes with Plato and his students, numerous historical comments. But right away, in a two-hour film, emphatically devoid of entertainment, entertainment, all this is perceived very difficult (Bogemsky, 1974: 16-17).

But, of course, the *Soviet Screen* could not pass by the works of Federico Fellini (1920-1993), Pier Paolo Pasolini (1922-1975), brothers Paolo and Vittorio Taviani and Bernardo Bertolucci (1941-2018).

Journalist N. Prozhogin wrote, for example, that in *Rome* (*Roma*. Italy-France, 1972) by Federico Fellini the hand of a great master is visible. There are no loose scenes, sloppy shots. Everything in it is carefully thought out, weighed. Even the deliberate, like an obsessive dream, the protractedness of individual episodes and the fragmentation of the film with a sudden, seemingly without apparent connection, change of scenes showing Rome either forty years ago or today, have their own semantic load. The author clearly wants to convince the audience that, no matter how the appearance of the city and even the political system of the country changes – from fascism to parliamentary democracy, Rome remains the same – both comic and tragic gathering, in fact, disunited people, carriers of voluptuousness and insane carelessness, leading them to inevitable death. This theme of Rome as “eternal Babylon” is not new in Fellini's work. ... But ... [Fellini's] look at Rome, life is ultimately dictated by the confusion of an intellectual who is in a deep spiritual crisis, who received a Catholic upbringing and lost faith in his former ideals” (Prozhogin, 1972: 17).

Thus, according to the article by N. Prozhogin, one could get a complete picture of the reasons why *Rome*, as well as *The Sweet Life* (*La Dolce vita*. Italy-France, 1960); *Satyricon* (Italy-France, 1969); *Casanova* (Italy-USA, 1976) and *City of Women* (*La Città delle donne*. Italy-France, 1980) never came out in Soviet distribution.

N. Prozhogin criticized Pier Paolo Pasolini's *The Decameron* (*Il Decameron*. Italy-France, 1971) even more sharply: “Having preserved the plot outline of several novels by Boccaccio, Pasolini distorted their spirit. Instead of the coarsely sensual, but joyfully provocative atmosphere of the Renaissance, he created an extremely monotonous and dull world of adultery. ... Perhaps Pasolini needed the Decameron only as a pretext for expressing his views not only on the Renaissance. But in this case, his film should evoke an even stronger objection” (Prozhogin, 1972: 17).

The works of the Taviani brothers in the *Soviet Screen* were also evaluated ambiguously.

If the film critic A. Svobodin (1922-1999) believed that the philosophical drama *Alonzanfan!* (Italy, 1973) breathes with “deepest pessimism” (Svobodin, 1975: 17), and film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) upset *The Meadow* (*Il prato*. Italy, 1979) with its unbridled “literaryness” of the plot, the conventionality of the characters and the incomprehensibility of the final conclusions (Dmitriev, 1981: 16-17), then film critic O. Sulkin argued that “the excellently filmed folk drama *The Night of San Lorenzo* (*La Notte di San Lorenzo*. Italy, 1982), epic in form, saturated with folklore symbols, plastically expressive, is worthy of the highest praise: “With all artistic passion, the Taviani brothers assert: fascism is the worst of evils, the tragedy of the nation, which cannot be forgotten, cannot be forgiven, justified “because of prescription” (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17).

Reviewing drama Bernardo Bertolucci's *The Moon* (*La Luna*. Italy, 1979), film critic S. Freilich (1920-2005) wrote that by design, this is an interesting picture. The young man is a drug addict, his mother cures him with her love. Love conquers illnesses and fears, it would be wonderful if love itself was not a disease – mother and son find themselves in physical proximity. The Oedipus complex in the most fatal way destroys the poetry in the picture, there are beautiful scenes in it, it is with great regret that we have to talk about it as a whole (Freilikh, 1980: 17).

And the shocking *Salomè* (Italy, 1972) by Carmelo Bene (1937-2002) aroused complete indignation among film critic G. Kapralov (1921-2010): “The Italian snobbish artist, esthete writer, formalist director, enjoyed that that in his disgusting, pretentious film *Salomè* for almost half an hour he showed footage in which the heroine, with thin fingers, literally skinned King Herod with her thin fingers... It is difficult for anyone who was not at this session in the Venetian Cinema Palace to imagine that happened in the hall. Some fans of sadism tried to applaud, but hundreds of spectators truly screamed in indignation and disgust, demanding to stop showing the picture. After the session, Carmelo Bene appeared, accompanied by two policemen guarding him” (Kapralov, 1972: 15-16).

Film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) ambiguously approached Ettore Scola's drama *Passion for Love* (*Passione d'amore*. Italy-France, 1981), which told about human deformity, and not moral, but physical, not hidden, but put on display occupying a significant portion of the screen space. The principle of extreme shock impact ..., of course, is debatable and cannot be considered the only one in the case of cinematography addressing such anomalies, but the moral purity [of the film], which calls for compassion in relation to any representative of the human race, cannot be questioned (Dmitriev, 1981 : 16-17).

The tragicomedy *The Smell of a Woman* (*Profumo di donna*. Italy, 1974) by Dino Risi (1916-2008), film critic A. Svobodin was reminded of the theater of the era of guest performers. In the middle is a big artist – the rest is not so important! But Gassman once again showed that he was worthy of this position. His playing is so rich in psychological details, nuances, details, his vigilantly. The awn is so great, and the temperament is so volcanic, that the role must be recognized as exemplary. The problems of the film, although not new and somewhat academic, are serious. The collapse of a "strong personality", the drama of individualism (Svobodin, 1975: 16).

And with regard to the tragicomedy *Traffic Jam* (*L'Ingorgo – Una storia impossibile*. Italy-France-FRG-Spain, 1979) by Luigi Comencini (1916-2007), film critic V. Shitova (1927-2002) noted that the final of Comencini's shallow but likable movie lays claim to an apocalyptic universality: life has stopped, it has bottled up itself, there is nowhere to expect deliverance. ... The symbolism of the finale is straightforward, but it would be unfair to deny it expressiveness (Shitova, 1979: 16-17).

So, the *Soviet Screen* of the 1970s evaluated Italian cinema mainly according to strictly adhered to Marxist ideological principles, on the basis of which even the films of such recognized masters as Federico Fellini were criticized.

But two sensational films of the 1970s were subjected to the most fierce criticism in the magazine: *The Night Porter* (*Il portiere di notte*. Italy-France, 1973) by Liliana Cavani (this movie got into Soviet distribution only in the era of the late “perestroika”) and a film adaptation of the novel by M. Bulgakov *The Master and Margarita*.

The high intensity and reasons for the condemnation of *The Night Porter* in the Soviet press can be judged by a very characteristic article in this sense by film critic R. Sobolev: As for *The Night Porter*, no lengthy comment is needed here. Cavani, a young Italian who has not experienced the horrors of war, told reporters that she decided to make a "truthful film" after learning that some female prisoners in the concentration camps were in touch with the guards and still wear flowers on their graves. Her “truth” is that the young guard, unrestrained by anything, willingly shows his worst instincts towards the prisoners. But this, according to Cavani, is only one side of the "truth". The other is that the girl-prisoner who became his mistress also throws back moral prohibitions and does not lag behind her SS man in anything. The film argues that a person will certainly become a beast, if he can become one. To prove this thesis, Cavani creates an extremely dirty, erotic film. Youth does not free a person from the need to think sensibly. Cavani could have judged what Hitler's concentration camps were by the documents, by the number of millions of people who died in them, and not by the stories of SS

mistresses. Therefore, she was offended in vain when one of the spectators – former prisoners – spat in her face – that was criticism, of course, extraordinary, but completely deserved by Cavani (Sobolev, 1975: 1-2).

D. Pisarevsky (1912-1990), editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen*, was no less harsh in relation to the film *The Master and Margarita (Il Maestro e Margherita*. Italy-Yugoslavia, 1972): The author turned out to be very far from understanding the humanistic idea of the work and the era depicted in it, and not only did not bring the novel closer to millions of moviegoers, but gave a false impression of it. ... the novel became just an excuse to slander about literary Moscow. ... From the very first shots, when a wooden, snow-covered, similar to a wretched village Moscow appears, it turns out that the talented writing of M. Bulgakov has been replaced by popular prints in the style of a la russe. ... However, it's not just about the "spreading cranberries" of the production. The philosophical idea of the novel, a cross-cutting thought penetrating and merging together the modern, historical, and fantastic layers of the book, has undergone a radical revision. Revealing in all the bizarre polyphony of things the conflict of good and evil, the writer, with the whole system of his images, affirms the inevitability of the victory of good, the doom of everything that is hostile to human happiness. This is the most important task and pathos of the book. A. Petrovich puts everything upside down. His film is about the triumph of evil, about the hopelessness of human destiny. ... The notorious problem became the center of the film "freedom of creativity", freedom, interpreted from the bourgeois-anarchist positions. Here the novel "preparirovan" with surprising shamelessness. His plot and images have undergone such fantastic metamorphoses in the film, before which even the fun and tricks of evil spirits described by M. Bulgakov pale. ... All this is a gag of the authors of the film, from which a mile away reeks of bourgeois insinuations about Soviet literature. ... The wonderful fusion of Bulgakov's prose, the fusion of realistic everyday life, violent fantasy, high symbolism, satirical grotesque, turned into pretentiousness and eclecticism in the film. ... In all this, the calculation of philistine tastes, commercial success comes through. In an effort to please that part of the Western public, for whom the more scathingly told about Moscow, the better, the authors have become like peddlers of stale goods (Pisarevsky, 1972: 18).

Film critic G. Kapralov fully agreed with the opinion of D. Pisarevsky, whom the film *The Master and Margarita (Il Maestro e Margherita*. Italy-Yugoslavia, 1972) outraged as a bad caricature, smacking of an "anti-Soviet odor" (Kapralov, 1972: 15-16).

A connoisseur of Italian cinema, film critic G. Bogemsky (1920-1995) undertook the "dirty job" of analyzing Italian commercial cinema in the *Soviet Screen*.

At first, he spoke negatively about the "spaghetti westerns" popular at that time: From these pictures (the films of Sergio Leone can be named as an example...) love, friendship, nobility, mutual assistance and solidarity are expelled – those good human feelings that warmed and made this genre of adventure film attractive. But cruelty – brutal beatings, senseless torture and torment – and gross naturalism are brought to their maximum. Even two or three such adventure films, with dozens of murders in each, are hard to endure, but when they are at the box office, as it was in Italy, 80 titles at once, it becomes a real national disaster! In addition, many of these inhumanly cruel films are imbued with the spirit of racial discrimination brought from American cinema, which is generally alien to Italians (Bogemsky, 1971: 13-14).

Then he exposed the harmful "subtexts" of entertainment films about "robbery in Italian": It would seem that films about crooks, which are also extremely numerous, are less dangerous. They are imbued with humor, sometimes really funny, they are, so to speak, "thieves' comedies." ... no matter who steals where, no matter what: the diamonds of a Brazilian bank or the crown of the English queen, the treasure of St. Januarius or the secret of the superbomb, it is important how, in what way it is done. But even these purely conventional films sometimes turn out to have a double bottom: the plot of a funny thieves' comedy suddenly contains a fair dose of foul-smelling politicking. So, in the painting by Marco Vicario *The New Major Operation of the Golden Seven (Il grande colpo dei 7 uomini d'oro*. Italy, 1966), a gang of gangsters abducts a Soviet ship using a submarine with a magnet, allegedly arrived in Havana with a load of gold bars to "arrange" revolutions in Latin America! The Cubans in this film are shown in an evilly caricatured form, and our sailors are so careless that when they take their ship away, they sing "Dubinushka" as if nothing had happened (Bogemsky, 1971: 13-14).

But G. Bogemsky's greatest regret (in our opinion, quite justified) was caused by the flow of Italian "militarist films": Home-grown militaristic films poured onto the Italian screen. It

doesn't matter who performs "feats" in these pictures -unknown red berets, English commandos or Italian (and fascist!) warriors – they are equally bloodthirsty, they kill in the same cold-blooded way, terribly naturalistically, enjoying "right" to kill the weak and defenseless (Bogemsky, 1971: 13-14).

A similar attitude to the Italian commercial cinema was in the article of the journalist N. Prozhogin: Those who profit from films seem to be convinced that the most salable commodity in the West these days is sex, murder, robbery, any form of violence. Even leaving aside frankly low-class films, we have to admit that the alcove theme captivated some directors who were known in the past for meaningful works. This, for example, comes down to the latest film by Luigi Comencini with the intriguing title *My God, how low I have fallen!* (*Mio Dio come sono caduta in basso!* Italy, 1974) (Prozhogin, 1975: 14).

The approach of the editors of the *Soviet Screen* to French films of the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s was also consistent (moderate) criticism of films of outstanding masters and sharp criticism of commercial film production.

The films of Francois Truffaut and Claude Chabrol practically did not get into the mass Soviet film distribution in 1970s, but the *Soviet Screen* wrote about them quite often.

So film critic E. Kartseva (1928-2002) regretted that Francois Truffaut (1932-1984) in the film *Fahrenheit 451* (UK-France, 1966) largely simplified the idea of the story. There is not that all-encompassing atmosphere of mass stupidity of people that is so impressive in Bradbury, there are no attempts to analyze why people voluntarily put up with this situation (Kartseva, 1972: 16-17).

The refined and psychologically subtle melodrama by Francois Truffaut *Two Englishwomen and a Continent* (*Les Deux anglaises et le continent*. France, 1971) was disappointing for journalist Y. Bocharov, who thought that even in this film the talented artist remains faithful to his lyrical manner, but the plot seems far-fetched (Bocharov, 1972: 15).

Film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) wrote that Francois Truffaut's drama *The Last Metro* (*Le Dernier métro*. France, 1980): is distinguished by a very high visual culture. One can only be surprised at the maximum accuracy with which the everyday structure of Parisian life during the Nazi occupation is reproduced on the screen. However, one should also be surprised that the former rebel, the head of the "new wave" François Truffaut, who in the past fiercely opposed academic art, has now himself removed an academic, geometrically calculated movie, almost indifferent in its Olympian contemplation. Because of this academicism, scissors arose between the tension of the plot and the manner of its implementation, and the anti-fascist pathos of the film turned out to be greatly muted (Dmitriev, 1981: 16-17).

It seems that a much more objective assessment of the artistic significance of *The Last Metro* was made by film critic and culturologist A. Razlogov (1946-2021), who highly appreciated this outstanding picture: The idea of the indestructibility of creativity even in hostile environment, bizarre intersections of the real life of the actors and their stage roles make this film a logical continuation of Truffaut's reflections on the meaning of art in the modern world (Razlogov, 1981: 17).

Referring to the work of another master of French cinema art, Claude Chabrol (1930-2010), journalist Y. Bocharov reminded the readers of the magazine that this director released a series of films imbued with bitter irony and criticism of the society in which he lives and works. The artist set out on an ambitious plan to create a gallery of images of the contemporary bourgeoisie, a panorama of bourgeois morals. ... *Ten Days Wonder* (*La Décade prodigieuse*. France-Italy, 1971) caused mixed responses. The artist is reproached for the excessive complexity of the plot, the lengthiness of the action. ... Despite the fact that this film cannot be called a completely successful author, it did not cause alarm among admirers of his talent. Chabrol is full of strength, energy, ideas and courage. He goes his own way, and one can undoubtedly expect new interesting works from him (Bocharov, 1972: 15).

Not so optimistic, although, in general, quite respectfully, film critic G. Dolmatovskaya (1939-2021) perceived the work of C. Chabrol: made the film *Let the Beast Die* (*Que la bête meure*. France-Italy, 1969). Here are excellent actors (and especially Jean Yann), cold landscapes that smell like the sea, thoughtful interiors, there is dynamics and tension, and the music is involved in the action, but the word "commercial" is spinning somewhere close if you want to retell the plot (Dolmatovskaya, 1972: 14).

And quite ironically approached the film by C. Chabrol *Innocents with Dirty Hands* (*Les*

Innocents aux mains sales. France-Italy, 1975) film critic A. Svobodin (1922-1999): There were two famous actors at once – Rod Steiger and Romy Schneider. ... It is twisted masterfully, but, alas, interest in the film fell from time to time. Then an erotic scene was given. A method that is used quite widely. ... The powerful personality of Rod Steiger with all recently with the incomprehensible force of penetration who played Napoleon and Mussolini, did not save. Romy Schneider seemed like an average actress. But their desperate professional conscientiousness was instructive. Nothing can be done – such is the acting life! (Svobodin, 1975: 16).

The films of Claude Lelouch, which were not included in the Soviet film distribution, were presented to the readers of the *Soviet Screen* quite ambiguously: *Life, love, death (La Vie, l'amour, la mort*. France, 1969); *New Year (La Bonne année*. France, 1973); *Smic Smac Smoc* (France, 1971), *Bolero (Les Uns et les autres*. France, 1981).

Film critic G. Dolmatovskaya wrote that we again observe a kind of diffusion – the penetration into the social film of commercial style to the needs of the philistine taste. Diffusion, which was so noticeable in the paintings of Claude Lelouch *Live for Life (Vivre pour vivre*. France-Italy, 1967), where the background was a political theme, and *Life, love, death (La Vie, l'amour, la mort*. France, 1969), conceived as a social drama. In the end, commerce supplanted everything. ... The hand of Lelouch the operator is correct. Perhaps he became stricter in the visual solution of his films. Only that sincerity and true warmth that were in *A Man and a Woman (Un homme et une femme*. France, 1966) disappeared. In the movie *New Year* Lelouch seems to be slightly ironic about yesterday. Above the purity, romance, sadness of *A Men and Women...* Not the playful atmosphere created around the robbery, not for a moment the beautiful performance of Lino Ventura saves the viewer from boredom. The film is empty, like an empty street in a southern town out of season. Not even a single thought can be found in this film. ... Many years of improvement of the director in the ways of commerce made his professionalism unnecessary. And this is the most terrible consequence that awaits the director, who sacrifices the meaning of art for the sake of the evening delight of the layman (Dolmatovskaya, 1973: 12-13).

Journalist Y. Bocharov also wrote about C. Lelouch in the same spirit, noting that in the film *Smic Smac Smoc* (France, 1971), the director touched on the topic of low-paid workers, which is acute for France. ... But Lelouch facilitates this theme by creating a vaudeville based on it. A half-hearted position takes revenge on the artist – ribbons come out of his hands, extremely superficial (Bocharov, 1972: 15).

Criticized in the *Soviet Screen* and large-scale work of C. Lelouch *Bolero (Les Uns et les autres*. France, 1981): An attempt to embrace the immense, to cover the most important events from 1936 to the present day. ... A movie complicated in form, a wide canvas that claims to be generalizations. With a lot of events that are impossible to enumerate. The film is immensely dragged out (Frez, 1982: 17).

The attitude to the drama of C. Lelouch was also ambiguous *Matrimony (Mariage*. France, 1974) (Svobodin, 1975: 17).

But the drama *The Last Train (Le Train*. France-Italy, 1973) by Pierre Granier-Deferre (1927-2007), which took place in 1940 in the Nazi-occupied France.

Film critic A. Svobodin (1922-1999) wrote that compassion for the heroes of this film is not only momentarily sensual, but philosophical and poetic, as happens, for example, when reading Tyutchev's tragic poems (Svobodin, 1975: 17).

And film critic R. Sobolev (1926-1991) noted that *The Last Train* talks about high moral purity, about the impossibility of betrayal for a real person and about love that elevates people (Sobolev, 1975: 1-2).

Referring to other French films about the Second World War, film critic G. Dolmatovskaya regretted that in this film there is no complete picture of the heroic Resistance. It is not the army that operates, but single individuals, connected only with each other in a strange, hostile world. How exactly they fight the Germans, we did not find out (Dolmatovskaya, 1972: 14).

Much more negative reaction was caused in the *Soviet Screen* by the drama *Lacombe Lucien* (France-Italy-FRG, 1973) by Louis Malle (1932-1995). Film critic R. Sobolev wrote that Malle took a real case of betrayal and considered the fate of the village boy Lucien, who served in the Gestapo, and then shot by the verdict of the court. Outwardly, Malle is objective: France, in fact, was split by the occupation and the Vichy regime, which bore the shadow of a swastika. There were French people who wrote denunciations about the French, and there were French

policemen who tortured and shot French patriots. All this can and should be told, but... only if the "ashes of Klaas" knock in the heart of the artist. Malle is trying to create a "portrait of the era", making her the hero of a traitor, a cruel and mentally limited person. ... The indifference of the film's author to those who supported the greatness of the unbroken national spirit in those years, turns into an equation between the partisans and the Petain police. In the end, according to Malle, it turns out that Lacombe accidentally became a traitor (Sobolev, 1975: 1-2).

Found in a magazine "and for criticism of exquisite films *Benjamin* (*Benjamin ou les Memoires d'un Puceau*. France, 1968) by Michel Deville (1931-2023) and *Claire's Knee* (*Le Genou de Claire*. France, 1970) by Éric Rohmer (1920-2010) and others, none of whom made it into Soviet film distribution in the 1970s.

For example, film critic G. Dolmatovskaya wrote that the elegant, very beautiful in color "costume" comedy by Michel Deville *Benjamin* [would not be worth] mentioning if it were not for the magnificent Michel Morgan in the title role and the exquisite camera work of Ghislain Cloquet (Dolmatovskaya, 1972: 14).

And G. Dolmatovskaya (in our opinion, without evidence) accused the psychologically subtle picture of Éric Rohmer's *Claire's Knee* (*Le Genou de Claire*. France, 1970) of the fact that in a film with such a bold name, there is not even a drop of sensuality ... What well, against the background of rampant sex on the Western screen, it seems that this is not bad. The only bad thing is that there is no feeling. ... And if the director wanted to show people who died at the age of 35 for feelings, he achieved his goal (Dolmatovskaya, 1972: 14).

Recognizing in the sensational film *Blow-Out* (*La Grande bouffe*. France-Italy, 1973), a cruel satire on the consumer society, film critic L. Pogozheva (1913-1989) was convinced that the trouble with this movie is that the critical fuse contained in it is combined with a solution of the problem that is vulgar in its very nature. Four excellent actors – Marcello Mastroianni, Philippe Noiret, Michel Piccoli, Ugo Tognazzi – played not only an apocalyptic vision of the death of the modern world, but also a humiliating zoologism, showed the disgusting details that accompanied the actions of the heroes in their intention to commit suicide with the help of gluttony. Both grub and "love" are shown on the screen with some amazing shamelessness, with savoring and naturalism truly unbearable (Pogozheva, 1973: 17).

The film critic K. Razlogov was also very strict, claiming that in *The Woman Banker* (*La Banquière*. France, 1980) by Francis Giraud (1944-2006) the viewer is given the opportunity to admire the dubious enterprise of the heroine-banker. This frank apology of bourgeois morality did not become an artistic achievement (Razlogov, 1981: 17).

Film critic O. Sulkin was no less severe in his article. He first accused Andrzej Wajda (1926-2016) of "artistic" running of "pseudo-historical ideas" in the French film *Danton* (France-FRG-Poland, 1982). And then he lamented that in the film by Jean-Jacques Annaud *Quest for Fire* (*La Guerre du feu*. France-Canada, 1981) "ahistoricity is clothed in the clothes of a scrupulous study of primitive society. We seem to be convinced: "homo sapiens" has always been cold and heartless, it is "in his blood". A gloomy, meaningless spectacle..." (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17).

Active protest from the editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen* D. Orlov (1935-2021) was caused by the film *Charlie Bravo* (France, 1980) by Claude Bernard-Aubert (1930-2018): Returning his memory to the last days, hours and even minutes of the stay of the French colonialists in Vietnam, the director is trying to sort of revise not so much the political (which would be just stupid today!), but the moral results of that war imperialist, colonial. On the one hand, and people's, liberation – on the other. Depicting the suffering of a bunch of thugs dressed in khakis, and with them a blond girl from a medical school, the director is trying to win over the sympathy of the audience to their side. The partisans are cruel to the point of senselessness, and they set traps and traps, and for some reason they shoot from behind every bush. The creator of this movie does not try to answer only one question: who invited this flying detachment of flayers to a foreign land, what do they need here, why weren't they at home? Hopeless are attempts to overestimate and rethink what history long ago gave its clear, clear and final answer (Orlov, 1981 16-18).

Other notable French films deserved higher ratings from the reviewers of the *Soviet Screen*: *To Die of Love* (*Mourir d'aimer*. France-Italy, 1970), *The Infernal Trio* (*Le Trio infernal*. France-Italy-FRG, 1974), *Loulou* (France, 1980), *Watchmaker from Saint-Paul* (*L'Horloger de Saint-Paul*. France, 1974), *Vincent, Francois, Paul and the Others* (*Vincent,*

François, Paul... et les autres. France-Italy, 1974), *Slap (La Gifle*. France-Italy, 1974), *Jean's Wife (La femme de Jean*. France, 1973), *Lily, love me (Lily, aime-moi*. France, 1975), *Cage (La Cage*. France, 1975), *Molière* (France, 1978) (Andreev, 1979: 18-19; Bocharov, 1972: 155; Chernenko, 1975: 9; Dolmatovskaya, 1975: 18; Golubev, 1975: 19; Ivanova, 1975: 16-17; Markova, 1975: 17; Razlogov, 1981: 18).

The *Soviet Screen* of the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s also published a number of articles about films traditional for the French entertainment cinema about policemen and bandits.

Here K. Razlogov positively noted that Michel Drash (1930-1990) in *The Red Sweater (Le Pull-over rouge*. France, 1979) denounces the inertia and bias of the actions of the police and prosecutors during the trial, and *The Police War (La Guerre des polices*. France, 1979) is directed primarily against the police themselves. He also praised the detective Yves Boisset *The Woman Cop (La Femme flic*. France, 1980), where the heroine is forced to leave the police service, since her investigation revealed the involvement of very high-ranking persons in the crimes (Razlogov, 1981: 18).

And then the conclusion followed that the combination of the futility of the fight against crime and the assertion of crime as the only way to restore trampled justice, the inability to find oneself in the grip of the bourgeois way of life and the doom of any active protest ... are also inherent in many other movies – a wide range of anti-bourgeois works, films of various subjects, genres, styles, individual creative manners. Their authors are united by the idea of leaving society, the rejection of traditional norms, the desire to gain true freedom outside the restrictive framework of the bourgeoisie (Razlogov, 1981: 18).

But at the same time, “the professionalism of other masters can easily degenerate into craftsmanship, brilliant acting can become self-indulgent actors' "numbers" (for example, in recent adventure comedies starring Jean-Paul Belmondo), the coherence of stories can become clichés repeated from film to film. ... With all the talent of their creators, the significance of these pictures does not go beyond variations on traditional themes that are essentially deadpan for contemporary Western art” (Razlogov 1981: 18).

One of such films with the participation of Belmondo – *The Inheritor (L'Héritier*. France-Italy, 1972) – was analyzed in the *Soviet Screen* by film critic G. Dolmatovskaya: In the plot structure of *The Inheritor* much resembles *The Mattei Affair (Il caso Mattei*. Italy, 1971) is a strong, poignant political film by Italian director Francesco Rosi. Already the “secondary” itself, the variation of the finds of a talented predecessor, is a quite clear sign that *The Inheritor* belongs to commercial cinema. ... And the director himself has no power to resist this force. Instead of the notorious cinematography of white telephones, he offers the viewer the cinematography of his own jets, equipped with the techniques of intelligent cinema: the wandering camera, the meaningful retrospections, the terseness of dialogues – all this cold and precise professionalism and directorial sophistication substitute the civic passion of the author, without which there is no political film (Dolmatovskaya, 1973: 12-13).

Critically presenting the film *The Burglars (Le Casse*. France-Italy, 1971) by Henri Verneuil (1920-2002) and other French films about crime on the pages of the magazine, the journalist Y. Bocharov wrote that the time of noble detectives like Sherlock Holmes or Maigret passed. Now detectives are increasingly competing with gangsters in atrocities. And the sympathy of the audience is given most often to gangsters. I have not seen a single detective on the screen who would die with glory in the line of duty. But gangsters invariably die like heroes in an unequal battle. There is no point in explaining what the educational value of such movies is. Even if we assume that in this way the police, standing guard over the interests of the bourgeoisie, are exposed (Bocharov, 1972: 15).

The *Soviet Screen* did not bypass the popular in the West (and, of course, in France) theme of cinema sex in the 1970s.

So film critic L. Pogozheva informed readers that in the French film *Mother and the Slut (La maman et la putain*. France, 1973) for more than an hour and a half, the characters cannot make a choice with whom to stay: with his wife or mistress. The film takes place mainly in bed. The film contains social criticism of society, interprets the problem of society's disastrous indifference to man, condemns morality, or rather immorality, prevailing in bourgeois reality ... But still, modern man, according to the author of the film, first of all, shows interest in sex (Pogozheva, 1973: 16-17).

Moreover, the film critic S. Freilich (1920-2005) was convinced (in fact, erroneously, since the example for proving this thesis was chosen extremely unsuccessfully) that the satirical picture became the limit of showing sex in French cinema. Bertrand Blier *Get Your Handkerchiefs Ready* (*Préparez vos mouchoirs*. France-Belgium, 1978): Here bourgeois art has crossed limits that until recently it was not decided: children now enter into sexual games as characters (Freilich, 1980: 17).

Among the French comedies that did not get into the Soviet film distribution, the magazine chose, as a rule, the works of famous comedians. For example, he praised Gerard Ury's comedy *The Brain* (*Le Cerveau*. France-Italy, 1969) for satire (Revich, 1971).

The film critic G. Dolmatovskaya wrote quite kindly and another well-known comedy by Gerard Ury – *Delusions of Grandeur* (*La Folie des grandeurs*. France-Italy-Spain-FRG, 1971): Free exercises on the theme of *Ruy Blas* by Victor Hugo testify that Ury is a comedian and Louis de Funès have a rich arsenal of comic tricks, sometimes already familiar, because de Funès is not inexhaustible, and we happened to see much more subtle manifestations of French humor (Dolmatovskaya, 1972: 14).

The works of notable masters were selected by the *Soviet Screen* for articles on Spanish cinema.

So film critic L. Pogozheva (1913-1989) wrote about the film *Anna and the Wolves* (*Ana y los lobos*. Spain, 1973) by Carlos Saura (1932-2023) (Pogozheva, 1973: 16-17).

A film critic Y. Warszawsky (1911-2000) wrote about another film by Saura: *Hole* (*La Madriguera*. Spain, 1969).

And it should be noted that this film evoked generally negative emotions in the venerable film critic: "Photo advertising at the entrance is alarming: some disgusting bugs and spiders are crawling over the body of a young woman; another photo frame shows the bloody face of a young man. Isn't it a horror movie? No, we are told, [*Hole*] is a problematic work by a sharp-minded artist, responding to the dramas of the times. ... But do not rush to summarize – everything is deceptive in the film of Carlos Saura. The film hardly needs your viewer's analytical skills – it takes the incompatibility of human beings as the eternal curse of the human race. Bardem and Berlanga meditated, grieved, called for humanity – their student Saura becomes hardened. Either the heroes of the film, or the author come up with new and new tortures for young souls, then in a dream – as, for example, with bugs – then in reality. ... From time to time you remember: somewhere all this has already happened, and more than once. Two people living inseparably together is hell. Whose motive? Of course, Sartre. The young woman is forever traumatized by her childhood fear of a Catholic trial; whose motive? Everyone will tell you: Fellini! A homemade masquerade with dressing up to revive love passion – who did we meet this with? Cinema connoisseurs will answer without hesitation: Buñuel! "Theater for yourself" becomes too cruel, threatens spouses with death ... Many viewers will remember the film with Elizabeth Taylor *Who is Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (USA, 1966). Saura's film is also made up of "blocks", only different ones. ...

Obviously, a few fans separate [*Hole*] from the flow of the usual film repertoire because in the film, whatever you say, the director's talent and serious school make themselves felt: after all, he was a student of Bardem and Berlanga. And it is felt somewhere that the underlying basis of the drama is a crisis of life values. But where is the "nerve" of the artist? Bardem once said about Carlos Saura and other young filmmakers of his generation: "We tried to convey our heartache and anger to them, it all turned out to be only cruelty." The film by Carlos Saura confirmed this disappointing characterization" (Warszawsky, 1969: 14-15).

Like the cinematographies of other Western countries, the *Soviet Screen* looked for anti-bourgeois and anti-militarist films in West German cinema.

In particular, the film critic E. Gromov (1931-2005) believed that the anti-war film of Michael Verhoeven *OK* (West Germany, 1970) for all its miscalculations – one of the best works of "young cinema" of Germany, or, as it is also called, "German new wave" (Gromov, 1972: 16-17).

Further, E. Gromov noted the artistic merits of P. Fleischmann's philosophical and analytical drama *Hunting Scenes in Lower Bavaria* (*Jagdszenen aus Niederbayern*. FRG, 1969) and films-parables of A. Kluge: These paintings are very different both in genre and in style, and ideologically and aesthetically. But there is something in common between them: frankness bordering on naturalism in the depiction of the shady sides of life and the predominance of a

negative, critical principle (Gromov, 1972: 16-17).

E. Gromov highly appreciated F. Schlöndorff's *Minute Flash* (*Strohfeuer*. West Germany, 1972): Unlike the avant-garde frills of the directors of the "young German cinema", ... his film is staged in a realistic manner, there is no naturalism in it. The topic is taken quite relevant and serious – the position of women in Germany. The film shows with its own eyes that despite all the declarations of politicians and various "sex revolutions", discrimination against women in public life continues to be a fact. The soft and sincere play of the leading lady ... gives the picture a special charm and subtlety (Gromov, 1973).

Film expert K. Razlogov praised another sharply social movie – *Lead Times* (*Die bleierne Zeit*. Germany, 1981) by Margarethe von Trotta: Not accepting terrorism, the director and the main character – and this is the depth and historical accuracy of the film *Lead Times* – understand that a sense of hopelessness often pushes on the path of bloody actions that do not achieve the desired results (Razlogov, 1983: 14-15).

In this context of support for socially oriented West German films, film critic E. Gromov wrote indignantly about the film *Touch, my friend* (*Las jucken, Kumpel!* West Germany, 1972): Today the working theme is in fashion, and the film is declared as "proletarian" – about the Ruhr miners. However, the working family is shown in it as a completely bourgeois social unit in its way of thinking and even in everyday life. Vulgarity screams in every frame. And not only because the picture is implicated in the most explicit pornography. More symptomatic is the ethical position of the author and his characters. A wife can cheat on her husband with anyone. He pays her in the same coin. Something like a "group marriage" is also permissible, only a violation of external decorum, order in the apartment, decency in clothes, and so on, is unacceptable. And this is a "proletarian" way of life?! (Gromov, 1973).

However, the *Soviet Screen* wrote relatively rarely about West German films like *Touch, My Friends*.

In the foreground were still the paintings of the first row: *The Tin Drum* (*Die Blechtrommel*. FRG-France, 1979) by Volker Schlöndorff, *The Enigma of Kaspar Hauser* (*Jeder für sich und Gott gegen alle*. FRG, 1974) by Werner Herzog and others.

So the film critic S. Freilich (1920-2005) highly appreciated Volker Schlöndorff's *The Tin Drum*, noting that the film is based on the novel by Günter Grass in the tradition of expressionism and satirical grotesque, who always resorts to a fantastic situation (Freilich, 1980: 17).

And film critic M. Chernenko (1931-2004) wrote that in the drama *The Enigma of Kaspar Hauser*, the director is trying to break through to the secret of psychological, philosophical, universal. For how many times has the screen tried to convince the viewer of the original human meanness, bestial cruelty. And this German Mowgli of the twenties of the last century, not burdened with the vices of civilization, turns out to be the embodiment of decency, kindness, goodwill, and such that it becomes one of the reasons for his tragic death – a complete inability to self-defense, the inability to believe in evil, ill will, cynicism (Chernenko, 1976: 16-17).

True, other films by W. Herzog in the *Soviet Screen* were much less fortunate. Film critic S. Freilich wrote that in bourgeois cinema the apocalyptic theme is treated in a decadent way. ... the spiritual crisis of bourgeois society is accepted as a crisis of the human race. Hence the fear of the end of the world, the aestheticization of horror (in connection with which various kinds of monsters and monsters appear on the screen in abundance), in these pictures the importance of the subconscious and instincts is exaggerated (which is the reason for excessive attention to sex and human pathology). Unfortunately, this also includes the film *Nosferatu* (*Nosferatu: Phantom der Nacht*. West Germany-France, 1979) (Freilich, 1980: 17). The film critic O. Sulkin and another mystical visionary film by W. Herzog – *Fitzcarraldo* (West Germany, 1982) (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17).

Turning to the work of another famous West German director – R.W. Fassbinder – film critic O. Sulkin wrote that "There is some tragic sense in the fact that Rainer Werner Fassbinder, who flashed like a comet across the cinema sky and left at the age of 36 as the author of 40 (!) movies, put an end to his work with the painting *Querelle* (West Germany-France, 1982), which absorbed all the inconsistency of his talent, which crossed all conceivable boundaries of morality, reflecting deep pessimism, the crisis of the artist's worldview" (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17).

The attempts of the authors of some West German films to whitewash the Nazis and distort the events of the Second World War aroused justifiably sharp rejection among the

reviewers of the *Soviet Screen*.

So film critic O. Sulkin wrote about the military drama *The Boat* (*Das Boot*. Germany, 1981) by Wolfgang Petersen (1941-2022): “The most expensive film in the history of West German cinema was made on a grand scale, inventively, technically flawlessly. What do we see? Everyday life of the crew of a Nazi submarine. Her life is specific. And morals even more so. Fascist pirates, it turns out, do not like the Fuhrer, despise the Nazi uniform, ignore the greeting “Heil Hitler”. But they listen to the BBC, sing English and French songs with pleasure, and openly conduct “seditious” conversations. They have never heard of genocide, concentration camps and similar “land” horrors perpetrated by “colleagues”. Do they kill themselves? They kill, but... immeasurably suffering and tormented by a guilt complex. The viewer is trying to convince that these are “good guys” to evoke sympathy and admiration for their fortitude and endurance. This is how an attempt is made to justify what cannot be justified, this is how historical truth is distorted, this is how they try to rehabilitate Nazism. It is far from accidental that the right-wing press on both sides of the Atlantic praises in every way the film “useful for NATO”, clearly adjusted to the current imperialist conjuncture” (Sulkin, 1983: 16-17).

Journalist M. Borisov rightly argued that the film *Cross of Iron* (*Steiner – Das Eiserne Kreuz*. West Germany-UK, 1977) shows the fascist thugs with the *Magnificent Seven*, and the war in the form of a sports game with the participation of experienced professionals: if they lose, then this is not so scary – happiness, they say, will smile another time. ... the viewer should be on the side of Steiner: he is kind, humane, the idol of a captive boy killed by cruel, soulless Russian barbarians (Borisov, 1977).

Film critic A. Karaganov (1915-2007), who wrote that in the military drama *Cross of Iron*, was in complete agreement with him: *Cross of Iron* idealized was shown a sergeant of the Nazi army, fighting somewhere near Novorossiysk, so this movie was on a par with dozens of less noticeable and not so skillful in art movies, directed by a vile and cunning idea that if the Wehrmacht was “cleansed” of “extremes “SS” army, this army of courageous and experienced soldiers can serve the “West” well in the military confrontation with the “East” (Karaganov, 1982: 1).

Following M. Borisov (Borisov, 1977), A. Karaganov (Karaganov, 1982: 1) and V. Chernenko (Chernenko, 1983: 16-17), film critic L. Melville emphasized that in the film *Cross of Iron* “The German invaders fighting on the Russian front are falsely romanticized. In the director’s interpretation, they are “just people”, by the will of fate beyond their control, thrown into difficult conditions, the same for all parties: both the aggressors and the defenders of their homeland. It is quite clear that such an “existentialist” equalization of political and moral opposites does not clarify the true meaning of the events of the Second World War, but obscures it to the limit. And in the film *The Boat* (*Das Boot*. West Germany, 1981), W. Petersen “tries to present the horrors of war through the eyes of ordinary Germans, who, without hesitation,” carried out orders “given” from above “... Depicting the torment and horrors, through which ordinary submariners pass, W. Petersen tries to arouse sympathy and sympathy for them. Insidious intent: after all, in this way they are trying to distract the viewer from the question – why are they following orders? Their conscience is not burdened, not one of them awakens a sense of guilt and responsibility for what they have done” (Melville, 1985: 20).

We can agree with the final conclusion of L. Melville even today: in a number of Western films, the events of the Second World War are distorted in favor of speculative schemes and reactionary concepts that are beneficial to those circles in the West who seek to pervert the lessons of the fight against fascism, to justify, and sometimes even rehabilitate the plans revanchists (Melville, 1985: 20).

Presenting Swedish cinematography on its pages, the editors of the magazine again turned to the work of the director Ingmar Bergman (1918-2007), who was almost inaccessible to the mass Soviet audience.

Here journalist A. Dumov wrote with regret the following: “When I watched *The Touch* (*Beröringen*. Sweden-USA, 1971), the impression of Bergman’s previous painting *Shame* (*Skammen*. Sweden, 1968) was still vivid in my memory, a vivid work in which the destructive effect is revealed wars on human souls. Against this background, Bergman’s new ribbon appears to be a cheap commercial craft, a zigzag in creativity” (Dumov, 1972: 12-13).

And the film critic L. Pogozeva remained dissatisfied with the pessimism of another psychological drama of the great Swedish director – *Cries and Whispers* (*Viskningar och rop*.

Sweden, 1972) (Pogozheva, 1973: 16-17).

True chamber drama of I. Bergman *After the Rehearsal* (*Efter repetitionen*. Sweden, 1984) received an assessment in the *Soviet Screen* (Bauman, 1985: 16-17).

It was also noted that Roy Andersson's *A Swedish Love Story* (*En Kärlekshistoria*. Sweden, 1970) enjoys great and well-deserved success in Sweden: This film is not only about the younger generation, but also about Sweden itself today, about the everyday life of ordinary people. R. Andersson, by all accounts, has a bright talent. They predict a bright future for him (Dumov, 1972: 12-13).

As before, *Soviet Screen* tried to impress upon its readers that the most interesting phenomenon in Swedish cinematography are the social works of young artists... Being honest before their conscience, they look upon art as a weapon in the struggle for the reorganization of society on progressive principles. Each of them, to the extent of their understanding and skill, opens the audience's eyes to capitalist reality, to the world of social injustice (Dumov, 1972: 12-13).

Journalist A. Dumov believed that the best of these works is *The Line*: A small Swedish village, blooming summer, joyful faces. Suddenly, a foreign aircraft with bacteriological weapons on board crashes nearby. An epidemic begins. The authorities don't fight it. Only an order is given not to let anyone into the infected area and not to let them out of it. The film blames capitalism as a system in which the common man becomes a pawn in the hands of politicians and the military (Dumov, 1972: 12-13).

Another movie in this series, – continued A. Dumov, the film *Comrades, the enemy is well organized*. It is documentary, tells about a two-month strike of miners in the Swedish North, one of the largest in the country in the post-war years. Members of the strike committee were involved in the processing of the footage. This was of considerable benefit, for it helped to focus attention on the main thing. Perhaps not all the assessments of the authors can agree. But the film undoubtedly contributes to the intensification of the workers' struggle for social progress (Dumov, 1972: 12-13).

However, knowing that Swedish cinema is not only philosophical films by Ingmar Bergman and films about the working class, the *Soviet Screen* did not get tired of exposing Swedish films that to one degree or another reflected the tendencies of the sexual revolution.

In particular, it was noted that director V. Sjoman shocked the audience with the dilogy *I am curious* (*Jag är nyfiken*. Sweden, 1967-1968), and, perhaps for the first time in the history of cinema, stuffed them with scenes of sexual acts, which caused a storm of discussions in Western cinema. In order to rid the movie of censorship prohibitions, he equipped it with a "parallel" line – the search for heroes of social justice. Sheman seemed to have found a gold mine. But she quickly faded. The film business began to search for a new vein. And found it in the form of "popular scientific" films... Their essence is the on-screen demonstration of sexual acts mixed up with the speculations of sexologists about sexual problems (Dumov 1972: 12-13).

- articles about international film festivals and foreign film weeks in the USSR

In articles in the *Soviet Screen* on international film festivals, the current repertoire of Western national cinematographies, and weeks of foreign cinema in the USSR, a clear division of Western cinema into "progressive" and "bourgeois" still reigned.

Most willingly, the *Soviet Screen* wrote about the state of affairs in Italian cinema and the Venice Film Festival.

In particular, the film critic G. Bogemsky (1920-1995) recalled that the cinema of Italy is well known to our audience. It once gave rise to neorealism, an outstanding artistic phenomenon in the entire world cinema, which arose, as the Italians themselves do not get tired of repeating with gratitude, under the beneficial influence of our cinema – the films and theoretical works of S. Eisenstein, V. Pudovkin, A. Dovzhenko and other Soviet masters. Even today it remains in Italy the leading edge of the daily struggle for national and democratic culture against the expansion of American capital and ideology. True, today in this struggle, the preponderance so far – at least quantitatively – is on the side of the so-called commercial film production. The commercialization of Italian cinema goes hand in hand with its Americanization. Having taken over a significant part of film production, American capital is taking over the film distribution, and now the cinema chain. ... If you analyze Italian film production over the past year or two, you see that a good 90 percent are movies that are a mass consumer product in the Western sense of the word, a product that is skillfully made, in

beautiful packaging, but no less rotten, if not poisonous. . The vast majority are films about gangsters. This does not mean that erotica and just pornography have lost their positions on the Italian screen, but they are being pressed by cruelty, violence, robbery and murder.

At the same time, “in the Italian “consumer society”, the process of commercialization of cinema has gone so far that even some films that seem to be protesting against the bourgeoisie immediately become an object of sale and purchase, a subject of speculation. Following Marco Bellocchio's film *Fists in the Pocket (I Pugni in tasca*. Italy, 1965), which anticipated the "cinema of protest", dozens of films by young directors came out – with rehashings of the motifs of this "rebellious" film. However, extreme “leftism” accompanies fashion speculation in them, pseudo-protest covers up sophisticated eroticism and cruelty more purely than in commercial films (Bogemsky, 1971: 13-14).

On the other hand, as the same G. Bogemsky noted, the main theme of the advanced cinema in Italy has been and remains the anti-fascist and anti-war theme. ... These are very different films, but all of them are imbued with a strong condemnation of fascism and sound like a reminder of its atrocities. However, progressive Italian filmmakers now approach the anti-fascist and anti-war theme even more broadly: fascism yesterday is neo-colonialism and American imperialism today is the thought that pervades some of the new films (Bogemsky, 1971: 13-14).

As examples, further cited the films of Valerio Zurlini *Seated at His Right (Seduto alla sua destra*. Italy, 1968) is a passionate anti-colonialist work inspired by the feat of Patrice Lumumba; *The Battle of Algiers (La Battaglia di Algeri*. Italy-Algeria, 1965) and *Quemaida (Burn! / Queimada!* Italy-France-Colombia, 1969) by Gillo Pontecorvo (1919-2006).

At the same time, G. Bogemsky admitted that not everything is so simple and prosperous in the sphere of progressive, anti-bourgeois, anti-fascist, anti-colonialist cinema: some films are of an anarchist, leftist character, in some, along with extremist motives, revisionist-capitulation sounds (Bogemsky, 1971: 13-14).

The TASS correspondent in the UK, V. Vasilets, complained on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*: Filmmakers are sure that sex and violence are what keep the audience in the hall. The opposite is now almost impossible to prove, because other films in London are not so easy to find. Indeed, of 436 films shown in West End theaters last year, only eight were free of explicit violence and sex and could be watched by children. Here are some of the titles of films currently on the London screen. ... The lion's share of the rental is violence, sex, anti-Soviet propaganda. ... The campaign of spy mania, which recently swept through England in a dirty wave, finds continuation in endless television series, newspaper "ducks", and film handicrafts. Soviet people are most often represented in them as stupid, treacherous, poor in spirit. Subsidizing such "works" are not interested in art. They cook them, spurred on by the menacing noise of the demonstrations of the English unemployed, the desperate pensioners who cannot live on meager handouts, the students' unions, whose rights are trampled on by the Conservative government. They avert the eyes of the public, slipping it, instead of deep social causes, an imaginary reason from outside the “red danger” (Vasilets, 1972: 18).

Film critic R. Sobolev (1926-1991) created a similar panorama of American cinema, arguing that in the United States, as always in the past, only individual paintings really deeply and reliably reflect the reality of life. The bulk of the approximately 340 films that are now shot annually in the United States are purely commercial productions. A large place is occupied by films that were previously divided into “gangster”, “detective”, “police”, etc., and are now increasingly called “crime films” (Sobolev, 1974: 16-17).

Further, R. Sobolev spoke sharply negatively about Hollywood “horror films”: Although vampires, werewolves, and all sorts of monsters still densely populate the screen, the ruler of the underworld himself, Satan, comes to the fore today. R. Polanski laid the foundation here, having filmed *Rosemary's Baby* (USA, 1968): an story about how an anti-messiah came into the world instead of a messiah – the son of an American woman and the devil. There have been many such films in the past seven years. The most sensational of them is *The Exorcist* (USA, 1973) by W. Friedkin (Sobolev, 1974: 16-17).

And then the film critic reminded readers that a special and significant part of modern American film production is made up of pictures that critics began to call “retro” ... They appeared quite a long time ago – the already famous gangster ballad *Bonnie and Clyde* (USA, 1967) by A. Penn not only showed the horrors of the great depression of the early 1930s, but to a

certain extent romanticized that time. However, the true heyday of "retrocinema" came in the 1970s. ... One must agree that, in principle, turning to history has nothing wrong: history often helps to understand the present, to avoid mistakes. It seems, however, that for the most part retro is a cinema of illusions, so familiar to Hollywood, the factory of dreams (Sobolev, 1974: 16-17).

As for another English-speaking country, Australia, the pages of *Soviet Screen* emphasized that in all the film studios of the country, all its cinemas, have passed into the grasping paws of the American and partly English film companies and are completely controlled by them. More than 400 feature films are imported into Australia each year, mostly from the US. A stream of foreign-made commercial movies promoting violence, cruelty, greed, bestial attitude towards women, explicit pornography filled the screens of literally all cinemas. But where will you go and to whom will you tell if colonial times have come in Australian cinema, if the "enlightenment" of the population has been completely transferred to foreign film companies? ... In addition, Australian producers generally do not dare to invest any significant funds in national films, rightly fearing that they will not be able to compete with Hollywood action films worth millions (Romanov, 1971: 12-13).

According to TASS correspondent R. Serebrennikov, French cinema in the 1970s also experienced a difficult period of creative difficulties and sharp social contradictions. ... Catastrophically reduced the total number of cinemas. ... There is a continuous rise in prices for cinema tickets (Serebrennikov, 1973: 14-15). And then the article expressed regret that progressive French films about workers and peasants ... are experiencing difficulties in France with access to mass film distribution. And all this is happening at a time when French cinema is experiencing an acute shortage of ideas, when the screens are crammed with ordinary production, when there are too few topics that have a public and social sound (Serebrennikov, 1973: 14-15).

No matter what happened in the cinema, according to the *Soviet Screen* went in the 1970s in Sweden: In the mid-50s, up to 72 million film visits per year were registered in the country, and in 1970 only 28 million tickets were sold, that is, an average of 3.5 tickets for each of the eight million inhabitants. The attendance of Swedish films has especially decreased. ... An important role in the process of renunciation of the masses from the art of cinema was played by the low artistic quality of most films. Cinematography could effectively fight to retain its audience by developing their artistic tastes and offering them great art. However, it is easier for businessmen to "make money" on surrogate films than on good films. ... And Swedish commercial cinema most often follows the well-trodden path of producing purely entertainment films. All these crafts are without fail "peppered" with bed scenes in a concentration that meets the tastes of their creators. ... Today, the Swedish movie screen is dominated by American, French, English, Italian and other Western film products, mostly low-quality, entertaining (Dumov, 1972: 12-13).

Similarly, Norwegian cinematography was presented on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*. In particular, it was reported that almost half of all films that were released in general distribution in Norway glorified violence: 190 films featured murders, and in 51 films the victims of the murderers were women, and yet "these statistics do not include "permissible", which is not contrary to "moral principles" "society sexism!" (Vesenberg, 1969: 12).

An alarming picture of the state of film distribution in Germany and West Berlin also arose in an article by film critic E. Gromov (1931-2005): "Most of the films shown on the West Berlin screen are stereotypical products of bourgeois mass culture. The themes of violence and sex vary in every way" (Gromov, 1973).

But when at the Workers in German Cinema Festival held in West Berlin ... titles of films devoted to the modern class struggle flashed on the screen, critics began to talk about the 'second breath' of [West German] proletarian cinema. The critics spoke of a 'second breath' of [West German] proletarian cinematography... A number of films attracted the attention of spectators and the press, owing their birth to a general intensification of political life, workers' mass demonstrations, and the indignation of youth against social injustice and the inequality of women (Chudov, 1974: 16). However, this article went on to criticize R.W. Fassibinder's television film *8 o'clock – not all day* (*Acht Stunden sind kein Tag*. FRG, 1973), where the consciousness of the necessity of the class struggle is somewhat blunted and even replaced by conciliation. The talented artist's subjective views on the class struggle and other problems of

capitalism (Chudov, 1974: 16).

Film critic A. Novogrudsky (1911-1996) was glad that at the film festival in Oberhausen a storm of passions was caused by the competition film of the West German director Axel Engstfeld *Festive Evening* (*Feier-Abend*. Germany, 1983), which was awarded the jury prize. ... The entire space of the documentary frame is filled with helmeted policemen. Eight thousand keepers of order on the streets of Bonn. Who are they protecting? It turns out that this evening the Bundeswehr is celebrating its 25th anniversary. The associated parade processions with torches, so reminiscent of the marches of the Nazi military, cause indignation among many ordinary residents of the city (Novogrudsky, 1983: 18-19).

Having visited the next West Berlin Film Festival, the editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen*, D. Orlov, was pleased to inform the readers of the magazine that the West German directors and producers who made a joint statement during the festival expressing their indignation at the incompetence of the film forum management that had admitted such helpless films to the competition were also right. They also said that they would not participate in the festival from now on unless the situation changed in the future (Orlov, 1981 16-17).

However, D. Orlov went on to say that the lack of competence alone cannot explain the essence of the problem. It would be more accurate to speak about bias, about tendentiousness, about a certain, unambiguous position of those who lead the festival, directing its course – publicly and unspokenly. It is not without reason that one of the "incompetent" managers blurted out the admission that the West Berlin festival is being held on American money. In the context of this confession, the story of the screening at the festival two years ago of the slanderous American film *The Deer Hunter* also becomes especially clear (Orlov, 1981 16-17).

The competition program of the Cannes Film Festival in 1983 included such significant films as *Nostalghia* (Italy-USSR, 1983) by Andrei Tarkovsky (1932-1986), *Money* (*L'Argent*. France-Switzerland, 1983) by Robert Bresson (1901-1999), *The Legend of Narayama* (Japan, 1983) by Shohei Imamura (1926-2006). However, despite this, in the report about this festival, the key phrase was a standard phrase for this kind of material: "Looking at the long series of films you watched at Cannes with one glance, you come to a sad conclusion: his program clearly ignored the main, burning problems of the time, those that worry the people of the planet: the problems of peace and security, the preservation of life on Earth, the assertion of social justice" (Shulyukin, 1983).

- short informational materials about events in Western cinema (from neutral reports to "yellow" gossip).

In the 1970s – the first half of the 1980s, *Soviet Screen* from issue to issue published on its pages short messages about the release of filming and the release of foreign films on the world screen.

Very rarely, but among these informational messages slipped those that are usually classified as "yellow".

In particular, in 1972, the *Soviet Screen* published an article about how the Frenchman Jean-Claude Dag became the world's first robber director: he was arrested by the Paris police on charges of seven bank robberies. And although Jean-Claude motivated his activities by the fact that he needed funds to stage a grandiose gangster action movie, the court sentenced the filmmaker-robber to many years in prison (Radi ..., 1972: 16).

Similar material from the category "their morals" was dedicated to the actor Jose Antonio Valdelomar González (1958-1992): he first played the central role of a gang leader in Carlos Saura's *Fast! Hurry!* (*Deprisa, deprisa!* Spain, 1981), who received the main prize at the West Berlin Film Festival, and then, together with his partner, was arrested by the police after a real bank robbery (Kudrin, 1981: 18).

In 1975, film critic G. Bogemsky told the readers of the magazine in some detail about how Fellini was robbed of a film with key episodes of the not yet released *Casanova* (Italy-USA, 1976) (Bogemsky, 1975: 17).

In 1982, a note was published that the people of the 'world's most democratic state' were shocked to learn that Monroe had not committed suicide, but was the victim of a planned assassination committed by agents of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. In the grave atmosphere of bourgeois ideology in a society where pragmatism and militant callousness have long been a tool in the deception of people, the grinding and corruption of souls, where disappointment, pessimism, despair are the main motif of both real life and the life of art

generated by this reality, the tragic story of the actress acquires a truly symbolic sound (Birukov, 1982: 17).

And in the pages of the 1984 magazine *Soviet Screen* described the details of the scandal associated with the fact that Hollywood director John Landis was threatened with imprisonment because on the set of *Twilight Zone: The Movie* (USA, 1983) actor Vic Morrow and two children who starred in the film six and seven years old were killed (Leonidov, 1984: 20).

Conclusion. So based on content analysis (in the context of the historical, socio-cultural and political situation, etc.) of texts published during the “stagnant” period of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1969-1985), the authors came to the conclusion that materials on Western cinema on this stage can be divided into the following genres:

- ideologized articles emphasizing criticism of bourgeois cinema and its harmful influence on the audience;
- articles on the history of Western cinema (with a much lesser degree of ideologization);
- biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors (as a rule, with positive ratings);
- interviews with Western filmmakers (as a rule, with those who came to Moscow film festivals, priority was given to filmmakers with “progressive views” who had a positive attitude towards the USSR);
- reviews of Western films (positive in relation to most of the Soviet film distribution repertoire and often negative in relation to those movies that were considered ideologically harmful);
- articles about international film festivals and weeks of foreign cinema in the USSR and reviews of the current repertoire of Western national cinematographies (here, as a rule, criticism of bourgeois cinema was also combined with a positive assessment of works and trends ideologically acceptable to the USSR);
- short informational materials about events in Western cinema (from neutral reports to "yellow" gossip).

Western Cinema on the Pages of the *Soviet Screen* Magazine: 1986-1991

In this chapter, we will focus on the analysis of materials about foreign cinema published in the *Soviet Screen* magazine from 1986 to 1991, when its editors-in-chiefs were: D. Orlov (1935-2021), Y. Rybakov (1931-2006), V. Demin (1937-1993).

In [Table 9](#) presents statistical data reflecting changes (from 1986 to 1991) organizations, the organ of which the journal was, its circulation, periodicity. The names of the editors of the journal and the time intervals of their leading work in the publication are indicated.

Table 9. *Soviet Screen* magazine (1986-1991): statistical data

Year of issue of the magazine	Organizations whose authority was a magazine	Magazine circulation (in million copies)	Periodicity of the journal (numbers in year)	Editor of the magazine
1986	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.7	24	D.K. Orlov Nos. 1-23 Y.S. Rybakov No. 24
1987	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.7	24	Y.S. Rybakov
1988	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.7	24	Y.S. Rybakov
1989	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	0.9 - 1.0	18	Y.S. Rybakov
1990	USSR State Committee for Cinematography, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR	1.0	18	Y.S. Rybakov Nos. 1-3 Editorial board (Nos. 4-8) V.P. Demin (Nos. 9-18)
1991	Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Goskino of the USSR (Nos. 1-17) Publishing house "Pravda" and the editorial staff of the magazine <i>Screen</i> * (No. 18)	0.4 - 0.7	18	V.P. Demin

* Under the name *Screen* the magazine was published only in 1991.

The authors of texts about Western cinema in the *Soviet Screen* in most cases were well-known film experts, film critics, some of whom held leading positions in the editorial offices of magazines and newspapers of that period:

Table 10. The main authors of the publications of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1986-1991) on the subject of Western cinema

No.	Surnames of film critics who most often published articles on Western cinema in the <i>Soviet Screen</i> magazine	The number of articles published by these film experts in the <i>Soviet Screen</i> magazine on the subject of Western cinema
1	Kudryavtsev S.V.	16
2	Braginsky A.V. (1920-2016)	10
3	Plakhov A.S.	10
4	Tirdatova E.I.	10
5	Dmitriev V.Y. (1940-2013)	9

6	Sulkin O.M.	8
7	Andreev F.I. (1933-1998)	7
8	Lavrentiev S.A.	7
9	Osipov A.A. (? - 1991)	7
10	Mikhalkovich V.I. (1937-2006)	6

1. S.V. Kudryavtsev (born 1956) is a film critic, director. Graduated from the Film Studies Department of VGIK (1978). Member of the Union of Cinematographers of Russia. He taught at VGIK (1994-1998), at the Higher Courses for Scriptwriters and Directors (2006-2013), at the Institute of Contemporary Art (2008-2010; 2015-2018). Published in the magazines: *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Video Digest*, *Cultural and Educational Work*, *Video-Ace*, in the newspaper *Kommersant-daily*, *Screen and Stage*, etc. Author of books and reference books: *500 films* (1991); *+500* (1994); *Latest 500* (1996); *Our cinema* (1998); *3500* (2008); *Nearly forty-four thousand* (2015-2017). In 2021, the premiere of his first feature "arthouse" film *...and there will be a daughter* took place. Laureate of the Guild of Film Critics of Russia.

2. A.V. Braginsky (1920-2016): film critic and historian, translator. Graduated from the Moscow Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages (1941). Was a member of the Soviet Communist Party, Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Author of many articles and books on French cinema. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, etc. Author of books: *Le Chanois* (1972); *Christian-Jacques* (1981); *Jean-Paul Belmondo. In cinema and in life* (1997); *Gerard Depardieu. Stolen letters* (1998); *Alain Delon. In love and life* (1999); *Catherine Deneuve* (2000), etc. Laureate of the Guild of Film Critics of Russia in the category "Literature about cinema" (for a series of books about French film masters) (1999).

3. A.S. Plakhov (born 1950): film critic and historian. Ph.D. (1982). Graduated from the Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics of the Lviv University (1972) and the Film Studies Faculty of VGIK (1978). Member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Honored Worker of Culture of the Russian Federation (2014). He was a member of the Soviet Communist Party (since 1980), President of FIPRESCI (2005-2010). Worked in the department of culture of the newspaper *Pravda* (1977-1988), taught at VGIK. Browser in newspaper *Kommersant*. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Seance*, *Sight & Sound*, etc. Author of books: *Struggle of ideas in modern Western cinema* (1984); *Western screen: the destruction of personality* (1985); *Catherine Deneuve* (three editions: 1989; 2005; 2008); *33 in total. Stars of world film directing* (1999); *33 in total. Close-up of the stars* (2004); *Aki Kaurismaki. The last romantic* (2006); *Directors of the present* (2008); *Directors of the future* (2009); *Cinema on the brink of a nervous breakdown* (2014); *Ozone* (2018); *Cinema beyond* (2019); *Visconti. History and myth. Beauty and death* (2022), etc. Laureate of the Guild of Film Critics of Russia, Honorary Diploma of the President of Russia (2014), Nika Prize "For Contribution to Cinematographic Sciences, Criticism and Education" (2017),

4. E.I. Tirdatova (born 1951): film critic, director, screenwriter and producer. Graduated State Musical and Pedagogical Institute (1972) and Film Studies Department of VGIK (1985). Member of the Union of Cinematographers of Russia, Vice-President of the Russian Guild of Film Critics. He teaches at VGIK, at the Higher Courses for Scriptwriters and Directors and other Moscow universities. Published in the magazines: *Soviet Screen*, *Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Opinions*, etc., in newspapers: *Screen and Stage*, *Culture*, *Interlocutor*, *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, *Russian Courier*, *Izvestia*, *Moskovsky Komsomolets*, *Evening Moscow*, *Rossiyskaya gazeta*, *Parliamentskaya gazeta*, *SK-news*, etc. In 1990 she wrote (together with P. Chernyaev) the script for the documentary film *Your "leaving object" Leonid Obolensky*. In the 21st century, she began to master the profession of a producer and director of documentaries and feature films. Author of the books: *Henry Fonda* (1989), *Spotted movie* (2020), etc. Laureate of the Russian Guild of Film Critics.

5. V.Y. Dmitriev (1940-2013): film critic, archivist. Graduated film studies department of VGIK (1962). Honored Worker of Culture of the Russian Federation (1998). He was a member of the Soviet Communist Party (since 1974), the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. After graduating from VGIK, he worked at the State Film Fund (department of scientific processing of a foreign fund), since 1996 he was deputy Director General of the State Film Fund of Russia. Created and became the artistic director of the festival of archival films "White Pillars". Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Film Studies Notes*, *Séance*, etc., in the newspapers: *Independant Paper*, *Culture*, etc. Author of books (together

with V. Mikhalkovich): *Alexander Ford* (1968, the monograph was not published due to A. Ford's emigration to the West); *Anatomy of a myth: Brigitte Bardot* (1975). He starred in the films *Mournful insensibility* (1983) and *Down with commerce on the love front* (1988). Co-author of scripts for documentaries *Promised Land. Return* (2000), *Flowers of the Occupation Times* (2003), *Big Holidays of the 30s, Forties* (2004) and others. Laureate of the State Prize of the Russian Federation in the field of literature and art (2007) and the Nika Prize "For contributions to the motion picture sciences, criticism and education" (2013).

6. O.M. Sulkin: film critic, journalist. Graduated from Moscow State University. Member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. Worked as head department of foreign cinema in the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1981-1987), editor-in-chief of the magazine *Soviet Film*. Co-author of the project of the film encyclopedia *Video Guide*. Since 1995 he has been living and working in the USA. He lectured at the UN, at a number of US universities. He was a film reviewer and reporter for the *New Russian Word* newspaper, and is currently a correspondent for the *Voice of America* Russian Service. Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Itogi*, *New World*, etc., in the newspapers: *Vedomosti*, *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*, *Evening New York*, etc. Author of books: *Natalia Andreichenko* (1984); *Yuri Ozerov* (co-authored with N. Sumenov) (1986); *Oleg Yankovsky* (1987).

7. F.I. Andreev (1933-1998): film critic, journalist. He was a member of the Soviet Communist Party and the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR. Worked as a deputy editor-in-chief of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1980-1990). From 1990 to 1998 he lived and worked in the USA, where, in particular, he was Executive Director of the Brighton Beach Borough Management Association (New York). Published in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Crocodile*, in the newspapers *Soviet Culture*, *Soviet Cinema*, etc. Author of books: *Ivan Pereverzev* (1982); *Oleg Tabakov* (1983).

8. S.A. Lavrentiev (born 1954): film critic, film critic Studied at Acting Department of the Sverdlovsk Theater School. Graduated from the Film Studies Department of VGIK (1982). He served in the Nizhny Tagil Drama Theater (1975-1977), worked as a researcher at the *Illusion* cinema of the USSR State Film Fund, researcher at Institute of Cinema History, editor-consultant of the *Ostankino* TV channel, editor-consultant of the film screening service of the TV-6 channel, director of film programs at a number of film festivals. He taught at the Moscow University "Synergy", the Moscow Institute of Television and Radio Broadcasting "Ostankino". He acted in the films: *Prishvin's Paper Eyes* (1989), *Concert for a Rat* (1995), *Specialist* (2009), *The Firebird* (2021). Published in the magazines: *Cinema Art*, *Soviet Screen*, *Seance*, in the newspapers: *Screen and Scene*, *Literary Newspaper*, *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, *Moskovsky Komsomolets* and others. Author of books: *Igor Maslennikov: Creative portrait* (1988); *Clint Eastwood. Furious and beautiful* (2001); *Red Western* (2009); *Mosfilm directors* (2021).

9. A.A. Osipov (? - 1991): film critic. Published in the magazine *Soviet Screen / Screen*. Author of the book: *Actors of French Cinema* (1991). He died in 1991.

10. V.I. Mikhalkovich (1937-2006): film critic and historian. Graduated from the Belarusian State University (1959) and film history department of VGIK (1968). Ph.D. (1997), professor. He was a member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and Russia. He worked as a researcher at the State Film Fund (1963-1966), in office of foreign cinema at VGIK (1966-1968), editor of the foreign department in the journal *Cinema Art* (1968-1970), researcher at the Institute of Art History (1970-1974), researcher at the Research Institute of History and Theory of Cinema (1974-1977), researcher at the State Institute of Art Studies (1977-2006), professor at VGIK (1986-2006) and at the State University of Management (2000-2006). Published in scientific collections, in the magazines *Soviet Screen*, *Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Film Studies Notes*, *Literary Review*, etc. Author of books: *Alexander Ford* (1968, together with V. Dmitriev, the book was not published due to A. Ford's emigration to the West); *Anatomy of a myth: Brigitte Bardot* (1975) (together with V. Dmitriev); *Meetings with the X muse* (1981) (together with V. Demin, I. Weisfeld and R. Sobolev); *Barbara Brylska* (1984); *Figurative language of mass media* (1986); *Poetics of photography* (1989) (together with V. Stigneevev); *Selected Russian cinemas* (2006). Laureate of the Guild of Film Critics of Russia.

Articles of the *Soviet Screen* magazine in the first four months of 1986 practically did not differ in subject matter and manner of presentation of the material from publications of 1983-

1985. And this is not surprising, since the active “perestroika” processes in Soviet cinema began in May 1986, when the memorable V Congress of Soviet Filmmakers took place (May 13-15, 1986), many key figures were not elected as delegates. At this congress and the subsequent meeting of the new secretariat of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR (it took place on May 29, 1986), the contents of the *Soviet Screen* magazine and its active editor-in-chief D.K. Orlov (1935-2021) has been heavily criticized.

Realizing that a chair staggered under him, D.K. Orlov made an attempt to keep his position, emphasizing in the editorial of issue 18, handed over to the set on August 1, 1986, that the editors "with special attention are studying critical remarks against our publication", since nand the V All-Union Congress of Cinematographers loudly, honestly and uncompromisingly spoke about the need for fundamental changes and in film production, and in the film distribution system, and in the work of the creative union itself.

This led to the conclusion that one of the most important, paramount conditions for solving pressing problems, overcoming the crisis situation is to increase the level of criticism, designed, first of all, to restore the criteria for assessing the ideological content, artistry, and aesthetic value of film works that have been blurred in recent years. The ability to call a spade a spade, to tell the authors of a failed picture, despite the faces, albeit bitter, but the truth, the desire to support true talent on its difficult path to the audience – this is what filmmakers and all our readers expect from a film magazine today ... What should the Soviet screen be like?

Both the editorial team and our numerous authors – film critics, critics, filmmakers of various professions – are now living with thoughts about this. Maybe, readers have already noticed certain changes in the content and design of the latest issues of the magazine. But, of course, its restructuring cannot be limited to what has already been done.

Too significant are the claims against the magazine, expressed both from the rostrum of the congress of cinematographers, and from the secretariat of our creative Union, and in the press. Undoubtedly, in determining its current activities, the editors will not pass by a single critical remark, each of which is prompted by a high interest in ensuring that the *Soviet Screen* as a mass, critical and journalistic illustrated publication meets the most important tasks of today (K..., 1986: 3).

D. Orlov always followed the rules of the game and, responding to criticism of the magazine, thathe "carried out the line of Goskino", rightly pointed out that “what other line, in fact, should he have pursued, being his official organ?” (Orlov, 2011).

And, indeed, after the 5th Congress of Cinematographers of the USSR, D. Orlov began to significantly change the content of the *Soviet Screen* magazine, proving from issue to issue that he was able to "rebuild" and effectively follow the course of state and cinematic changes. Let us suggest that if, at the end of 1986, D. Orlov would not have been replaced in the chair of the editor-in-chief Y. Rybakov (1931-2006), the *Soviet Screen* magazine would be no less critically "sharp" and "perestroika"...

At the end of 1986, the theater scholar Y. Rybakov took over as editor-in-chief of *Soviet Screen*. Despite the general decline in film attendance in the USSR, the circulation of the magazine in 1987-1988 remained at the level of 1986: 1.7 million copies. At the same time, Y. Rybakov initially left the editorial board of the *Soviet Screen* in the same composition (and the deputy editor was, as under D. Orlov, film critic F. Andreev), significant changes occurred in it only at the beginning of 1988, when famous film critic and film critic V. Demin (1937-1993).

The way Y. Rybakov saw the *Soviet Screen* can be judged from the editorial article, published in early 1987: “Changed in the life of the country, in our life. The fresh wind of perestroika, glasnost, and the struggle for the moral health of society seemed to have moved like an avalanche the stale layers of habits acquired in the recent past towards inertia of thought and action. Change. The delegates of the 5th Congress of Cinematographers of the USSR, which took place in May last year, also visibly felt them. A frank business conversation, which was heard from the rostrum of this representative forum of screen masters, allowed in a free creative discussion to identify, identify "pain points" and "bottlenecks" in film production and distribution. It became clear that without new approaches to urgent problems, without a collective thought based not on good-hearted wishes, but on a deep and honest analysis of the existing situation, it is impossible to reach a qualitatively new round of creativity. Today, cinema is going through a difficult, but very interesting and fruitful time of renewal. Not everything is working out the way we would like. There are still gray films made by an indifferent hand (and,

alas, there are quite a few of them), still quite unresolved, and sometimes even unresolved issues in film distribution, still coming out on the screens, sometimes criticism still rolls along the familiar, well-trodden rut. ... Perestroika is a big and complex job, not designed for one day. And the new year 1987 coming into its own, the year when the entire progressive world will celebrate the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, now takes on his shoulders all our unfinished business. To continue what has been started so actively, not to calm down, not to turn halfway - this is today the main task, the duty of the cinematographer to the time" (Na..., 1987: 2).

As can be seen from these theses, the new program of Y. Rybakov was not much different from what D. Orlov on the pages of the magazine in the summer of 1986. *Soviet Screen* was ready to follow the current party guidelines and decisions of the new leadership of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR, with all the necessary references and citations. Moreover, the November issue of the magazine for 1987 traditionally placed on the first cover an anniversary inscription, in this case "70 years of the Great October Revolution", and then came the corresponding quite ideologically consistent materials written by representatives of the older generation of film critics and film critics.

At the same time, it was under Y. Rybakov, several "youth" issues of the *Soviet Screen* were published, where articles by young film critics were published, many of which were sharply out of step – both in style and in material – from the usual rut of this still mass magazine.

However, the continuing decline in film attendance and, on the contrary, the growing distribution of video did their job: in 1989, the circulation of the magazine reached one million copies. In addition, instead of 24 issues per year, only 18 issues began to appear (though with an increase in the volume of each issue from 24 to 32 pages).

In 1989, the *Soviet Screen* also reacted to the invasion of video, a heading *Videocompass* appeared on its pages, which was initially led by film critic S. Kudryavtsev (then he was replaced by film critic A. Vyatkin).

Here we agree with N. Shishkin: "Affecting ideological and legal aspects of the video boom, a publication represented by video enthusiasts ... defended the freedom to choose spectacles without ideological interference, took the side of an ordinary video amateur who, by accident, could end up in the dock even because of watching a Western video film at home. When the deepening process of liberalization led to the removal of this problem from the agenda, its place was taken by the issue of video piracy, in the approaches to which the editorial staff showed a certain loyalty" (Shishkin, 2020: 930).

Meanwhile, the "perestroika" tendencies in the USSR were rapidly gaining momentum: on May 23, 1989, a decree was issued on the restoration of Soviet citizenship by director Y. Lyubimov. In August of the same year, the journal *Novy Mir* for the first time in the USSR began publishing A. Solzhenitsyn's book *The Gulag Archipelago*; On November 9, 1989, the destruction of the Berlin Wall began, and on January 30, 1990, the USSR agreed to the unification of Germany. On November 18, 1989, the Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On the restructuring of creative, organizational and economic activities in Soviet cinematography" was issued, which practically approved the previously given permission to create cooperatives, including cooperatives for the production and distribution of films. And most importantly, in 1989 there was a change of power in many countries of Eastern Europe.

All this led to the fact that the editorial course of Y. Rybakov began to be perceived by the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR as not corresponding to the dynamics of the "perestroika" events, and in the spring of 1990, one of the then secretaries of the Union of Cinematographers, film critic and film critic V. Demin (1937-1993).

Despite all the changes, the circulation of the *Soviet Screen* in 1990 still amounted to a million copies. But the general trends of the economic crisis, reinforced by a sharp drop in attendance and cinema halls and the flourishing of pirated video, led to very negative trends for the existence of the magazine, about which V. Demin wrote in his article in September 1990: "We are clipped wings, increasing the price per issue two and a half times. The rise in price of paper is accompanied by rise in price of printing services. *Soyuzpechat* is going to charge twice as much for distribution. Let's add a rather harsh tax law. This means that our income, which has been greatly reduced, which, however, does not go to either the staff of the journal or its authors, will still be cut off by the tax rate.

Today we have a million subscribers. How many will there be on January 1, 1991? Half?

Quarter? What part can be compensated by the lost retail? One tenth? The equation is obtained with a very large number of unknowns, to which new ones will be added, also not yet known. More than fifty private and cooperative journals have already been registered in Moscow. ... Someone was able to contact a foreign printing base, much newer than ours. What response will be born in the soul of the reader when these and other publications lie next to the *Screen*? How will our polygraphy and paper sound in the conditions of this competitive struggle? And what about our content? ... Forecasts, even the most desperate ones, are worth absolutely nothing – we have nothing to compare our tomorrow with, we have not yet lived in the conditions of the book and magazine market” (Demin, 1990: 3).

The year 1991 showed that V. Demin's fears were largely justified: the circulation of the magazine (from the name of which the word "Soviet" was removed) fell sharply to 0.4-0.7 million copies, with a final trend of temporary stabilization at the level of 400 thousand copies.

In 1991, the editorial board changed in the journal: instead of F. Andreev, who emigrated to the USA, the position of deputy editor was taken by film critic T. Khloplyankina (1937-1993), the second deputy editor was the journalist and film critic V. Kichin, the journalist B. Pinsky became the responsible secretary.

The materials of the magazine became more “free”, politicized, calling for further “democratic changes” in society, which could not but cause sharp resistance from the conservative part of the Ekran audience, who perceived these changes extremely negatively.

The third and sixth issues of *Screen* in 1991 featured characteristic letters from this category of readers:

“I subscribed to your magazine for 15 years. It's a pity to leave, but such a magazine as Demin made it together with like-minded people is not interesting to me. Now the magazine publishes only that material that coincides with the views of Demin, where everyone is trying to kick the party, one way or another. Who is angry, and who is with a cheerful gleam in his eyes. Because of this, the journal lost a lot of what it had, after all, even the usual objectivity. So we get a sad picture: you no longer go to the cinema, because they have recently overfed us with negativity, and now you have to give up the magazine as well” (V. Balandina).

“Mr. Demin, V.P. Since 1957, I regularly received the *Soviet Screen* by subscription and kept all the issues, but this year I canceled the subscription. Cause? Rejection of the political coloring of the magazine, its aesthetic norms. Your unbridled cosmopolitanism could still be tolerated to some extent, but Russophobia, skillfully camouflaged and presented in every issue, is not worth enduring. ... I wish you to lose all your subscribers and burn out, but for you personally, as they used to say in the old days, neither the bottom nor the tire” (V.K.).

“For twenty-two years I have regularly read your magazine, but I am ashamed of the new *Soviet Screen*, and I did not subscribe to it for the 91st year. I will take it in my hands only when the “naked” ones disappear from it. ... I'm tired of tearing pages out of a magazine, I have two sons, and I'm ashamed that they see these vulgarities. Why does the state need depravity? We need money, and behind this money they forgot about morality. Goodbye. I'm crying!”.

“I have always subscribed to your magazine, but this year I will not. Money sorry? No no. That's not why at all. Your magazine prints more filth than any other magazine prints. I am a man, not a bore and not a hypocrite, but not a dirty trick either. I will see a naked woman anyway if I need to. It is not necessary for me to look at this “beauty” in a magazine. And then on the inserts of some whores you print, on the covers – what the men are ashamed of...” (Musein).

V. Demin was not too lazy to answer these letters, emphasizing that the magazine does not and did not have any Russophobia, that “we regularly publish two, three opinions about the film”, and “who wrote where how many millimeters of a female naked shoulder can be shown, from which millimeter to start the ban?” that “the very principle of publicity already presupposes a dispute with a point of view, even the most authoritative one, if it is incorrect. ... truth for the sake of truth” (Demin, 1991: 22, 4).

But it can be assumed with a high degree of probability that the majority of readers who unsubscribed from *Screen* magazine in 1991 were not affected in any way by such answers. In 1992-1998, the circulation of the magazine continued to fall sharply, which eventually (already with a circulation of 40 thousand copies) led to its disappearance ...

- *ideologized articles emphasizing criticism of bourgeois cinema and its harmful influence on the audience*

Despite the fact that at the end of 1986 there was a change of editor-in-chief at the *Soviet*

Screen, and the growth of “perestroika” tendencies regarding Soviet cinema continued, in the approaches to exposing the “harmful influence of bourgeois cinema”, the *Soviet Screen* of 1986-1987 largely retained the traditions of previous decades.

For example, film critic O. Sulkin, in his article “Aggression of Pseudo-Culture”, who reviewed A. Kukarkin’s book “Bourgeois Mass Culture” (Kukarkin, 1985), wrote that “by sharpening the argumentation, convincingly revealing the reactionary essence of the pseudo-aesthetic manifestations of the ideology of imperialism, we will be able not only to more successfully resist the attacks of enemy propaganda, but also to seize the initiative, at the same time to strengthen the atmosphere of ideological and moral exactingness among the workers of our socialist culture. ... The ideological struggle does not forgive carelessness, underestimation of the harmfulness of models of bourgeois consumer goods. A. Kukarkin's book ... convincingly shows the destructive impact of Western pseudo-culture on the human psyche and mind” (Sulkin, 1986: 22).

In a similar vein, international journalist M. Ozerov (1944-2022) wrote on the pages of the magazine, emphasizing that in American “mass culture” is reviving with renewed vigor such a phenomenon as anti-Sovietism. It is precisely among the anti-Soviet films, moreover, of the most rude kind and, moreover, “tuned” to violence, that Stallone’s films, the action films *Red Dawn* (USA, 1984), *Firefox* (USA, 1982) and a huge number of other frank fakes (Ozerov, 1986: 20-21).

In an article by another well-known international journalist, M. Sturua (1928-2021), the attention of the readers of the *Soviet Screen* was drawn to the connection between the Pentagon and Hollywood: Wall Street finances militaristic movies. The Pentagon acts as their “idea producer”. Such, for example, is the film *Patriot* (USA, 1986), the main character of which is Superman from the sabotage squads of the US Navy. Incidentally, now Hollywood has become a genuine mouthpiece of state terrorism. This is evidenced by such films as *The Green Berets* (USA, 1968), *Top Gun* (USA, 1986), praising vulture pilots based on aircraft carriers, *American Anthem* (USA, 1986), the series of films *Rambo* and some others. The anti-Sovietism of movies labeled “Made in the Pentagon and Hollywood” literally cries out to the heavens. ... The military doctrine of the United States proceeds from the principle of the admissibility of nuclear war, survivability and victory in it. That is why the Pentagon is acquiring first-strike weapons, that is why it is implementing the Star Wars program – plans for the militarization of space. Yes, the destruction will be great, say the strategists of the Pentagon, but in the end, America will survive and erect the building of “Pax Americana” – “the American world” on the ruins of civilization. In full accordance with this extremely dangerous doctrine, Hollywood is churning out films like *Mad Max* (1979), whose heroes are supermen, in the end, America will survive and on the ruins of civilization will erect the building of “Pax Americana” – “the American world.” In full agreement with this extremely dangerous doctrine, Hollywood has made films like *Mad Max*, in which the heroes are supermen who recreate the “New Jerusalem” from nuclear ruins based on a cult of strength. Similar ideas underlie the film *Terminator* (USA, 1984). The only difference is that the main character in *Mad Max* is a policeman, while the main character in *Terminator* is a robot (Sturua, 1987: 2-3).

Further, M. Sturua reasonably noted that the process of quite a definite politicization of American cinema and, if I may say so, the “cinematographization” of American politics, it was no coincidence that it crossed itself with Reagan, his presidency. The point, I repeat, is by no means that Reagan was a film actor in the past. The fact is that with his coming to the White House to power in the United States, the most militaristic, anti-communist circles, having imperial ambitions, but calling us the “evil empire”, seized control. The crusade they declared against socialism and progress began to dominate the ideology and culture of America, distorting and distorting them. Therefore, the camera turns into a weapon. And not only in a figurative sense. ... In the film *Born American* (1986), overseas thugs sow death and destruction in the Soviet Union. In the painting *Amerika* (1987) will show the “Soviet” occupation of the United States. How far all this is from the ideas of friendship among peoples, from the principles of peaceful coexistence! (Sturua, 1987: 2-3, 11).

In the same 1987, journalists Y. Algunov and V. Orlov emphasized that the 70th anniversary of October is celebrated not only by us and our friends in the world. Those who do not like the Soviet way of life are also “celebrated”. They “celebrate”, of course, in a peculiar way: first of all, strengthening, hardening, forcing anti-Soviet propaganda. All lines. Through all

channels. And not least with the help of cinema and television, the audience of which is tens and hundreds of millions of people. ... An unbiased display of both our history and socialist reality has been and remains the strictest taboo for the American film industry. But slander and lies have become more sophisticated. Fortunately, there were some of the "former" who were eager to share "knowledge" (Algunov, Orlov, 1987: 20-22).

However, further, in the order of objectivity, they drew the attention of readers to the "sober, bitter realism of O. Stone's films" *Platoon* (USA, 1986) and *Salvador* (USA, 1986), characterizing them as philosophical movies about the moral consequences of aggression, however, stipulating that, unfortunately, such examples can be counted on the fingers (Algunov, Orlov, 1987: 20-22).

Since 1988, such articles with clearly expressed anti-American and anti-bourgeois accents no longer appeared on the pages of the "perestroika" *Soviet Screen*.

And the then worldview of Soviet film critics of the older generation can be judged from the article of one of the most consistent (in the 1950s-1970s) conductors of the Marxist-Leninist teaching in film studies S. Freilich (1920-2005): "There is a great confusion in our society now. We are used to living in slavery. With a one-party system, it was easier, you knew in the evening what would happen in the morning, they would give you instructions, they would tell you where to go, what to do. And now we do not know how the Communist Party Congress will end. The paradox is that our cinema now lives off a stagnant period. During the period of stagnation, paintings were banned, many of which have now won international prizes. When you think about it, the usual notion of the "torment of creativity" is filled with historical content" (Freilikh, 1990: 12-13).

As a result, by the end of the 1980s "bourgeois cinematography, which for a long time was a "vague object" of ideological denunciation for Soviet viewers and critics, has ceased to be such. The editors of [*Soviet Screen*] were faced with the task of eliminating the audience's illiteracy with regard to previously banned film production and overcoming their own inferiority complex, which has political, social and professional roots. ... [But] the rehabilitation of bourgeois cinema initiated by socio-political transformations did not cause a noticeable increase in the number of publications about it, only the tone changed" (Shishkin, 2020: 700, 702).

- articles on the history of Western cinema

With regard to the history of Western cinematography, the *Soviet Screen* magazine did not change its traditions even during the period of "perestroika" and still spoke warmly about the work of Chaplin. True, now the authors openly expressed regret that many important films of this great cinematographer were not bought for the Soviet film distribution, or bought too late.

For example, director E. Ryazanov (1927-2015) wrote as follows: "Charlie Chaplin for me and, I think, for the vast majority of the world's population, of course, is a genius and precisely a genius for good. ... Another thing is curious: before the war, our country bought films of the world comedian. ... But *The Great Dictator* (1940) was not bought. He was not shown to the people, who at that time were waging a desperate battle not for life, but for death with the fascist hordes. But the picture of Chaplin would have helped the fighters, she debunked the enemy, destroyed him with laughter, struck, as they say, on the spot. Who banned Chaplin's anti-fascist movie? Was it Stalin himself, who saw that some analogies could be associated with him? Or one of the devoted lackeys? Don't know. ... True, our country did not buy films of the brilliant master further. We got acquainted with the films *Monsieur Verdoux* (1947), *A King in New York* (1957), *A Countess From Hong Kong* (1967), *Limelight* (1952) belatedly ... We were explained that Chaplin's films are so expensive that for the price of one of his films, you can buy a dozen others. And these "others" were bought. The country was flooded with foreign cheap crafts in every sense, the brains of the audience were stuffed with commercial crap, and our people did not see the films that the whole world watched. In fact, Chaplin was stolen from the people. For films should be watched when they are made, and not decades later. Each film is a child of its time and acts in its context" (Ryazanov, 1989: 25-27).

E. Ryazanov was echoed by film critic A. Zorky (1935-2006): "I remember the beginning of the seventies, when we finally acquired and released on the screen several great Chaplin films. These were *The Gold Rush* (1925) and *The Circus* (1928) almost half a century late, *Limelight* (1952) and *A King in New York* (1957) with a delay of only 15-20 years... Then, in the early seventies, Chaplin's films suffered a crushing failure at our box office. Any *Queen of the gas station* could then easily knock out *A King in New York*. I will not talk about the mediocrity of

our film distribution, which ruined masterpieces in the bud – gray advertising, complete lack of control over the premiere situation of "old" films, absolute conviction in their "unwatchability" – what a professional word! – and immediate shoving off the screen into film storage. Many thousands of viewers simply did not have time to get to the cinemas, many, many thousands remained in the dark that Chaplin's films were in our bins, and to this day – I was convinced of this more than once! – they simply don't know that *Circus* and *Gold Rush*, *Lamplights* and *A King in New York* were bought by us and seemed to be on the screens. And again at meetings with the audience questions, notes: when will we finally see Chaplin? Rolling results were shameful and, as usual, unpublished. But they should have been published today for moral self-purification" (Zorky, 1989: 28-29).

Taking this opportunity, we will finally present here the statistics of the USSR Goskino, intended in the 1970s for purely official purposes: *A King in New York*: 12.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration; *Gold Rush*: 10.6 million viewers; *Circus*: 8 million viewers; *Lamplights*: 6.4 million viewers. And here A. Zorky is right: the attendance of the *Queen of the Gas Station* was much higher: 34.3 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration, and yet it was far from the highest grossing Soviet comedy film of the 1960s and 1970s.

In "perestroika" *Soviet Screen* / *Screen* also published positive articles about the work of B. Keaton (Chernenko, 1987: 20-21), I. Bergman (Utilov, 1991: 23); G. Garbo (Trauberg, 1990: 24-25), V. Leigh (Utilov, 1991: 25), R. Taylor (Kompanichenko, 1991: 12-13), M. Rökk (Mosina, 1991: 6), D. Durbin (Bosenko, 1991: 6-7), M. Lanza (Shishov, 1989: 27), G. Philipe (Bozhovich, 1991: 10-11), J. Gaben (Braginsky, 1991: 13).

At the same time, film critic V. Utilov (1937-2011) wrote that the best roles of Vivien Leigh have always been a cry of pain and a challenge to compromise, hypocrisy and indifference. This is the secret of Vivien Leigh: a great actress, a caring person, a lady with a broad and generous soul (Utilov, 1991: 25). And Ingrid Bergman was given something more than the ability to perfectly clearly and emotionally convey the feelings of a woman in love, experiencing unbearable psychological pressure, doubting and finally experiencing her discovery of a woman. With her heroines, Mystery returned to the screen: incapable, joyful, knowing no barriers of love-instinct, love-gift, love-rock. On top of that, this actress was perfectly cinematic (Utilov, 1991: 23).

Film expert V. Bozhovich (1932-2021), clearly exaggerating and obscuring the situation in the Soviet film distribution of the 1950s-1960s, composed an entire ode to the remarkable French actor Gerard Philip: our gloomy screen of the 1950s and 1960s of the dazzling Gerard Philip in the role of Fanfan-Tulip. This jubilant hero burst into the circle of inhibited characters, who, without ideological sanction and author's permission, seemed to be unable to take a step, burst into this jubilant hero, like a messenger from another world. He did not look back at anyone, was not afraid of anything, did not reflect: he was a man of action and obedience only to his own emotional impulse, a direct outburst of feeling. ... Movies like *Fanfan La Tulipe* (1952) and *Great maneuvers (Les Grandes manoeuvres)*, 1955) illuminated by the brilliance of the French tradition, the skill of their creators and the smile of Gerard Philip, and now, as if alive, stand before the eyes of our memory (Bozhovich, 1991: 10-11).

Other retro-portraits of actors of past years were painted with a haze of nostalgia:

For many, it pops up before their eyes: a huge white staircase from *The Girl of My Dreams*, a magnificent, billowing dress, a dazzling smile and ... gilded shoes with huge heels. From a musical phrase to another, from the top step to the bottom step, these heels jump, beating the beat of an ever-accelerating melody, until the actress is at the foot, face to face with the audience ... Music and dance almost from the cradle joined the life of Marika Rökk, so that, it seems, her biography also obeyed their stormy, impetuous rhythm, which knows no respite (Mosina, 1991: 6).

Music of amazing beauty and sadness. A graceful girl with a gentle soulful face. And an incredibly handsome young man in military uniform, circling his partner in a captivating waltz ... Such a sad and wonderful memory was *Waterloo Bridge* (1940) in the memory of those whose childhood and youth fell on the fifties. The waltz "Burning Candles" then sounded from the stage and on the dance floors. Photos of Vivien Leigh and Robert Taylor, even in the monstrous performance of local craftsmen, dispersed from the shelves and from under the floor ... Taylor brought to the cinema – in addition to male beauty rare even for Hollywood – his own theme: a man whose talent manifests itself in love, in relationships with women

(Komanichenko, 1991: 12-13).

We lived in poverty. Our girls are like a sigh of barracks melancholy. Plain black aprons and round collars... But Deanna Durbin. Vivien Leigh, Milica Korjus, Marika Rökk, Sony Henie, Francesca Gaal! *The Great Waltz* (1938) – we brought to life from the screens of the old Arbat (Zorky, 1991: 19).

An article by film critic V. Mikhalkovich (1937-2006) about the key actor of the "Tarzaniada" J. Weissmuller (1904-1984) was more academic, although also not devoid of personal memories: "I came across an article in a foreign magazine about the last years of Johnny Weissmuller's life. He settled in Acapulco, the reporter wrote, exists on welfare, is practically a beggar. From a photograph on a magazine page, a haggard old face with protruding cheekbones, sunken cheeks, with an extinct look looked out. Sadly thought: and idols are not eternal. He really was an idol - Johnny Weissmuller, Tarzan, the hero of the childhood of people like me – fifty years old ... The canonical motives of the epic in the films with Weissmuller turned out to be emphasized, pointed, bulging. Here it became especially clear that with the help of Tarzan, nature is protected from people in general, from people as such. Tarzan fights not only with selfish and greedy Europeans, he is also at enmity with the local African population, thus placing himself outside the framework of the human community and finding himself "on the side" of nature. At the same time, this outcast cannot exist without an institution, which, it is true, is characteristic not only of man, but of almost all vertebrates, namely, without a family. From series to series, Tarzan acquired life partners. First, Jane appeared, rescued almost from the cauldron of savages, then a baby who miraculously survived a plane crash and was picked up by the "king of the jungle". Tarzan, Jane and the Kid, having gathered together, formed, as it were, the holy family of the jungle" (Mikhalkovich, 1988: 17-18).

On the pages of the *Soviet Screen* appeared, of course, and articles about filmmakers, whose work, although gone down in history, was not yet distant from the moment of publication for decades.

So film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) published a review of the book "Luchino Visconti. Articles. Evidence. Statements" (1986), where he evaluated the work of this outstanding director respectfully, but ambiguously (Dmitriev, 1987: 21).

And the film critic K. Razlogov (1946-2021) wrote about a much more controversial figure in Italian cinema art as follows: "Introducing the audience to the paintings of the Pasolini retrospective held in Moscow and in a number of other cities ... I, with a sense of awkwardness, had to begin my speech with a blatant banality: "Who would have thought until very recently that this is possible...". Of course, I immediately apologized to the audience for this common cliché, and yet - *The Flower of a Thousand and One Nights* (*Il Fiore delle mille e una notte*, 1974) just a few years ago even filmmakers had no right to watch. And now it is watched by "just" viewers who have bought a ticket for a particular session. Of course, the screening of Pier Paolo Pasolini's films in our country, although not as wide as we would like, is a sensation. One of the most complex and controversial figures in the culture of this century, the poet, writer, cinematographer, publicist, scientist, Pasolini combined such a number of talents and used them so recklessly that not only in our country, but also in his homeland, he often caused a shock reaction. Christianity and demonstrative homosexuality, Freudianism and Marxism in their own way focused the extremes of his nature, refracting in all those areas where he had a chance to create" (Razlogov, 1989: 26-27).

And absolutely unusual for Soviet film critics was an article by E. Tirdatova, who in 1988 dared to write a long positive article about director Alfred Hitchcock (1899-1980), who was categorically condemned in the USSR: "Hitchcock – this name sounded to us, "stagnant", fascinating. Hitchcock was frightened like a terrible beech: he put supposedly pathological "horror films". This incarnation of all the abominations of capitalist society was not allowed into our closed, closed from alien influences, pure and immaculate world. ... Yet before I say what Hitchcock did, I'll tell you what he didn't do. He did not deal with ghouls, ghouls, monsters, zombies and other evil spirits. So all sorts of Frankensteins, Draculas, Nosferatu, as well as King Kong are not his part. And Boris Karloff, like Bela Lugosi, he never shot, but shot more and more beautiful superstars: Ingrid Bergman, Grace Kelly, Cary Grant, James Stewart, Gregory Peck, Henry Fonda. ...

To dot all the "i": a detective in its purest form – as an intellectual investigation – he was also of little interest. So what is Hitchcock? Hitchcock is the ultimate master of suspense. With

the exception of a few works, all of his paintings are made in the thriller genre. Their indispensable affiliation is a riddle, a mystery, a crime. Ironic suspension is a must. Hitchcock is a master of subtle psychological analysis. Hitchcock is style. Hitchcock is taste. Hitchcock is quality. "Light" camera and clear simplicity – this is also Hitchcock. Hitchcock is anti-literary, he is cinematic. ... The main thing for him – using all the specifics of cinema – editing, rhythm, angles, sound effects – is to create an atmosphere of tension. ... In my opinion, he has achieved the very balance that everyone who works in cinema dreams of deep down – the balance between spectacle and Art, commerce and Creativity” (Tirdatova, 1988: 12-14).

The last issue of *Screen* in 1991 was almost entirely devoted to the history of the film distribution of "trophy" Western cinema in the USSR.

A fragment from the memoirs of the film critic I. Manevich (1907-1976) was published there, in which he described how, in fact, the fund of the so-called “trophy films” was formed: “The Minister of Cinematography asked if I would like to urgently fly to Berlin. Naturally, I agreed. ... Bolshakov explained that my task was to find and urgently send a batch of color German films to Moscow. ... [Back] with me to Moscow flew the famous *Girl of my dreams* (*Die Frau meiner Träume*, 1944) starring Marika Röckk. I returned to my editorial cell on the fourth floor and now met films from the Reichsfilmarchive only in the cinema, where for many years they helped Glavkinoprokat to exceed the plan and receive awards” (Manevich, 1991: 4-5).

And the editor-in-chief of *Screen*, V. Demin (1937-1993), recalling his childhood, wrote that when the mysterious “New Film Program” appeared in cinemas in the late 1940s and early 1950s, everyone knew that this was another the so-called "trophy" film. Precisely what “so-called”, because, having defeated Germany, to take American, English and French films as a trophy – only we Russians can do this. ... Of course, the inevitable selection was carried out here too. Not a single Hitchcock film was given to us. Why scare compatriots? ... But the *Stagecoach* (1939) was brought – under the title *The journey will be dangerous...* As for Robert Riskin and Frank Capra with their socialist realism based on the Roosevelt program, they were presented almost completely... Excuse the expression, not a single striptease was presented to us at that time. But there were, there were extremely daring ladies' dresses, on stage or even in everyday life, and a millionaire recovering. And most importantly, in these films, to our amazement, there was a body, feminine, attracting, bewitching, lusting, or masculine, keeping a physical memory from work or a fight, with its own voice that does not coincide with the voice of pure reason. ... The trophy film was an anti-culture sally. Did Stalin understand this, did Zhdanov, Molotov, or anyone else understand it, but they introduced us to the feeling of a free person, not a cog in the state, not a person who is interesting because she is destined for something, but simply a person who exists in real life. space of life, without our censorship cuts (Demin, 1991: 2-3).

Recalling the release of the famous *Sun Valley Serenade* (1941) in the USSR, playwright V. Slavkin (1935-2014) wrote: What did we absorb while watching these films? We absorbed the lifestyle. Where else was there to see how others live – not us? Of course, the plot, of course, the music, but above all, the style! Yes, and music, jazz was perceived by us as life, and not as art. It was impossible to love jazz and at the same time remain a Soviet hemp in a gray Cheviot suit, with a Komsomol badge in a buttonhole. So the jazz banners intuitively understood from which side the danger came. But that's it guys, it's done! "Sun Valley Serenade" watched. Stylish people picked up the Chucha, spread the score between the guitar and the phono, someone learned the words in English... (Slavkin, 1991: 26).

Film critic Y. Bogomolov (1937-2023) was most analytical about this retro theme of the magazine, quite reasonably arguing that in the 1920s the revolution that had won in Russia and the victorious movie heroes from Hollywood” were united by “the uncertainty of the legal norms of the emerging statehood – as in conditional Wild West, and in the real circumstances of the revolutionary elements. Norms and laws matured and matured directly in the course of action and were identified with this or that character. Both the virtuous sheriff and the stern commissioner were equally sources of lawmaking, at the same time they contained the functions of a judicial search, coupled with repressive ones. In short, the Bolsheviks could probably in some ways and with some imagination enter into the position of Hollywood cowboys, who, in turn, were not alien to some of the slogans of professional fighters for the people's happiness.

Both did not get along on the issue of collectivization. Cowboys remained principled and irreconcilable individual farmers. In general, all Western movie heroes, even those who are socially close to us (like the tramp Charlie), turned out to be sworn individualists, in connection

with which the iron curtain was lowered. From that moment on, our paths diverged: they moved each on their own, relying only on themselves, and we are in formation, moving to the front step at the right moments... Therefore, in the distant twenties, American cinema was not useful to us.

The next fleeting meeting with him was almost illegal. I mean the appearance on our screens in the first post-war years of trophy pictures. Commercially, this operation turned out to be successful – films were rolled to the *darmovshchina*, which collected packed halls. But ideologically, it was an undermining and a puncture. Ragged Tarzan, a child of the jungle and the best friend of the monkey Chita, appeared as an apologist for the main bourgeois values - abstract humanity and devout individualism. But on us, the then Timurovites, he made an indelible impression. And Tarzan, and Robin Hood, and the avenger from El Dorado... acted at their own peril and risk, under personal responsibility.

...Then a date with a typical Hollywood cinematography turned out to be short-lived and therefore especially romantic. After all, it took place even before the first thaw. It was almost the only light in the window at the time of low pictures, when the moviegoer lived with visual impressions from *The Fall of Berlin* and *The Tale of the Siberian Land*. ... And, of course, our ideological overseers were right in their own way when they covered the light in the window and sent all the trophy movies to the special film fund. A person for whom the General Assembly is the Lord God did not have the right to associate with a person who relies mainly on himself (Bogomolov, 1991: 29).

- biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors

If in the 1950s – 1970s and the first half of the 1980s *Soviet Screen* tried to write mainly about "progressive" Western filmmakers, but during the "perestroika" period, the main reason for publishing creative portraits of foreign actors and directors was the appearance in the Soviet film distribution and the Moscow International Film Festival of films with their participation.

Thus, positive materials about famous Western actors appeared in the magazine: F. Ardant (Braginsky, 1987: 18); J. Birkin (Osipov, 1988: 24); L. Ventura (Braginsky, 1987: 18); M. Vitti (Babenko, 1986: 23); C. Deneuve (Amashukeli, 1990: 16-17; Rubanova, 1986: 20-21); G. Depardieu (Gérard..., 1988: 22, 24); M. Douglas (Nenasheva, 1990: 16; Pozdnyakov, 1989: 16-17); M. Jobert (Osipov, 1989: 26); A. Quinn (Tretyak, 1987: 21); J. Lang (Lavrentiev, 1989: 9-10); G. Masina (Bogemsky, 1986: 20-21); J. Marais (Mosina, 1991: 18); L. Minelli (Litvyakova, 1990: 15); O. Muti (Bogemsky, 1990: 16-18); J. Nicholson (Lavrentiev, 1989: 8, 10); P. Noiret (Braginsky, 1987: 18-19; Makarov, 1986: 20-21); M. Placido (Bogemsky, 1987: 20-21); M. Pfeiffer (Vladimirov, 1990: 16-17; Osipov, 1991: 18); V. Redgrave (Yartsev, 1987: 18); M. Streep (Drozdova, 1990: 20-21); J.-L. Trintignant (Plakhov, 1991: 28-29); O. Hepburn (Mikhalkovich, 1991: 14-15); A. Hopkins (Anatolyev, 1987: 15); O. Sharif (Maskina, 1991: 12); A. Schwarzenegger (Kokarev, 1988: 12-13); I. Huppert (Isabelle..., 1988: 22, 24); quartet "Charlot" (Bragin, 1986: 21).

Unlike past decades, the biographies of some actors included some details of their personal lives. For example, S. Lavrentiev mentioned Jessica Lange's affair with Mikhail Baryshnikov (Lavrentiev, 1989: 8, 10).

Analyzing the creative path of Audrey Hepburn (1929-1993), film critic V. Mikhalkovich (1937-2006) wrote that her acting fate is a kind of confirmation of the idea that reality is as much subject to common myths as the "dream factory", and maybe even stronger. For the actress was persistently offered roles that were directly related to a certain mythological character. Such perseverance makes one think that here life dictated its own laws. ... Subsequently, critics noticed a curious feature of Hepburn's screen heroines: young people, the same age as these girls, almost never fell in love with them. The heroines of Audrey were adored by men who were fit to be their fathers – such is Professor Higgins, who turned a shabby flower girl into a society lady in *My Fair Lady* (1964). ... Novels with peers are a natural thing. But when passions flare up in the hearts of men very different in age, then one would want to think about obsession, about charms, in which both nymphs and undines and mermaids are excellent masters (Mikhalkovich, 1991: 14-15).

Just as accurately approached the actor's image, this time Jean-Louis Trintignant (1930-2022), film critic A. Plakhov recalled that after waking up after Lelouch's film *A Man and a Woman* (*Un homme et une femme*, 1966), the famous, Trintignant still remained "a man in himself." The smile of a happy lover and a successful professional did not become either his face or mask. Five years later, domestic distribution again prepared a meeting with the actor for us –

and what a! Film *The Conformist*... The divided life of a neurasthenic, who feels at heart a stranger, an uninvited guest at the feast of life, is probably the main motive of Trintignant the actor! ... One way or another, in his images, an otherworldly existence beyond the bounds of madness and absurdity is more and more visible (Plakhov, 1991: 28-29).

Film critic S. Lavrentyev was equally convincing about Jack Nicholson's creative credo, rightly pointing out that both in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1975) and in *Professione: Reporter* (1975) an actor plays a person who cannot fit into the surrounding reality, whouncomfortable in it, looking for ways to change its position. Let's say more – various variations of this model of human existence appear before us in all of Nicholson's major films. ... However, the losing heroes of Nicholson, even in the loss, do not cease to be Americans. They don't think about giving up. They perfectly feel stronger, cleaner, better than the life that defeated them. Depending on the individual traits of character, his characters can move away from life, spitting on it, become embittered or enter into a real fight with it. ... He is not just a good actor, there are many. He is an actor who expressed the essence of the era. There are only a few of them (Lavrentiev, 1989: 8, 10).

Film expert G. Bogemsky (1920-1995) reminded the readers of the *Soviet Screen* that Giulietta Masina (1921-1994) was glorified by films created by Fellini's mighty talent, it was in them that she gave us unfading images, touching and humane, which became not only classics of cinema, but symbols of defenseless kindness, sincerity, humanity. We do not at all want to say that Masina owes everything to Fellini, here the matter is much more complicated: it was not for nothing that Fellini himself repeated more than once that he owed everything to Giulietta. The mechanism of mutual understanding, interdependence, complementarity of these two great artists, who understand each other without words on the set and guide each other, is very subtle: more than forty years of married life and joint work are worth something! (Bogemsky, 1986: 20-21).

And the film critic I. Rubanova (1933-2024) was convinced that the beauty of C. Deneuve has no marks of history. She is for all time, because she is close to what can be called the absolute of female attractiveness. This determined, on the one hand, the multi-genre nature of her work, on the other hand, the fact that a popular actress is not perceived as a representative and, as a result, an exponent of one generation. It happens infrequently (Rubanova, 1986: 20-21).

At the same time, film critic A. Osipov (? - 1991) was sure that compatriot Catherine Deneuve – actress Marlene Jaubert – took her place in French cinema. And not only thanks to talent, the ability to be concise and recognizable in every role, the ability to convey on the screen the most complex range of movements of the female soul. Marlene Jaubert captivates with her now rare poetry, the depth and unspent feelings with which her heroines live – at the same time fragile and persistent, strong and restless (Osipov, 1989: 26).

Another talented French actress, Isabelle Huppert, also received warm words on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*: The best works of the actress are distinguished by concise means of expression and at the same time great inner fullness. ... After the success of *The True Story of the Lady with Camellias* (*La Storia vera della signora delle camellie / La Dame aux camellias*, 1981), criticism increasingly began to compare Isabelle Huppert with the famous Greta Garbo, the romantic movie heroine of the 1930s, the best lady with camellias world cinema. They really do have a lot in common – lyrical charm, watercolor colors, subtle nuances of psychological nuances, a kind of melancholy reticence behind which the currents of an intense inner life pulsate (Isabel..., 1988: 22, 24).

The magazine also praised the roles of famous American actresses: Liza Minnelli and Meryl Streep:

In *Cabaret* (1972), Sally Bowles, played by Liza Minnelli, is defiantly free, talkative, flirtatious, cheerful and at the same time pathetic, defenseless, naive and lonely. The actress, capable of grading a wide variety of feelings, with her sparkling performance, a whole cascade of changing emotions, does not leave any spectator indifferent (Litvyakova, 1990: 15).

Youthful ideals, an independent mind, mentality as a value in itself, sensuality as a feature of a developed intellect formed the basis of the type that the actress brought to the American screen. By analogy with the definition of traditional female charm – “she is all made from the bottom”, one can say about Meryl Streep that she (and her eroticism as well) is “all made from the top” (Drozdova, 1990: 20-21).

A kind of aloof in this series of creative acting portraits looked like a large, filled with a positive revision of the biography of R. Reagan, who was recently cursed by the Soviet press, an article by film critic E. Tirdatova, written clearly on the opportunistic wave of the "perestroika" revival of Soviet-American interstate relations and negotiations between the heads of the USSR and the USA – by M. Gorbachev (1931-2022) and R. Reagan (1911-2004): "For about a quarter of a century, Reagan worked in Hollywood – and during this time he played more than 50 roles. He always treated cinematography and continues to treat it with great respect, considering it a very important part of the spiritual life of Americans. ... What is the reason for such popularity? ... Reagan immediately defined his role – "a typical American." He was, as they say, "a pleasant young man", easy, contact, flexible – and in the cinema, and in life. He was the most suitable for the embodiment on the screen of the ideal of the average American, corresponding in many respects to the idea of the president. What was included in this image? First of all, it had to be a person you can rely on. Reliable, strong and strong. Restrained and laconic, as befits a real man. Endowed with a sense of justice and duty, common sense and humor. Firmness of character and sincerity will not interfere with him either. Further: business, with a practical streak. Conservative in the good sense of the word – with stable habits, stable ideals. A patriot, a true friend and a good family man. And most importantly, simple, like everyone else. Therefore, the success that he achieves can be achieved by anyone. This is the type of positive hero (with variations and deviations, of course) that Reagan brought to the screen in most of his films.

The same actor's image then organically and naturally turned into a political image. ... In 1966, Ronald Reagan took over as governor of California and was re-elected for a second term four years later. ... Many believe that Reagan's spectacular success in the televised debate with President Carter played a decisive role in the general election, in which Reagan won. This is where his many years of experience in film and television turned out to be so necessary! Almost half a century ago, Reagan, through the mouth of his favorite hero Drake McHugh, said the phrase: "Someday I will surprise this city." The words turned out to be prophetic: Reagan became the most famous person in America" (Tirdatova, 1988: 20-21).

There were noticeably fewer articles on the work of Western filmmakers in the *Soviet Screen* in the second half of the 1980s than there were biographies of actors.

So the *Soviet Screen* could not pass by the seventieth birthday of the outstanding Swedish director Ingmar Bergman (1918-2007). Film critic A. Plakhov, in our opinion, absolutely correctly wrote that the film *Fanny and Alexander* (*Fanny och Alexander*, 1982) occupies a special place in Bergman's work. The bright Renaissance worldview is not at all alien to the "Nordic temperament" ... But the real nightmare of life, embodied in the world's sorrows of the middle of the century, eclipsed smiles, deeply settled and took root in the minds of Bergman's heroes. Regardless of their personal experience, each of them carries this nightmare and fear of life, which prevents them from enjoying everyday comforts, spiritual blessings and emotional attachments. Most of Bergman's male characters are either mired in hardened egocentrism, or they are obsessed with an abstract speculative idea... But women, unlike men, are able to suffer deeply and therefore suffer doubly - both for themselves and for the strong half of humanity. But the children who suffer most of all are those who, from birth, look into the mirror of the sins and torments of their parents (Plakhov, 1989: 30).

In connection with the long-awaited release of the musical Bob Fosse *Cabaret* (1972) in the Soviet film distribution, an article devoted to his work was published in the *Soviet Screen*, which noted that Sally Bowles, "Fräulein from America," on the stage of the triumphant *Cabaret* (1972) heralded the birth of a new musical. The personal catastrophe of the heroes in front of the audience develops into a worldwide catastrophe. Contrary to all the rules of a film musical, in the finale the lovers part, but another plot that developed in parallel, with and without their participation, corresponds to the canon of the chosen genre; in a fit of social hysteria, the country throws out a hand with a swastika on its sleeve. ... In *Cabaret* the musical comes to life not because it has mastered the modern film language. Here there was a "surgical intervention" in the core of the genre. ... The director uses the roll prepared for him by tradition. Heroes and spectators are equally defenseless against the magical "expected effect". True to the terms of the genre, the characters desire intensely, but their dreams cease to come true. Flywheel stuck. Utopia is preparing a big surprise and is not exchanging for trifles. She wants to make everyone happy. And as a result, everyone immediately punishes. The atmosphere, which Sally Bowles, in the spirit of the times, calls "divine decadence", is a sublimation of the feeling of Utopia. Since

dreams have ceased to come true, the genre proclaims a new law: "Let yourself!" And the heroes obediently allow themselves everything, without becoming freer or happier because of this (Maximov, 1990: 28-29).

In 1991, *Screen* published one of the first articles that positively assessed the work of the émigré director Roman Polanski. Film critic A. Plakhov wrote that his *Cul-de-sac* (1966) and especially *The Fearless Vampire Killers* (1967) are distinguished by the grace of ambiguity, light and piquant irony. ... And in the rather heavy-weight *Pirates* (1986), the most charming and inspiring moment is the uprising on the ship because of the rotten meat issued to the crew. As in the *Battleship Potemkin*, turned inside out not without malice. ... *Repulsion* (1965) can serve as a practical textbook for both psychopathology and filmmaking. This is a surprisingly capacious prototype of Polanski's later works, each of which develops one or another line outlined in it. ... Freudian paraphernalia (a crack as a "hole of the subconscious", secret attraction with an incestuous tinge) reappears in *Chinatown* (1974). The motive of disastrous, pernicious, infernal female beauty will be repeated many times in Polanski. In all this, internal connections are found with the intellectual problems of European and American modernism – with Jean Cocteau and Tennessee Williams, with Bergman and Antonioni. ... *Rosemary's Baby* (1968) is the pinnacle of Polanski's work: cruel, truly diabolical energy appears in it, a fairy tale plot is rooted in psychological reality. Once again, we are faced with a masterful deformation of time and space, with the destruction of habitual inertial connections, when the viewer, together with the heroine, begins to be convinced of the unreliability of his sensations, that things sometimes are not at all what they seem to us (Plakhov, 1991: 12-14).

The work of Woody Allen was also highly appreciated in the *Soviet Screen*: As a true intellectual – and Woody Allen is a very intelligent comedian – he, first of all, laughs at himself: at his appearance, his problems and complexes. And, amused, he overcomes the difficulties that inevitably arise on the path of a small, ugly, frail little man in a vast, ruthless world. There is great wisdom and great democracy in this self-irony (Pritulenko, 1989: 26-27).

- interviews with Western filmmakers

The principle of choosing interviewed Western filmmakers in the "perestroika" *Soviet Screen* was approximately the same as the choice of persons for writing creative portraits, that is, completely free, but, as a rule, tied to the events of the Moscow International Film Festival and the current film distribution.

Of course, positive acting interviews dominated: J.-P. Belmondo (Osipov, 1989: 16-17); K.-M. Brandauer (Gurkov, 1987: 23-24); L. Ventura (Braginsky, 1986: 20-21); M. Vlady (Svistunov, 1989: 26-27); M. McDowell (Kolbovsky, 1990: 14); G. Depardieu (Svistunov, 1987: 11); C. Cardinale (Svistunov, 1987: 22-23); N. Kinski (Braginsky, 1987: 20); M. Mastroianni (Sulkin, 1986: 21-22); M. Mercier (Shumyatskaya, 1991: 10); J. Moreau (Osipov, 1988: 22; Smirnova, 1991: 18-19); M. Placido (Rtishcheva, 1990: 31); R. Redford (Svistunov, 1988: 20); I. Rossellini (Karakoleva, 1991: 20-21); D. Sanda (Osipov, 1989: 16-18); A. Celentano (Bogemsky, 1987: 12-13, 15); H. Shigula (Krasnova, 1988: 20-21).

Interviews with Western directors, screenwriters and producers were significantly less: M. Antonioni (Antonioni, 1986: 20-21); P. Barthel (Fomina, 1991: 31); N. Jewison (Tirdatova, 1990: 24-25); J. Dreville (Vikhlyaev, 1986: 20); K. Lanzmann (Lungina, 1989: 26-27); C. Zavattini (Weisfeld, 1986: 20-21); P. Maslansky (Rakhlin, 1991: 26-27); O. Stone (*Platoon...*, 1987: 20-21).

In 1987, even an interview with the formerly "disgraced" émigré director Milos Forman was published (Kompanichenko, 1987: 21-22). It was very friendly, but cautious, without going beyond the then "red lines" (after all, 1987 of the "Great October" was practically the last year of its existence for the *Soviet Screen*, when it was to some extent important to show a positive difference between socialism and capitalism).

- reviews of Western films that got into the Soviet film distribution

Due to the fact that at the initial stage of "perestroika" Western films continued to be released to Soviet film distribution, purchased in a limited number and subject to numerous censorship restrictions in the previous period, in 1986-1987, the *Soviet Screen* published reviews mainly of secondary ones and today thoroughly forgotten western movies.

And in some reviews, the rudiments of the magazine's former ideological approaches were still visible, when it was important in the first place to single out (if any) a "progressive political component" in Western films.

Here is how, for example, in the *Soviet Screen* Giuseppe Ferrara's Italian film *One Hundred Days in Palermo* (*Cento giorni a Palermo*, 1983) was evaluated: The film follows the traditions of documentary art, conscientiously reconstructing the events of the political chronicle. It contains real names, carefully recreated pictures of the massacres of the mafia over their victims. ... The director skillfully inflates the atmosphere of fear around the protagonist, the inevitable expectation of a terrible end. ... The progressive forces of Italy still have a long and persistent battle ahead of them against the secret syndicate of criminals that is the offspring of capitalist society. The Italian democratic public and the Communist Party have repeatedly noted that the Mafia can be eradicated only through profound social changes in the life of all Italian society, the elimination of unemployment, social inequality, poverty and exploitation (Malyshev, 1986: 19).

Analyzing the Spanish film *Demons in the Garden* (*Demonios en el jardín*, 1982), film critic N. Savitsky drew the attention of readers to the "correctly placed" ideological accents of the film: In *Demons in the Garden* a shaky and blurry, like a shadow projection of events and moods is given, by which a huge disturbing world lives, it seems, tightly fenced off from the cramped and prosperous little world of the petty bourgeois for an outsider's gaze... At the same time, it would be an obvious stretch to perceive the movie as an open metaphor for Spanish reality during the reign of Franco. Aragon does not pretend to do this at all, we are offered something else: a kind of random sliver of time; we are allowed to feel its atmosphere, suffocating, oppressive, and, looking closely, imagine the essence of the socio-political system, which deliberately emasculates the human soul (Savitsky, 1986: 9-10).

However, evaluating the political detective story *The Seventh Target* (*La 7ème cible*, 1984), film critic A. Osipov was more critical. Noting that in this film the thought of the defenselessness of the human person in a capitalist society, which has become especially aggravated in recent years due to the rampant terrorism. A. Osipov emphasized that the authors of *The Seventh Target* do not pretend to be a serious social analysis of the topic raised. ... By the end of the film, the intrigue's amusement becomes self-sufficient. The authors' attempt to give psychological motivation to the actions of the characters turns out to be only external credibility, because this attempt is nothing more than the result of speculative plot constructions. None of the lines of the film is not fully revealed artistically. The contrived plot, the cold mannerism of directing, dramatic stamp deprive the picture of life volume and reliability. And here neither the charm of Lino Ventura, nor the talent of other performers who simply have nothing to play, nor the wonderful music of Vladimir Kosma (how often dramatic helplessness is hidden behind beautiful music) can save (Osipov, 1987: 11).

Film critic G. Maslovsky (1938-2001) reviewed the Spanish film *Stico* (1984) in a similar vein. The reviewer considered that the main task of this parable was to stigmatize a society in which the ancient slave relations were only modernized, acquired sophisticated forms (Maslovsky, 1987; 21).

Curiously, cursed by the Soviet press for the film *Confession* (*L'Aveu*, 1971), recognized as anti-communist and anti-Soviet, director Costa-Gavras was completely rehabilitated in the 1980s in connection with the release of his political drama *Missing* (1982), which sharply condemned the dictatorial regime of Pinochet.

Running a little ahead, it can also be noted that in 1990 a screening of *Confession* took place in Moscow, which was attended by the authors of this psychological drama, which was also reflected in pages of the *Soviet Screen* (Braginsky, 1990: 14; Gerdt, 1990: 14-15).

A magazine review of *Missing* in action noted that it recreates an atmosphere of total violence with amazing authenticity. It is everywhere, it seems to be dissolved in everyday life. ... Costa-Gavras exposes the dialectic of betrayal pretending to be mercy. ... *Missing* is a political film. He explores the "logic" of imperialist thinking, according to which man, whom the ancients called the "measure of things", becomes a neglected value, easily "subtracted" from life. Unrighteous power, in order to assert itself, needs deception and demagoguery. And those who cannot be deceived are destroyed. There is no need to talk about how relevant, how hot this topic is in our time (Valagin, 1986: 10-11).

Also positively evaluating *Missing*, film critic N. Tsyrukun wrote on the pages of *Soviet Screen* that almost simultaneously with Costa Gavras, American director Roger Spottiswoode made the film *Under Fire* (1983), also inspired by a true story: the murder in 1979 in Nicaragua of an American journalist who was preparing a report on the fighters of the Sandino National

Liberation Front. ... The tense dramatic situation itself is deliberately weakened by them, rarefied, the narration is slowed down, so that the viewer is given time not only to follow the course of events, but also to think about them. The personal experiences of the central characters and how they gradually become aware of their involvement in the just struggle of the rebellious people for national independence and democracy come to the fore (Tsyркun, 1987: 21-22).

N. Tsyркun and S. Lumet's drama *Daniel* (1983) were positively evaluated: Lumet staged the picture, not counting on box office success and not hoping for the location of criticism. But, to his surprise, the film found its audience and received a high response from the progressive press. This, apparently, affected the interest of Americans, who are starting to get tired of pseudo-political tales like *Red Dawn* (1984), *Moscow on the Hudson* (1984) or *Invasion USA* (1985), made in the spirit of cavernous anti-communism, to a film in which events related to the persecution of communists in the United States itself are recreated without any political chatter and tendentiousness, to a topic that was first heard in such a tone from the American screen. ... Lumet's film enters into controversy with a whole clip of films that have appeared in recent years in the United States, such as *First Blood* (1982), *Rambo: First Blood. Part II* (1985), *Commando* (1985), *The Delta Force* (1986), whose heroes, appearing in the guise of supermen, defend the expansionist interests of their country in Southeast Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and other far from borders of US regions. ... In Lumet's film, the problem of choice is posed rigidly: there are only two ways: resistance to the military-political machine or withdrawal from the struggle, but then the fate of the victim awaits you (Tsyркun, 1987: 21-22).

Moving on to an analysis of the American film *Flashpoint* (1984), N. Tsyркun wrote that it would be a stretch to call it a political film in the full sense of the word: the action-detective genre, the brilliant stunt numbers of the lead actor Chris Kristofferson do not allow the viewer to fully focus on the serious background of on-screen events: the theme of the assassination of the president runs as if on a tangent. And, perhaps, one could reproach the authors of *Flashpoint* that they only speculate on a sensitive topic, play on the interest in the mystery. This reproach would be absolutely fair, if not for one circumstance. The film unequivocally conveys the idea that the official version of the lone killer is doubtful, that there was a conspiracy organized not without the participation of the CIA and the FBI – otherwise why pursue and kill those who who is trying to find out the truth? It is precisely this thought that makes *Flashpoint*, for all its naivety, related to such serious films as *Under Fire* and *Daniel*, where, unlike the pictures that tell about the mythical "red threat", the incredible exploits of *Rambo*, etc., we are talking about real issues that are relevant to America and Americans, and the viewer can check for truth the rhetorical statements about democracy, human rights and bourgeois freedoms, in the light of which the American administration seeks to present its country to the world (Tsyркun, 1987: 21-22).

The review of the film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) on the Australian drama *Winter of Our Dreams* (1981), on the contrary, was devoid of ideologization: The film sympathizes with an individual in his searches and disappointments, in the desire to break himself and get out from the dreary and dreary everyday life. However, having got out, he risks being in a dead end of loneliness, and, to prevent this from happening, you need to go to the people involved in the business (Dmitriev, 1986: 10).

Of course, even during this period, the initial "perestroika" period, films by prominent Western screen masters sometimes got into the Soviet film distribution.

Thus, film critic V. Bozhovich (1932-2021) wrote that in Francois Truffaut's stylized and ironic film *Vivement dimanche!* This is done very subtly. Truffaut suggests that his viewer is an expert and connoisseur of the chosen genre. And not just a detective, but a detective of the 1930s and 1940s, with its black and white palette, restraint of external means and the finest lace of intrigue. ... The wonderful actors Jean-Louis Trintignant and Fanny Ardant do not play real people, but conditional cinematic characters. Their action and facial expressions correspond to certain feelings and dramatic situations, but are devoid of real psychological content. And again, no pressure, the parodic beginning is a little dawning. To play like this, you need the highest class skill (Bozhovich, 1986: 10).

Analyzing the film of another outstanding French director, Bertrand Tavernier, film critic A. Plakhov, not forgetting to ritually mention that he "gained a reputation as the largest director in France, an artist of anti-bourgeois in spirit," he further noted that in *Sunday in the country*

(*Un Dimanche a la campagne*, 1984), this master “will show himself as a skillful restorer of time and – what is especially important – an in-depth interpreter of it. ... he managed to change his artistic style, remaining absolutely organic in the sound of his author's voice” (Plakhov, 1986: 10).

But in relation to the films of two famous Italian directors – Francesco Rosi (1922-2015) and Ettore Scola (1931-2016) – A. Plakhov was more strict.

So about the film *The Chronicle of a Declared Death* (*Cronaca di una morte annunciata*, 1987) A. Plakhov wrote that “Rosy, following Marquez, considers ... connections within a semi-patriarchal society, oppressed by the fate of age-old prejudices. The springs of a protracted and cruel conflict are not love, passion, not even jealousy, but adherence to rituals that are senseless in their wildness, encouraging people to play roles that are unusual for them. The humanistic pathos of this movie is stated frankly and strongly, but it is prevented from being realized by an equally frank picturesqueness, decorativeness of the environment in which the characters are placed (Plakhov, 1987: 20-21).

And in Scola's film *Family* (*La famiglia*, 1986), according to A. Plakhov, there is no sharpness of thought that captivated in the film of the same Scola *Terrace* (*La terrazza*, 1979), built on a similar technique, there is no laconic expressiveness of microplots *Le Bal* (1983), although one cannot fail to pay tribute to the wit and ingenuity of the production (Plakhov, 1987: 20-21).

Damiano Damiani's film *Pizza Connection* (1985) received a very restrained assessment in the *Soviet Screen*. Film critic O. Nenasheva, recognizing that Damiani is a recognized master of political detective, who knows all the intricacies of the recipe for a “movie about the mafia”, further made the reasonable conclusion that in the film *Pizza Connection* the desire to please the viewer outweighs. A sharp, dynamic... tough plot and frank melodrama of the story told, softening the disturbed hearts of the audience, will not make us regret the time lost in the cinema hall. And no frontal political attacks (Nenasheva, 1989: 29).

On the other hand, film critic A. Doroshevich considered David Lean's grandiose fresco *A Passage to India* (1984), based on the novel of the same name by E.M. Forster (1924). A. Doroshevich reasonably considered that having made the film after fourteen years of silence, Lean nevertheless remained faithful to his artistic principles, remained a romantic director, professing a “great style”, striving to see some kind of eternity behind the vicissitudes of individual destinies, which in this case should carry India in itself (Doroshevich, 1987: 10-11).

Claude Lelouch's melodrama *Edith and Marcel* (*Edith et Marcel*, 1983) also received quite a benevolent assessment in the magazine. Film critic T. Khloplyankina (1937-1993) wrote that the director did not overload this beautiful legend with either everyday details (which, however, is probably good), or psychology. As a result, the picture turned out to be whole in its own way, although – we repeat – and greatly stretched. There is a legend about love in it, and there is love itself – to the extent that the legend allows (Khloplyankina, 1987: 21).

A notable event in the initial period of “kinoperestroika” was the release of the famous film by Wim Wenders *Paris, Texas* (1984) in the Soviet film distribution.

Film critic A. Plakhov perceived this philosophical parable as the implementer of a universal model of human feelings and relationships (Plakhov, 1987: 20-21). And film critic E. Tirdatova noted that most of the audience attracted by the name of the picture will be disappointed. True, the spectacle that will open their eyes will be simply gorgeous: a dazzling, fantastic panorama of Houston at night or a strange, bewitching picture of a deserted suburb in the evening after a thunderstorm ... There is both a mystery and a touching story about lost love with tears and repentance, and a beautiful woman: the star Nastassya Kinski... Wenders' picture is extremely simple: it is a melodrama, the plot twists and tricks of which are directly designed for audience success ... and it is extremely complex – this is a thoroughly metaphorized parable about modern man (Tirdatova, 1987: 22-23).

In 1987, F. Fellini's film *And the ship is sailing* (*E la nave va*, 1983), in general, there was a unique case: an enthusiastic review of it was posted on three pages of the *Soviet Screen* with color frames from the film! There was no such case with reviews of a Western film in the magazine either before or after...

Theater and film critic T. Bachelis (1918-1999) wrote that in the film *And the ship is sailing* Fellini's mischievous fantasy shifts the images of the film into the register of a buffoon opera, where the banal coexists with the original, the monstrously tasteless with impeccably

beautiful, the sublime with base and where the music never stops. ... But through the amusing collage of cinematography and opera, comedy and lyrics, tragedy soon gives its voice ([Bachelis, 1987: 6-8](#)).

But around another then novelty of the Soviet film distribution – the movie *Ginger and Fred* (1986) by Federico Fellini – on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* (albeit with a large distance gap) a dispute arose.

Film critic N. Savitsky, in his very positive review, wrote that in the film *Ginger and Fred* the director – for the umpteenth time! – creates its own special world. Quirky, enchanting, extravagant. ... In the polyphonic sound of the film, the dominant motif gradually stands out – a sarcastically merciless debunking of modern "mass media", commercial television, this insatiable moloch of today's bourgeois culture, which grinds and crushes everything under itself. Talents, minds, human souls. This is more than just a profit-making spectacle. This is a whole "philosophy", a well-thought-out system for processing the mass consciousness in the interests of those who "order the music". A system of leveling the tastes, the spiritual demands of multimillion audiences, directly designed to kill any healthy taste, etching the spiritual beginning in man ([Savitsky, 1986: 20-21](#)).

In general, film critic T. Bachelis (1918-1999) agreed with N. Savitsky's opinion, arguing that *Ginger and Fred* is perceived very easily. Everything is clear in it, although in it sadness goes hand in hand with joy, serious drama - with a careless joke, lyrics – with irony, and faith in the future – with undisguised bitterness. That is, this is again a Fellinian mixture of contradictory feelings, a Fellinian brew, where the vulgar suddenly becomes elegant, the rough becomes tender, and the tender becomes sharp and spicy. One plot enters into another, "an object cuts an object", and the trifle of a "tip-top" variety dance turns into a poem of resurrecting love. ... Let us note by the way that Fellini does not miss a single opportunity to caustically ridicule the stupefying television business ([Bachelis, 1988: 18-19](#)).

But the film critic Y. Bogomolov (1937-2023) admitted that in the film *Ginger and Fred* he did not like the movie as a movie. ... The "love story" of the elderly dancers, told in the film, is not so much romantic as sentimental. Giulietta Masina and Marcello Mastroianni, great actors, meeting whom the audience stands up and the ovation does not stop for several minutes, this time did not add anything to what was known about them before, at least to me. The impression is that they appeared to remind of themselves. That, they say, they are alive... That they are healthy, full of creative powers ([Bogomolov, 1990: 30](#)).

No less controversial opinion about another famous Western film of the 1980s, which hit the Soviet film distribution, was expressed by A. Plakhov, reproaching him for being unemotional. Evaluating the masterpiece of Milos Forman *Amadeus* (1984), the film critic argued that "Foreman, having mastered the Hollywood self-discipline, did not succumb to the nostalgic elements, made the film cold, perfect in its own way and accepted as a product of the highest standard on all five continents ([Plakhov, 1987 : 20-21](#)).

But since not only masterpieces of Western cinematography appeared on Soviet screens in the mid-1980s, critical articles about ordinary productions of Western entertainment cinema also appeared in the magazine.

In particular, in his witty review of the American film *Heavenly Bodies* (1984) film critic V. Turovsky (1949-1998) noted that the authors of this film are very desperate, funny and fearless guys. Who would tell and who would believe that from a television program like our "Rhythmic Gymnastics" you can build a full-length, one and a half hour feature film into which they will try to squeeze love, aerobics, the problem of sports honor, the theme of the perfidious deceit of rivals, the conflict between honest knights sports and sharks of private capital. ... It is difficult to suspect the authors of the seriousness of their artistic intentions, and therefore it is difficult to question them on any account of art. The art of cinema, unlike the art of aerobics, was not part of their intentions at all, so they must be judged by the laws they adopted for themselves. They made an honest, frank, professional visual guide to aerobics, which at times is impossible to look at ([Turovsky, 1986: 10-11](#)).

But the most resonant in this series was the article by film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) "About *Angelique*", published in 1987. To a large extent, this publication was a response to the emotional, but devoid of analytics, criticism of the situation in the Soviet film distribution, expressed by journalist Y. Geiko on the pages of *Komsomolskaya Pravda* in his sensational article "Why *Angelique* came to us" In particular, Y. Geiko criticized the USSR Goskino in

purchasing such entertaining Western films, such as French costume adventures: *Angelique – Marquise of Angels* (*Angelique, marquise des anges*) and so on movies (Geiko, 1985).

V. Dmitriev reasonably noted that the case of *Angelique*, which seemed so simple and unpretentious, now does not seem so simple. It's no secret that opinions clashed around the film. Critics are largely against it. The audience is largely in favor. The former allude to aesthetic illiteracy, the latter to isolation from the tastes of the broad masses. ... First of all, *Angelique* is not a historical film. It is a historical popular print, using the scenery and costumes of the 17th century not to restore the everyday truth of the past or to explain in depth the reasons for the clash of opposing forces, but to create a great performance that lives according to the laws of a multi-colored spectacle. ... *Angelique* is what it is: an entertaining picture that does not pretend to be much, a historical popular print, with its ups and downs, its not fully thought out aesthetics, its more than modest place in the pyramid of world cinema. ... Imagine for a second that the entire screen is filled with *Angelique*, *Three Musketeers* or *Counts of Monte Cristo*. Nightmare. And if it is filled with some serious problematic films? Hand on heart, do we want this? (Dmitriev, 1987: 16-17).

With the light hand of V. Dmitriev, the *Soviet Screen* further wrote about Western entertainment film production that got into the Soviet film distribution, already without the previously obligatory ideological curtsy (Dementiev, 1989: 28; Eshpay, 1989: 28; Ivanova, 1989: 29; Mikhalkovich, 1989: 28; Razlogov, 1988: 21-22; 1990: 25; Simanovich, 1989: 28; Stishov, 1989: 26-27; Sulkin, 1988: 21-22, etc.).

So film critic Y. Ivanova wrote that, of course, one can continue to call American action films a product of mass culture, accusing them of all sorts of commercial "sins". But if for many years even our box office managed to patch up financial holes with the help of such "certainties", it means that the viewer has a need for such cinematography. ... People love scary stories. Memories of sweet horror stretch from childhood, from tales of ogres and dragons to tales of witches and vampires. The need for emotional sensations of this kind gives rise to a steady interest in their carriers - rumors, detectives, horror movies. Even at the beginning of the century, it became clear that the timeless Horror Story, and even more so with a detective story – a sure pledge of commercial success of the film. It is precisely on such a win-win combination that Curtis Hanson's film *The Bedroom Window* (1987) is based (Ivanova, 1989: 29).

And film critic O. Sulkin rightly noted that the ingenuous main character of the film "Crocodile" *Dundee* (1986) "in the company of modern fashionable heroes of the commercial Western screen ... looks like a "black sheep". It is enough to compare him with the muscular and merciless avengers of Stallone and Schwarzenegger, the gloomy outcasts of Eastwood and Pacino ... He is from some other value system. He personifies the myth-memory of mankind about the "golden age" ... He is somewhat akin to the Russian Ivan the Fool ... This hero is attractive, because he is from a fairy tale. From a fairy tale for all times" (Sulkin, 1988: 21-22).

Analyzing *The Soap Thieves* (*Ladri di saponette*, 1989), film critic A. Dementiev (1957-2023) was convinced that it was a very light, very "entertaining" comedy about how a neorealistic picture and commercial advertising are mixed up on the TV screen. ... How pleasant this unpretentious and at the same time witty film looked against the general background of the competition program! And let it be lightweight, let it be! At least cinema (Dementiev, 1989: 3-6).

The French comedy *The Runaways* (*Les Fugitifs*, 1986) was also positively assessed in the *Soviet Screen*: "The main thing for Weber is an interesting story. And the genre, the choice of actors and everything else is the closest and most acceptable way for him to tell this story. ... In *The Runaways*, as always with Weber, laughter is based on witty and tense comic situations, subtly sustained on the verge of absurdity. In general, this feeling of "on the edge" is extremely important for comedy as such. After all, here it is so easy to jump into vulgarity, into a frank psychological blunder, and simply into "not funny". Until now, this feeling of Weber has not failed – it has not failed this time either" (Stishov, 1989: 26-27).

Film critic V. Mikhalkovich (1937-2006) believed that Wolfgang Petersen in his films – *Enemy Mine* (1985) and *The Never Ending Story* (1984) – stubbornly follows a certain program, worship of the past felt to be the essence of Petersen's program, its basis. *The Never Ending Story* is about an attempt to breathe new life into the images of the past, taken not from the space sagas of modern fiction, but from traditional children's literature that has retained an affinity for fairy tales with their princesses, brave heroes and monsters. These creatures inhabit the Land of Fantasy in Petersen's painting. ... If *The Never Ending Story* is tied to traditional

children's literature, then *Enemy Mine* is a clear move towards *Star Wars*. ... The story of the hero's initiation seemed ornamental in Lucas, in *Enemy Mine* it is the main content of the film. His hero – astronaut Will Davidge – in full accordance with the canons of initiation goes through all its stages: he leaves his familiar environment, though not of his own free will, acquires secret knowledge and, in the end, finds himself in a new environment – with those whom he considered enemies. ... Worshiping the past is called passeism. The creator of *The Never Ending Story* and *Enemy Mine* is no doubt a passeist. For him, the history of mankind is truly endless, since it makes its movement in a circle. Technique progresses infinitely, becomes infinitely more complex, but ethics does not need such progress – it immediately presented itself to the mythopoetic consciousness in its absolute forms. Having described the circle, humanity will return to them – this is probably how our future is conceived by the creator of *Enemy Mine*. The Passionist is not often optimistic. Petersen is inherently optimistic because he believes that the past is achievable (Mihalkovich, 1989: 28).

No less analytically another film critic – V. Eshpay (1953-2016) – reacted to another bright example of entertainment production – *Romancing the Stone* (1984), believing that this movie can be treated as an adventure thriller and not racking their brains over it, moreover, the majority will do so. However, this film is not as simple as it seems. Being drawn into the picture, you notice that everything is somehow shifted in comparison with the usual adventure films. ... Commercial cinema? Without any doubt. But accurately reflecting the artistic and cinematic tastes of middle-aged Americans. As a matter of fact, cinema, as the most mass-produced of the arts, should be so - accessible and, as far as possible, not vulgar. American yuppie directors do it well (Eshpay, 1989: 28).

But about *Single (Le Solitaire, 1987)* on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* in 1989, two reviews were published at once.

Film critic G. Simanovich melancholy noted that the film by Jacques Deray *Single* “evokes sadness. Police thriller with Belmondo – and suddenly sadness? You don't believe anyone, they dismiss it, they go to look, and then they ironically advise you to turn to a neuropsychiatrist. ... I was also in anticipation. Having cast aside this annoying critical snobbery of ours, I, honestly, prepared to be that childish grateful viewer of adventure films, for whom dashing, spectacular attractions are much more important than artistic integrity, moral conception, general idea and other "conventions" important for finicky adults. And, God knows, I steadfastly fought back the annoying sensations that all this was, was, was, and it was already clear, it was known what the next episode would be.

When the derogatory, arrogant, biting term “Belmondism” was put into use by our criticism (and this is the end of the 70s), any domestic viewer who had the slightest understanding of cinema art, any admirer of the actor had every reason to be offended by Jean-Paul Belmondo. Yes, he has already participated in several not very successful police films, hinting at the image, the role of the hero, calmly looking down the barrel of an enemy pistol, but managing to shoot first. However, could one forget that this is the actor of Godard, De Sica, Louis Malle ... that theatrical Paris applauds him. We have to stick a label, that the brand is licked, once, and you're done. ... After *Single* I realized something had changed. It seems to be the same gestures, the same chic style of reprisals against opponents, but some kind of tiredness, mechanistic, "breathlessness" in Belmondo's game. And within the framework of a worn-out plot cliché, in terms of obvious director's amorphousness boring and vulgar actor it all comes out" (Simanovich, 1989: 28).

To a large extent reflecting the opinions of the mass audience, film critic A. Dementiev (1957-2023) argued with G. Simanovich: When I see any creation of Belmondo on the poster, even if it is at least three times *Single*, I'll go, by golly. And I really do not want to be deprived of this pleasure. ... Belmondo will always be of interest to him. If this Belmondo is given a teaspoon a year, then they will love only him, dream only of him. I agree, The Loner may not be the highest quality essential item. But where are they, these high-quality ones? ... I want to watch Belmondo hold a cigar, get into the Citroen and kiss the baby. By God, even with sluggish directing, it's better than our beauty pageants. And Belmondo is a living embodiment of an amazingly beautiful life (Dementiev, 1989: 28).

In the late 1980s, succumbing to persistent pressure from the new Board of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and the film press, the USSR Goskino bought and sent for wide release a considerable number of masterpieces of Western cinema, which had been inaccessible

to the masses of viewers in previous decades. Of course, these old movies did not become box office hits (especially against the backdrop of an aggressive video boom), but they received considerable support in the *Soviet Screen*.

Thus, reviewing Jean Cocteau's *Orphée* (1950), released to the Soviet cinema with a colossal delay, film critic V. Mikhalkovich (1937-2006) wrote that Cocteau refers to the ancient Greek myth not just to return it to modern times. The poet's existence is tragically torn between the real world and the beyond. This is how it was thought in antiquity, and this is how it is now. Cocteau's film tells about the eternity of this gap (Mikhalkovich, 1989: 26-27).

Film critic N. Amashukeli reminded readers that the director of the film *French Cancan* (1954) Jean Renoir "belongs to the generation of great French directors Jean Vigo, René Clair, Marcel Carnet. In his films, in particular in the *French Cancan*, simplicity and sophistication, a special, inherent picturesqueness, are surprisingly combined. The episodes of the exhausting rehearsals of the girls from the Moulin Rouge resemble paintings with blue and pink dancers by Degas, colorful posters, of course, Toulouse-Lautrec, at the sight of the narrow and hunching streets of Montmartre, Utrillo's drawings come to mind, and cheerful visitors to taverns, cafes and cabarets seem to have gone from the paintings of Auguste Renoir, the director's father. Yes, literally every character in the film resembles the images of impressionist artists, each of his frames is permeated with a poignantly sad and at the same time cheerful sense of the world, characteristic of these artists. ... Let me repeat: the whole film is characterized by a special, amazing sense of style, exceptional cheerfulness" (Amashukeli, 1990: 28).

Referring to Federico Fellini's masterpiece *8 1/2* (1963), which was finally released in Soviet cinemas, theater and film critic T. Bachelis (1918-1999) reasonably argued that time is powerless before some works. *8 1/2* is one of them. And if the means of expression, first used by Fellini, are replicated a thousand times by his followers and imitators, then the main motive of the picture completely retains its freshness and power. Moreover, I dare to say that in our days, in the current social conflict, this motive has gained additional sharpness. For the main theme of the film is the heavy burden of responsibility that the freedom of expression granted to the artist imposes on the artist (Bachelis, 1988: 18-19).

Film critic N. Savitsky reminded the readers of the magazine that *The Red Desert* (*Il Deserto Rosso*, 1964) was staged by the recognized master of Italian cinema Michelangelo Antonioni almost a quarter of a century ago, but an attentive viewer will certainly notice and appreciate the unique – not only for his time – the artistic solution of *The Red Desert*. The subtle, deep psychologism of this picture, where every, even the most inconspicuous nuance is essential, and optional details are absent. Impeccably accurate in terms of performing technique and at the same time naturally laid-back work of a well-coordinated ensemble of actors, in which Monica Vitti is confidently leading. The slender composition of the movie, all the more surprising given the almost eventless and deliberately blurred plot. workshop, a truly directorial use of color is not a help in achieving pictorial authenticity or self-made spectacle, but a powerful means of emotional impact that forms a capacious metaphor for human experiences. ... Antonioni chose one of the most disturbing and painful problems of the so-called post-industrial, that is, modern capitalist society, the problem of alienation, the catastrophic rupture of natural human ties, as the object of his primary interest. ... There are many questions in the film and questions for the film, and none of them suggests an unambiguous, simple answer. It is clear, however, that in a world where nature is fading away and living human feelings atrophy, breathing is difficult, and full-blooded existence is unthinkable. And there is nowhere to go from here ... But the world can (must!) be changed, trying to start at least a little to replenish the increasingly tangible lack of humanity in it, morality - in its broadest sense. This is the main result of the trip to *The Red Desert*, the main meaning of the message of the artist-humanist, addressed to the people of the Earth without a statute of limitations (Savitsky, 1989: 26-27).

These kind of retro-reviews adjoined articles about the old Hollywood westerns *Stagecoach* (1939) and *The Magnificent Seven* (1960).

Film expert V. Mikhalkovich (1937-2006) wrote that we remember *Stagecoach* under the long, albeit expressive name of our distributors *The journey will be dangerous...* *Stagecoach* makes an unforgettable, indelible impression thanks to the skillful dosage of tension. ... Here, at Ford, all episodes with a moving carriage seem to be permeated with the "smell of danger." It seems to hang in the air and is physically palpable. In fact, this feeling is evoked "without cinema" – not by camera angles, not by montage, but by purely dramatic means, by the prudent

and effective introduction of signs of an approaching threat into the plot (Mikhalkovich, 1991: 26-27).

And film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) in relation to *The Magnificent Seven* (1960) reasonably suggested that in the early sixties we did not have a more famous foreign film. The roar with which he rolled across the screens of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, very soon reached the ears of cinema lovers of the most remote outskirts. Copies were in short supply, they were torn hot from the processing machines of film copy factories and thrown to the audience, languishing from tedious waiting. ... And when the remarkable critic Yuri Mironovich Khanyutin dared to remark that he personally liked *The Magnificent Seven* much more than *The Seven Samurai*, it was considered a joke, unworthy scurrilousness, a mocking mockery of the shrine of world cinema. Protested and ostracized, Yuri Mironovich, as I recall, did not change his opinion, but he did not consider it necessary to vigorously defend it. ... For us, *The Magnificent Seven* was a solemn film that embodied the dream of male brotherhood, personal responsibility and that intoxicating feeling of freedom, when everything seems to be within your power, you can race on a beautiful horse against the wind and, breathing in the fresh air, feel yourself the master of the earth that is under your feet, the wide sky that is above your head, the entire boundless universe, of which you are a small part. How could this feeling please our ideological system to the limit with its forever established hierarchy of values and priorities? Shouldn't it have frightened that considerable part of the citizens of our country, which saw the only possible evolution of society in a slightly modified Stalinism? (Dmitriev, 1990: 29-30).

But, probably, the most unexpected retro premiere of the Soviet film distribution in 1991 was Liliana Cavani's film *The Night Porter* (*Il Portiere Di Notte*, 1974), accused in the 1970s of justifying Nazism not only in the USSR, but also in many other countries.

Film critic A. Plakhov wrote in his review, in our opinion, filled with very overestimated estimates of the secondary and morally slippery work of L. Cavani, that *The Night Porter* caused him "a surge of conflicting feelings. On the one hand, it was confirmed that the powerful energy of this picture continues to operate and has not been blown away by the wind of history. On the other hand, that the scandals that accompanied the appearance of the film are not connected only with the insanity of ideology, but affect the very nature of man, his "ego" hidden from prying eyes. ... Socio-cultural stratifications, intellectual metaphors and "naive" laces of postmodernity entangled the natural trunk, and it took the vital corrosiveness and feminine recklessness of Liliana Cavani to penetrate this core. ... This film, teetering on the dangerous edge of the erotic guignol, tried to locate somewhere between Visconti and Pasolini. ... Between two interpretations of fascism - as a demonic myth in the coordinates of the new history and as a decadent performance in the spirit of kindergarten libertinage. ... And the intuitive rebuff that the film caused in America, frightened by the double bogey of anti-Semitism and pornography, says not only that idiots are found everywhere, that there are far more of them than ideologically preoccupied Soviet film critics. He also speaks of the original frightening power that emanates from this piercing drama, testifying to the incomprehensibility of a person's actions, through and through, to "black holes" drilling his body and soul. ... Oh yes, and Cavani herself. and her teammates were convinced they were making a left-wing anti-fascist film. ... No matter how perverted and wild this love may seem, it is still ultimately hostile to ideology. Love is an exception, not included in the program of ideology. And so she must be killed. As for sex, it certainly enters into this program - one way or another, no matter how ideologically it is denied. ... Cavani's film is one of the acts of introspection of Western society, acts necessary in its time, when the "sexual revolution" was put forward as an antithesis to totalitarianism. The very combination of words is paradoxical. Cavani is one of those who reminded that violence is accompanied by pleasure, and all this together creates the ground for tyranny, for fascism. No revolution is a panacea and does not guarantee the free development of the individual. Now it is time to remind us of this. Liliana Cavani, whom we have been frightened of as a monster to whom it is dangerous to let underage children within reach, is indeed a tough, sometimes cruel director. In all her films one can find shocking scenes: as a rule, they receive some kind of meaningful justification" (Plakhov, 1991: 18-19).

But, of course, in the late 1980s and at the turn of the 1990s, relatively new Western films by well-known filmmakers appeared on the screens of the USSR, which were also analyzed now without biased ideological optics.

For example, film critic G. Krasnova reasonably noted that "in terms of dramaturgy, *The*

Longing of Veronica Voss (*Die Sehnsucht der Veronica Voss*, 1982) loses to *Maria Braun* (*Die Ehe der Maria Braun*, 1978), although over the script in collaboration with The same pair of playwrights worked as Fassbinder... But with all the imperfections, this film gives a visible idea of Fassbinder's style. ... the psychological drama of the film's characters is revealed in contrasts of light and shadow, black and white, and in this Fassbinder acts as a continuer of the traditions of German film expressionism – the art of light painting. Glare of light, falling on the faces of the characters, creates an atmosphere of uncertainty, doubt, impending disaster. The glow of neon advertisements and the twinkling of street lamps through streams of rain, the shimmer of precious stones, the sweep of the blades of a huge fan in the newspaper office - everything here is permeated by a continuous pulsation of light" (Krasnova, 1988: 21).

And film critic N. Petrova wrote that Arthur Penn's film *Four Friends* (1981) represents the duel of young heroes with life in the American ring of the 60s. ... We are watching how the hopes of young people melt away, how the illusions of a generation disappear, how the American dream gradually fades, although it still lives on. "What happened to the American Dream?!" W. Faulkner exclaimed in the 1950s. The echo of his words is heard in the Arthur Penn film. But the director does not give a definite assessment of the past, apparently not wanting to be categorical and simplify (Petrova, 1989: 29).

Speaking about the psychological drama *Father* (1990), in which the main character denounces a Nazi criminal 45 years after the Second World War, film critic O. Sulkin emphasized that "the most intriguing thing in the film is the gradual, very slow, but inexorable disclosure of the inner [former Nazi] Müller's world under the influence of external circumstances. It is clear that today he is a good, kind person. But is it possible to erase the sin you committed from your memory, like chalk from a school board? Can the gravity of what has been done leave the human soul? God forgives the penitent sinner, but the sinner is doomed to drag his cross to the end of his days. Directed by John Power, an avalanche of psychological nuances allows Max von Sydow inexplicably maintains the mysterious impenetrability of the soul, and this, without causing annoyance or languor, keeps the interest in the film" (Sulkin, 1991: 10).

Analyzing the film *Sweet Dreams* (1985), film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) believed that the English birthright did not allow Karel Reisch to completely dissolve in the elements of American cinema, to make a film literally following the formulas of traditional melodrama. ... This picture is not so much a continuation of Hollywood as a game of Hollywood, in condensed sentimentality, brutal tenderness, in a semi-magical world, which appears at the same time as a literal cast from the surrounding life and a semblance of a theatrical scenery (Dmitriev, 1989: 28).

But *The River* (1984), according to V. Dmitriev, is a cinematic formation that is not so common: it is a traditional Soviet film in a traditional American performance. ... We will see not only our plot schemes, of course, adjusted for American realities, but also our principle of editing, our principle of framing, our artlessness, when, for example, love experiences are depicted by changing the corresponding landscapes, and, finally, our pathos (Dmitriev, 1990: 16).

Referring to the sensational film adaptation of U. Eco's novel *The Name of the Rose* (*Il nome della rosa*), film critic V. Mikhalkovich (1937-2006) recalled that in the comments on the novel, Umberto Eco told about his trick: for the title, he deliberately chose a symbol so ambiguous in that it allows for many different interpretations. From the reader, the symbol requires mental work, efforts to find "its own" interpretation and substantiate it with plot events. Jean-Jacques Annaud, staging the film, coped with a similar task. ... Echoes of the fiction of two English writers – Conan Doyle and Fleming – seem to be fighting in the screen Baskerville, and this struggle is no less entertaining than the detective intrigue of *The Name of the Rose* (Mikhalkovich, 1990: 18-19).

Reviewing another striking Western film of the second half of the 1980s – *Angel Heart* (1987), film critic M. Drozdova correctly noted that in this film a split personality is masterfully built. The mystical branch of the plot opens a pathological mutant with two souls who commits crimes on the intuition of one of them that belongs to Lucifer. In the historical twist of the plot, we have before us a specific *American tragedy*. A painful stage in the nation's hateful romance with the Dream (the central character of its civil mythology). The picture was taken during a period of neo-conservative tendencies in American culture. And reflections on the painful

relationship of the nation with its first fetish are quite natural. ... It remains to add that the elegance of the intrigue will allow those who are not up to it to avoid being drawn into philosophical historicism. Today, the American filmmaker who decides to talk about serious things most often erects them as an intellectual mezzanine above the first floor, accessible to anyone, right off the street (Drozdova, 1990: 29).

And we can probably agree with the film critic E. Plakhova, who, in her review of the psychologically subtle film *The Four Adventures of Renet and Mirabelle* (*Quatre aventures de Reinette et Mirabelle*, 1986), that there seems to be no phenomenon more alien to domestic distribution, than the films of the French director Eric Rohmer. So here you are, as many as three of his films "package" out on our screens. But, perhaps, it is against the inflamed, screaming background that the calm meaning of these paintings becomes especially transparent. Their stories are defiantly unpretentious. Little love misunderstandings, temptations and mistakes of youth, heart worries. Their heroes do not experience fatal passions, their main passion is curiosity about life. Knowing it not in an extreme, but in an everyday face, they discover its paradoxical nature. They also discover the play of contradictions within themselves. The essence of Romer's films is precisely in this subtlety of gradations of measurement, in the enlargement of the scale. Using this method, together with the director, we discover that any, literally any incident around us is far from unambiguous, and our own participation in it can be interpreted in completely different ways. ... Romer aestheticizes life, but does it with such graceful carelessness (or its appearance) that it seems as if life itself drapes itself into artistic forms (Plakhova, 1991: 14-15).

Film critic and culturologist K. Razlogov (1946-2021) reasonably stated in his voluminous article that 1987-1988 in world cinema was characterized by a radical change of milestones. Leadership gradually shifted from children's and teenage fairy-tale legendary movie comics to cinema for forty-year-olds: retro-nostalgic melodramas, dramatic comedies that allow former rebels of the sixties to find peace with themselves and honor the memory of their once abused parents. [However] the foreign repertoire of our cinemas ... based on the films of 1987-1988, nevertheless, as a whole, stands apart from the world film process. And this is no coincidence. The leaders of the world distribution both were and remain unaffordable to us in terms of prices, and they can be viewed at best in the out-of-competition program of Moscow international film festivals or on video. We still dare to hope that in the near future the "champion" of more than a decade ago, *Star War*", will finally appear on the screens of cinemas, we timidly ask ourselves how the famous *E.T.* will be combined with the domestic psychosis of "flying saucers" (Razlogov, 1990: 25).

And then Kirill Razlogov, in his review of the current Soviet film distribution repertoire, we note certain advantages of the films *The Moderns* (1988), *Married to the Mob* (1988), *My friend is a traitor* (*Mon ami le traître*, 1988), *Tandem* (1987) and *To the left of the elevator* (*À gauche en sortant de l'ascenseur*, 1988) that although the principle of periodic self-repetitions can lead not only to a crisis in art, but often contributes to honing skills (Razlogov, 1990: 25), this is not always the case.

Among all this rather diverse bouquet of Western films, K. Razlogov singled out Eric Rohmer's elegant parable *My Friend's Friend* (*L'Ami de mon amie*, 1987) – a modern version of medieval morality... This story of love qui-pro-quo with unexpected happy endodrom could appear only in the country of Marivaux and the *Rules of the Game* (*La règle du jeu*, 1939) by Jean Renoir, whose heir can be considered Romer. Like his *Green Ray* (*Le rayon vert*, 1986) (Grand Prix of the Venice Film Festival and an unexpected guest of our screens), *My Friend's Friend* (*L'Ami de mon amie*, 1987) runs the risk of falling short of the expectations of everyone – distributors, directors of cinemas and spectators, but meanwhile this, in fact, the most famous picture of the reviewed repertoire (Razlogov, 1990: 25).

Thanks to the efforts of the film critic Y. Bogomolov (1937-2023), the "perestroika" *Soviet Screen* also responded to the screenings of Western television series in the USSR. At the same time, the mechanisms of their influence on the mass audience were revealed.

For example, Y. Bogomolov rightly wrote that in the *Jane Eyre* (1983) series that there is magic, which, however, contains motives of a non-aesthetic and non-artistic order. The series *Jane Eyre* is a myth about a person's stoic resistance to forces that doom him to spiritual conformism and social inequality. This is a myth with a winning ending. That is why it allows millions of people to get rid of, even if only emotionally and even for a short time, a complex of

both social and moral inferiority (Bogomolov, 1989: 7). And the character of the Italian TV series *The Octopus* (*La Piovra*, 1984) – police commissioner Cattani we need for consolation ... the creators of this seemingly endless series lead Corrado Cattani consciously, or perhaps instinctively, to a one-man duel with an octopus. Folklore, fabulous patterns are already at work here. The hero must single-handedly crush the dragon or the haughty snake. And the fact that *The Octopus*, despite all the realities, both political and everyday, tying it to today, – the creation of folklore and mythology, so it's obvious. ... The main lesson taught by the Octopus is that evil is an organization, and good is an individual, a single person on a single Earth. So they are waging an eternal, as well as endless battle, in which Corrado is always at the forefront, and against him are countless hordes of bought, hired, intimidated by the octopus fighters of the invisible front (Bogomolov, 1989: 10).

And after watching the TV series *Dallas*, which appeared on Soviet television screens, Y. Bogomolov noted that the relationship of the people inhabiting *Dallas* is very contradictory, overflowing with unsatisfied desires and ambitious ambitions. But at the same time, this is a fairly stable world: the balance in it is maintained by the fact that everyone knows something compromising about the other. Compromising evidence is the weapon of the middle bourgeoisie. He also uses it for defensive purposes. ... Each series is built according to one plan: first, something like the harmony of personal and private business relations is demonstrated, then it, this harmony, is violated (some kind of dirty provocation, betrayal, hurricane), and then it is restored. ... If we lift the canopy of the business morality of ordinary American millionaires, then under it we will find a Russian folk tale that begins something like this: the old man had three sons: the eldest was a scoundrel, the middle one was an alcoholic, and the third was Bobby the Fool, that is, a simple kind soul. ... *Dallas*, in particular, hints at the fact that all of us – such adults, smart, civilized, regardless of the color of our skin and the fifth point, from educational qualifications and social security – are terrible idealists in the deep subconscious (Bogomolov, 1991 : 23).

- reviews of Western films that were not shown in the Soviet film distribution

The ratings of Western films that were not shown in the Soviet film distribution on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* at the initial stage of perestroika were, as in previous decades, largely ideologically biased.

However, even today such American anti-Soviet "cranberry" crafts as *Red Dawn* (1984) and *Amerika* (1987) are perceived exactly as Soviet journalists wrote about them in 1986-1987: a mediocre anti-Soviet propaganda brew.

So the international journalist Y. Ustimenko wrote on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* that *Rocky-IV* (1985) makes a depressing impression: a monotonous scuffle with thickly smeared, wherever possible, blood and cannon punches of boxing gloves. The plot is obscenely primitive and boils down to a fight between Rocky and the "Soviet" champion Ivan Drago (it was necessary to come up with such a "purely Russian" name) (Ustimenko, 1986 20). And then Y. Ustimenko quite reasonably noted that such movies appeared on the screens at a time when the White House is frantically looking for an "external enemy"... [and] the United States carried out barbaric aggression against sovereign Libya, escalates threats against Nicaragua ... The authors of such films are characterized not only by the desire to distort Soviet reality, but also to present the Soviet people in the form of subhumans who have no place on earth, and therefore they are not worthy of pity and regret. It is not only a sport, but also a sacred duty of every 'true' American (Ustimenko 1986: 20-22).

In 1987, journalists Y. Alunov and V. Orlov published a review article, which quite objectively told the readers of the *Soviet Screen* about the most notable Hollywood anti-Soviet / anti-Russian film creations:

"In the *Red Dawn* (1984) show how the "Soviet landing force" made an attempt to capture the American town. In *Rocky IV* (1985), boxer Rocky Balboa proves the superiority of the American way of life in the "match of the century" in the Soviet ring...

Thus, a distorted, caricature image is persistently created about the USSR as a country that, in comparison with America, is in the "Stone Age" in terms of development. ... And the plot of the television movie *Amerika* is built on a wild fiction about the capture of the United States by the "Soviet Armed Forces" acting under the guise of UN troops. It was no coincidence that the idea of a television series saturated with hatred of the Soviet Union was born precisely in the bowels of the ABC, which for many years has been distinguished in the trio of commercial US

television empires by militant reaction. ... a murky anti-communist, anti-Soviet, anti-UN brew, the creation of which was spent about 35 million dollars, spilled onto the TV screens in the homes and apartments of millions of Americans. During the 14.5 hours of TV time they saw the Capitol set on fire by the "Soviet invaders", members of the U.S. Congress fall, the "invaders" tanks ravaging American cities and towns, and beast-like soldiers raping American women... This was the monstrous light in which ABC's efforts presented the Soviet Union to U.S. citizens" ([Algunov, Orlov, 1987: 20-22](#)).

It is curious that even one of the leaders of the "cinema perestroika" – film critic V. Demin (1937-1993) – in the same 1987, he very critically assessed the *Platoon* (1986), which was generally positively assessed by the Soviet press, telling readers of the *Soviet Screen* that although in West Berlin *Platoon* received the "Silver Bear" for directing, "at the announcement of this prize, as in the initial screening, the audience burst into heart-rending whistles. To understand such a reaction, one must not deduce the meaning of the picture from what is directly shown in it. The atrocities of the American army against the unarmed Vietnamese population are shown. Multiple and inventive. A young hero, a college boy, a volunteer pours out his bile in mental letters to a distant grandmother: what the hell took me into this swamp, this is not a war, but solid vomit, these are not comrades-in-arms – trash, human scum, food for prisons. So you are waiting for on-screen repentance: I participated in a vile and ungodly deed, forgive me, people, if you can! .. The film turns in a different direction. College bum grows into a great warrior. His inner monologues now herald newfound truths - friendship tested by bullets, brotherhood after despair, unity through hell. The politicians are to blame for not being able to avoid this vileness, and we - we have proved to the whole world that we can endure even worse. And a solemn dedication at the end - to those Americans who were and remained in Vietnam" ([Demin, 1987: 20-21](#)).

A rather sharp assessment was received in the *Soviet Screen* and the sensational film *The Last Temptation of Christ* (1988) by Martin Scorsese. Film critic A. Braginsky (1920-2016) wrote that delivered to Paris already with a halo of martyrdom (persecution by orthodox "fundamentalists" in the USA), this film was met with fierce attacks from the most conservative Catholic circles – "integrist", who, like their American "colleagues", do not allow any liberties in the interpretation of the image of Christ. ... I can testify: M. Scorsese made a rather boring film. ... One way or another, there is enough falsehood and even outright stupidity in the picture ([Braginsky, 1989: 30-31](#)).

And the masterpiece of Bernardo Bertolucci *The Sheltering Sky* (1990) received a completely ambiguous assessment in the *Soviet Screen*: "Bertolucci's Desert is a test tube for a tricky experience with a hurtful, bitter, unambiguous result. Bertolucci cuts off everything extraneous, private, so that his research in the field of the human psyche reaches almost scientific purity. ... When Bertolucci stunned the world in the 1970s with his *Last Tango in Paris* (*Ultimo tango a Parigi / Le dernier tango a Paris*, 1972), few realized that the strength and novelty of the images was not in explicit sex scenes, but in the intensity of the psychological interaction of the participants in the drama. Bertolucci revealed completely new ways for cinema to penetrate the human psyche, sharply, like no one before him, exposed the existential conflict. In the new film, the fierce sexuality of *Last Tango in Paris* deliberately gives way to an almost dull physiology. Heroes not only cannot say anything to each other through sexual contact. They have absolutely nothing to say to each other. ... Anyone who tries to find a coherent story in Bertolucci's new film will be disappointed. The director does not lead either the characters or us anywhere, except for the edge of the psychological abyss" ([Rakhlina, 1991: 22-23](#)).

Did not feel reverence for well-known Western directors and film critics. A. Dementiev (1957-2023), who, in our opinion, quite reasonably noted that inadaptation of D. Lawrence's *The Rainbow* (1989), the famous Ken Russell tries in vain to repeat his own discoveries of twenty years ago, made by him in the brilliant film adaptation of *Women in Love* by the same author. Today's Russell was only enough to picturesquely shoot, say, a glass of red wine on an inlaid table, but otherwise this solid and boring costume spectacle (at times, however, completely without a costume) causes only regret about Russell's stormy energy that has gone somewhere – rebel of the 1960s and 1970s. Hector Babenko, from whom one could expect masterpieces after *Kiss of the spider woman* (1985), was presented with the painting *Ironweed* (1987)... which, whatever one may say, cannot be called a masterpiece. ... A sort of American *At the Bottom* of the Great Depression with an admixture of *The Threepenny Opera*: long, tedious

and on the verge of a masquerade (and sometimes, frankly, beyond). ... The author of *Fifteen Years Old*, Jacques Doillon, seems to have delved into the study of the consciousness of a girl of adolescence so seriously that he achieved the feeling that his entire film was directed by such a fifteen-year-old girl – the level of directing, in any case, is appropriate (Dementiev, 1989: 3-6).

Just as strict (and, in our opinion, excessively and not always justifiably) to the works of famous Western screen masters of the second half of the 1980s, film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) also appeared on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*, literally defeating the Cannes and Oscar winners:

Too beautiful for you (Trop belle pour toi, 1989, special prize of the last Cannes Film Festival) – verbal fights, erotic fun, female perseverance and male impotence. An ironic self-parody by the fifty-year-old Frenchman Bertrand Blier.

Sex, Lies and Video movie (1989, Grand Prix of the same festival): male impotence and female perseverance, erotic fun, verbal fights. Touching narcissism of a young American Steven Soderbergh.

Pelle the Conqueror (Pelle Erobreren, 1987, Oscar for the best foreign film in 1988) by the Dane Bille August is a large novel form, heavy construction, intense directing, barely holding the crumbling material in his hands.

The Last Emperor (1987, Oscar for the best film in 1987) by the Italian Bernardo Bertolucci is a cumbersome novel form, tense construction, heavy directing, holding collapsing material to the limit of possibility.

And again you are convinced how dangerous it is to form an opinion about a picture based on what you hear, without seeing it. I recall the recent enthusiasm of our critics, addressed to the winner of the West Berlin Festival in 1989 *Rain Man (1988)*, American Barry Levinson, but after watching the movie, I lower my hands, initially ready for a storm of applause. Before me is more than traditional cinema, rather conventional, overly theatrical, plot monotonous, and even the brilliant actor Dustin Hoffman seemed to me this time only a hypocrite, masterfully playing sketches on a given theme and striving for technical perfection, not supported by internal obsession. One feels he is also tired (Dmitriev, 1989: 10-11).

However, V. Dmitriev treated many Western films that were deprived of such significant film prizes even more strictly:

How many pleasant words could be read in the foreign press in connection with the black comedy of the Englishman Peter Greenaway, *Drowning by Numbers (1988)*! And at first you really look with pleasure. And then such boredom, such self-satisfaction, such dissolute literaryism creep out onto the screen that even individual successful finds do not want to be attributed to noticeable merits.

I believe that the Englishman Ken Russell (born in 1927) has the right to shoot erotic episodes in the film *The Rainbow (1989)* using the old man's peeping method with pressure and barely restrained pleasure. But to be honest, it is absolutely incomprehensible to me why the American Phil Kaufman (born much later) uses the same method in his *The Unbearable Lightness of Being (1988)*, turning a very serious movie into a political-sexual show with long tricks of very dubious taste, which, having appeared on the screen, begin to rapidly live an independent life and require that they pay much more attention to them than is required by the logic of the development of the action. And if we add to this the fact that, defusing the situation, the director lubricates the film with thick and deliberate sentimentality, then one of the generally recognized sensations of the festival does not seem to me a sensation at all (Dmitriev, 1989: 10-11).

Almost equally pessimistic was the article by film critic V. Kichin, devoted to the analysis of films presented at the Berlin Film Festival in 1991:

In the movie *House of Smiles (La casa del sorriso, 1990)* by Marco Ferreri, who went out to receive the Golden Bear, does not resemble the author of *La Grande Bouffe (1973)* or *Dillinger (Dillinger è morto, 1968)*, who is now certainly "dead". The film breathes the energy of a paraplegic, and received the prize, according to the jury, for the totality of the master's contribution to cinema.

Sentence (La condanna, 1990). Special Jury Prize. Marco Bellocchio in recent years fell ill with mysticism and devilry. ... Panther-like divas from erotic visions finished off the audience, the film went under the friendly laughter of the audience, and the jury that handed him the "silver" was booted.

Dances with Wolves (1990). Kevin Costner (producer, director and lead actor) was named best director at the Golden Globes in Hollywood. And all this for a picturesque western on a grand scale, where each plot move is guessed in half an hour. Of course, the panoramas of South Dakota are amazing. Of course, the bison shake the hall with a stereotype. Of course, in every frame there is a humane idea of rapprochement between peoples and civilizations. But this is a product of the assembly line, not insight.

The Russia House (1990). The first big-budget American film shot in 'real Russia'. Sean Connery against the backdrop of Moscow cathedrals is impressive. Michelle Pfeiffer, filming in the USSR, experienced first hand the charms of our democracy and even went on strike in solidarity with the Soviet members of the film crew, who, according to our rules, cannot eat with the Americans and must swallow their saliva. Having known reality, she perfectly played the Russian woman Katya, exhausted by the most humane system. Katya is hungry, but spiritual. The hero Connery is full, but in love with Russian literature, temples, and then with Katya. Love is slightly hindered by the fact that he was sent here on a special mission by the Russian Department of the British Secret Service. ... Nevertheless, the usual spreading cranberries came out ... (Kichin, 1991: 25-28).

Much more warmly V. Kichin spoke about the films *Journey of Captain Fracasse* (*Il Viaggio di capitano Fracassa*, 1990) by Ettore Scola ("the film is touching, evokes nostalgia for the beautiful tradition of the "travel novel"), *The Godfather Part III* (1990) by Francis Ford Coppola ("the best of the Don Corleone series. ... 161 minutes of the film passes like a moment ... A brilliantly designed intrigue ends with an episode in an opera that is not surpassed in editing skill") and Peter Weir's *Green Card* (1990) ("he has now shot an absolutely brilliant comedy ... An example of witty dialogue, impeccably funny positions and superbly played characters") (Kichin, 1991: 25-28).

At the same time, film critic T. Khlopyankina (1937-1991), which at the Moscow International Film Festival in 1991 the Soviet spectator, who, on the one hand, believes that we have "no sex", and on the other hand, is already pretty tired of the dull domestic screen half-heartedness, but believing that somewhere out there, in well-fed and prosperous countries, still there is a diverse, powerful, great cinema, whose characters live with passions that are not limited to the limits of the bunk, a powerful sexual volley fell. ... After countless scenes that showed us how men "fuck" with men, women with women, how a sister suffers from attacks of passion for her brother, how suddenly people who accidentally find themselves together in an elevator rush into each other's arms, and how they try put themselves in a state of combat readiness bored with each other spouses, discussing all the stages, as if at a reception with a sex therapist – after this festival marathon, which merged into some endless on-screen intercourse, one could really forget that the word "love" has many other connotations (Khlopyankina, 1991: 6-7).

Of course, such a situation at the Moscow Film Festival was absolutely impossible to imagine either in the 1950s – 1970s, or in the first half of the 1980s, when censorship there was, of course, not as strict as in mass Soviet film distribution, but still very strict.

But in general, especially in the late 1980s and at the turn of the 1990s, Western films that did not end up in the Soviet film distribution were evaluated in the magazine with an unprecedented degree of benevolence.

Thus, film critic A. Plakhov quite highly appreciated the artistic level of Francis Ford Coppola's *Rumble Fish* (1983) films shown at the Moscow Film Festival (here the director's subtle understanding of the possibilities of cinema was noted by him "its deep impact on the level of the viewer's subconscious") and *Good morning, Babylon* (*Good morning Babilonia*, 1987) Paolo and Vittorio Taviani (Plakhov, 1987: 20-21).

Film critic I. Rubanova (1933-2024) wrote that in the emotional drama of Francesca Arcebuggi *Toward Evening* (*Verso sera*, 1990) – the wind that calmed down by night, soft light, still sparse shadows – is poured into the very fabric of the film – quiet, discreet, to the point of modest asceticism. So gentlemen, fans of film fireworks – whether in the form of linguistic acrobatics or hummocks of plot incoherence – are asked not to worry (Rubanova, 1991: 7).

Film critic F. Andreev (1933-1998) noted that *Drugstore Cowboy* (1989) outwardly seems to be enclosed in traditional US cinema forms. The dashing four young drug addicts, using all sorts of tricks, every time avoiding police persecution, rob pharmacies. ... You soon become convinced that the creator of a serious psychological study needed the traditional plot schemes

of the first episodes as a kind of bait. What follows is a picture full of bitter and terrible generalizations of the “dehumanization of the heroes”, their gradual loss of the properties and qualities that until recently made four charming young people into people (Andreev, 1990: 28).

P. Almodovar's films *Matador* (1986) and *Tie me up! (¡Átame!)*, 1989) (Vetrova, 1991: 26), *Jacquot from Nantes (Jacquot de Nantes)*, 1991) Agnès Varda (Khlopyankina, 1991: 6-7).

And even the very ambiguous film by D. Jarman *The Garden* (1990) was interpreted on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* as an apocalyptic vision of the world ... Jarman is not embarrassed by arbitrariness, subjectivity, apparent randomness of images, as a result of the film they will make up a world of rare integrity, full of light and love, sublime and purifying. What is unique is that for all the author's bias, he never stoops to straightforward social or political criticism. ... A picture that puzzles with its structure and strikes with artistic power (Kuznetsov, 1991: 11).

And quite paradoxically “perestroika” in the magazine looked unrestrainedly enthusiastic review of the film franchise about the adventures of the superhero Rambo, which was recently cursed by the entire Soviet press: “They scared us for eight years. And he is really scary when he makes a face, shaking his machine gun. And so – well, the sweetest person! Bad luck for John Rambo. Worn out by our videos and hammered by international observers, he finally broke through with his machine gun into the horizon of our domestic screen. Ronald Reagan himself at one time gave patronage to the movie hero, appreciating his merits in the fight against “godless communism.” And we, tormented by a cruel inferiority complex, could not then interpret his adventures otherwise than “damage to the military and ideological power of the USSR.” ... Meanwhile, in the film by Ted Kotcheff *First Blood* (1982) (then there were *Rambo II, III...*) the protagonist is initially presented not as a predator, but as a victim (having returned from the war, the veteran meets the open hostility of the authorities and is forced to enter into war with them). His cruelty is not the sophistication of the villain, but a reaction to misunderstanding, the aggression of the defender. This is a man who has gone through the fire and water of Vietnam and, like a “green beret”, can do nothing more than kill, crawl on his belly, and complete a task” (Ageev, 1990: 15).

The radical perestroika changes of the late 1980s, accompanied by the invasion of video, led to the fact that in the *Soviet Screen* there was a heading “Videocompass”, which gave a brief analysis of notable Western films that, for various reasons, did not fall into the Soviet film distribution of the 1960s – 1980 -X. This column in 1989-1990 was written by film critics S. Kudryavtsev and A. Vyatkin.

At the same time, it was about both outstanding works of cinema and typical entertainment products.

In particular, S. Kudryavtsev, almost for the first time in the history of Soviet film criticism, gave a positive assessment of Bernardo Bertolucci's *Last Tango in Paris*, noting that he “belongs to a small number of films, the importance of which increases over time. The scandalous story of 1972 about his “explicit erotic scenes” prevented a lot of people from accepting and understanding *Last Tango in Paris*. ... Fans of porn pictures will certainly be disappointed: the film, one might say, is innocent in comparison; that comes across sometimes in the program of Moscow international film festivals, not to mention what is found on video cassettes. ... The director managed to catch and show in the most clear form the monstrous confusion that reigned then in the minds and moods of society” (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 30).

S. Kudryavtsev also highly appreciated another until recently absolutely inaccessible to ordinary Soviet viewers, the film *Casanova Fellini (Casanova di Fellini)*, 1976): side of his character's life. The witty fantasy of a great master deprives these scenes of rudeness and vulgarity, brings a sense of celebration, the triumph of love, freedom and liberation of the body and spirit (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 30).

Michelangelo Antonioni's classic masterpiece *Blow-up* (1966) also received, in our opinion, quite an adequate assessment: “Antonioni uses this story ... to create a parable about the unknowability of the world by man. Truth is hidden from the observer, as well as the boundary between illusion and reality. The theme of non-communicativeness, typical for M. Antonioni, of a person's inability to understand himself (and even more so, who is nearby) was transformed in *Blow-up* into a study of the philosophical problem of the relativity of human knowledge, which is content only with signs of things and events. The world here is a clownery, an illusory game in which everything is devoid of meaning and essence” (Kudryavtsev, 1989:

29).

Another winner of the Palme d'Or at the Cannes Film Festival, *Scarecrow*, 1973, was also highly appreciated: "The sober and impartial attitude of the filmmakers to reality does not contradict their kind, slightly sentimental completely dissimilar people who loiter like tumbleweeds and seem to respectable townfolk "scarecrows." The humanity and sincerity of the picture allow it to retain its charm and power of influence even today" (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 29).

It seems that it was quite rightly noted that the satirical parable *Being There* (1979) by Hal Ashby, which successfully "uses" the display of the surrounding eyes of a person, on the one hand, "not spoiled" by civilization, and on the other hand, is a pure "product of of the television era, gives a striking effect – the hero gives presidents and politicians advice that is unexpected for them, but for him natural and simple. The greatest achievement of the film is the brilliant, virtuosic performance of the role of the gardener by Peter Sellers (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 29).

S. Kudryavtsev called *Duel* (1971) by Steven Spielberg "a small masterpiece", where the director not only was able to inventively maintain tension throughout the plot, but accurately guessed the rare opportunity to create a philosophical parable about the impersonal, anonymous force of evil pursuing the ordinary a person, an "average American" (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 29).

S. Kudryavtsev also liked the screen version of the Broadway musical *Hair* (1979): "Perhaps it was the distance in time that allowed M. Forman to create not just a screen version of one of the first rock musicals, but a kind of portrait of a generation, a panorama of youth subculture 60 -s. The acute relevance of the topics covered in the performance (the Vietnam War, student unrest, the spontaneous revolt of the "hippie" movement) and the calculation of scandalous outrageousness (in one of the episodes completely naked actors appeared on the stage) in the film gave way to a bitter and sober look at the "prodigal children" America and America itself, lost in a world of violence, military psychosis, rampant unbridled permissiveness. M. Forman's evil satire on the "powerful ones", on the insane military ... did not really appeal to American viewers and critics. ... However, such an attitude aside, the film, it seems, cannot but admire the unrestrained imagination, the vivid imagery" (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 29).

Further, perhaps for the first time in the history of Soviet film criticism, two films by Andrzej Żuławski, *It's important to love* (*L'important c'est d'aimer*, 1974) and *Possession* (1981), received positive reviews. In fact, the plot, even tense, with elements of mysticism and detective story, is always for the director A. Żuławski only an excuse, a starting point. The action of his paintings suggests an expansive, metaphorical interpretation. The director gravitates towards the method of fantastic realism, towards the genre of the parable about "human passions". According to Żuławski, one brief moment of happiness justifies long torments, strife, the eternal and irreconcilable struggle of the male and female principles, the dramatic, and often tragic fight of one person with another and at the same time with himself. ... Żuławski is a philosopher of initially doomed passion, confusing situation of mutual attraction – repulsion of a man and a woman. ... an ambiguous, complex artist (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 29).

S. Kudryavtsev also claimed that the film *Tales of Ordinary Madness* (1981) by Marco Ferreri is full of inner subtlety and wit. The "pain of an artist" here is not just an image. The intense, unceasing search for inspiration, the joy of creativity is far from being as beautiful as its result (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 29).

But the boundless delight experienced by S. Kudryavtsev from watching the sensational drama Michael Cimino *The Deer Hunter* (1978) seems to us greatly exaggerated.

Apparently, in defiance of previous Soviet publications, in which this movie was subjected to well-founded ideological criticism (Yurenev, 1979: 19, and many others) S. Kudryavtsev, significantly simplifying and exaggerating the assessments of Soviet film critics of the older generation, decided, contrary to the plot and the author's concept of this movie, to try to inspire the readers of the Soviet Screen that "a large-scale saga about human destinies, which are mercilessly distorted by a senseless, useless war in Vietnam, our press accused of anti-Sovietism on the sole basis that some of the heroes were the children of emigrants from Russia, and in Vietnam American prisoners of war were mocked by playing "Russian roulette" (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 29).

Meanwhile, the main claims to the really professionally made *The Deer Hunter* in the same *Soviet Screen* of the 1970s were made quite different: "The just war that the heroic people

waged for forty years against the French and American imperialists is shown only in a monstrous episode where a Vietnamese blows up Vietnamese women and children. The Vietnamese woman is shown as a prostitute who is not ashamed of her own child. The Vietnamese are shown as a confused herd running after the American soldiers. And most importantly, the heroic Vietnamese warriors, whose courage and military prowess the Americans were given to experience to the full, are shown as fanatics torturing prisoners! .. The Vietnamese are shown as fanatics, executioners, and the American interventionists are innocent victims and invincible supermen" (Yurenev, 1979: 19).

S. Kudryavtsev's assessment of N. Oshima's scandalous film seems unjustifiably overpriced." *Corrida of Love (Empire of the Senses / L'empire des sens, 1976)*. Here, clearly overflowing with the "perestroika" impulse of "creative freedom", S. Kudryavtsev at that time "shockingly" wrote that "N. Oshima's film can make a shock impression, and not only on our viewers. The directorate of the Cannes Film Festival in 1976 did not dare to allow this film to participate in the competition precisely because of "obscenity". ... It took time to understand that there are no boundaries for true art, and these boundaries are set mainly by our moral prejudices. ... *Corrida of Love* is clearly not designed for one viewing. This is a profound exploration of the existential foundations of love, a philosophical analysis of the human personality and its limits, in particular the problem of the penetration of one individuality into another - at the edge of the abyss between life and death. In addition to this "European stratum" there is a specifically Japanese one: N. Oshima continued here his favorite theme of the collapse of national myths, rituals, ceremonies, codes of honor" (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 30).

Referring to the best examples of entertainment cinema, S. Kudryavtsev rightly singled out Steven Spielberg's *Raiders of the Lost Ark* (1981) as one of the best films of the adventure genre, striking with the richness of fiction, incredible stunts, and the unique use of all kinds of visual effects, computer technology. This is not only a story of dizzying adventures... but also a witty, subtle, intellectual parody of films of this genre (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 30).

Among science fiction films, *The Terminator* (1984) by James Cameron received a positive assessment: a wonderful example of tense non-stop action that does not let the viewer go literally for a second. ... The director accurately felt and sustained to the end the necessary rhythm and pace of action, showed remarkable imagination (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 29).

Another sci-fi film, *Blade Runner* (1982), was also highly acclaimed: R. Scott very subtly combines the style of a typical "black film" in the spirit of D. Hammett or R. Chandler with science fiction at a high level of technical complexity. ... R. Scott's film is a good example of a very interesting combination of a spectacular "action movie" with an entertaining intrigue, with a philosophical picture-reflection (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 30).

And Walter Hill's *48 hrs* (1982) was singled out from a wide range of police comedies, where the combination of a tense development of action with comic situations, tricks, gags can be defined as a "comic thriller" (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 30).

And again, too enthusiastically, in our opinion, the mystical *Rosemary's Baby* (1968) by Roman Polanski was evaluated. We can agree that Polanski "not only created a fashion for" screen demonism", opening with his work a whole direction of films about modern occultism, but brought European culture to the film, connected the mystical genre with centuries-old philosophical searches in literature ... paying special attention to the manifestations of the magical, otherworldly, diabolical world at the level of everyday life (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 31). But with the fact that "from this point of view, the film *Rosemary's Baby* is perfect" can probably be argued...

With certain reservations, S. Kudryavtsev also positively assessed other famous Western entertainment films: *Trading Places* (1983) by John Landis (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 29); *Blow Out* (1981) by Brian de Palma (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 29); *Robocop* (1987) by Paul Verhoeven (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 30); *The Omen* (1976) by Richard Donner and *Back to the Future* (1985) by Robert Zemeckis (Kudryavtsev, 1989: 31).

Whereas such secondary entertainment movies as *Cobra* (1986), *Xtro* (1983), *Class of 1984* (1982), *Salon Kitty* (1975), *King Solomon's Mines* (1985), *Police Academy* (1984) and others deservedly received negative ratings (Kudryavtsev, 1989, 29-30).

Analyzing the "Bondiana" that was recently mercilessly criticized by the Soviet press, film critic A. Vyatkin suggested that the readers of the *Soviet Screen* recall its plot scheme, which passes from film to film: 1. The enemy is a maniac who claims to rule the world or, at worst, to

unleash a new world war. 2. Technique – on the verge of fantasy, the enemy – titanic, Bond – miniaturized. 3. Beauty – of all nationalities, colors of hair and skin, and none can resist the charm of James. 4. Plein air – like on tourist postcards. And finally. 5. Irony, parody, play – all this gives lightness to the most cumbersome inventions and reduces the drama of the most cruel fights (Vyatkin, 1990: 30-31).

In general, we can agree that accusing Bond of dislike for the USSR is like accusing a fairytale knight fighting dragons of dislike for the animal world. Bond fights a Stereotype of the Enemy - during the Cold War, and during times of détente, his opponents often do not have a specific citizenship and a specific nationality. These are either maniacs-"Bonapartes" or agents of the fictitious organization SPEKTR (Vyatkin, 1990: 30-31).

Further, A. Vyatkin, also without ideological pathos, introduced the readers of the *Soviet Screen* to the *Star Wars* franchise, reasonably noting that until recently, we associated the expression "star wars" not with cinema, but with the arms race. It is to be hoped that now *Star Wars* has forever occupied the only worthy place for them – on the screen (Vyatkin, 1990: 28-29).

Reflecting on the film adaptations of Stephen King's novels, A. Vyatkin wrote that King's fear is spilled in everyday life, among cars and computers, electric stoves and typewriters. His heroes are not only vampires and werewolves, but above all telepaths and psychics. Fear, according to King, inspires us not with a mysterious past, but with a threatening future, the sprouts of which are in our today ... King hits on sore points – social, political, environmental. But he does not paint global catastrophes. The horror of a single human soul is much more impressive, the writer believes (Vyatkin, 1990: 28-29).

In the same 1990, A. Vyatkin decided to review Hollywood horror films. First, he recalled that not so long ago, the horror film genre was one of the lures of the rotten West, along with chewing gum and rock music. Today we chew our own gum, and listen to our own rock, and films, as the audience complains, "are getting worse and worse" (Vyatkin, 1990: 30-31).

And then, turning to the analysis of three famous franchises: *Friday the 13th*, *A Nightmare on Elm Street* and *Poltergeist*, Andrey Vyatkin wrote that the main reason for success with the audience is win-win use of the main factor of the "horror movie". This is the so-called "suspense", tension, that is, the viewer experiences a feeling of fear not so much at the sight of something terrible as in anticipation of it. Conventional tricks – disturbing music, the sound of steps, the creak of a door, a creeping shadow – always work flawlessly, causing an increased heartbeat (Vyatkin, 1990: 30-31). To this, as the film critic correctly noted, an element of irony was often added.

Articles about the problems of distribution of foreign films in the USSR and about the "video boom"

The first "swallow" in which the situation of film distribution of foreign films in the USSR was sharply criticized was a sensational article by journalist Y. Geiko (Geiko, 1985) in *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, published in the fall of 1985. The Soviet film press, controlled by the USSR Goskino, then kept silent.

However, in May 1986, the fifth, so-called "revolutionary" Congress of filmmakers took place (from which, in fact, an active film restructuring began) and the subsequent meeting of the new secretariat of the USSR filmmakers, at which the *Soviet Screen* was criticized.

Against the backdrop of the weakening positions of the USSR State Film Agency and its then head F. Yermash (1923-2002), the editors of the magazine, in an attempt to rehabilitate themselves, published an article by film critic O. Sulkin "Only for sale?.. Polemical notes on the rental of foreign films", where it was noted, that a number of Western films that were released in the Soviet film distribution in the mid-1980s are designed "for the most undemanding taste" and even contain "justification for immorality": "Alas, in the distribution policy, there has recently been a more and more tangible bias towards films that are artistically untenable and ideologically flawed representing not even the second, but, so to speak, the third and fourth echelons of Western "mass culture". Let's not underestimate the harm they cause. After all, they teach the viewer, especially the young one, to the fact that cinema is not an art, that the perception of the film does not require any spiritual work, that it is like a dessert, a sweet pie that should be eaten quickly and immediately forgotten. It's easy to get used to film chewing gum, but it's much more difficult to get used to it. That is probably why many works that require a little bit of mental stress are not perceived, which is why there is a "discrepancy" with serious

films. "Mass culture" deforms the value orientations of the individual, and sociologists and social scientists speak about this with concern. The harm is that for other viewers who do not fully realize that they are dealing with a fantasy world of "white phones", such film illusions often serve as a way of knowing the Western way of being. He looks at one such surrogate, another, and comes to the conclusion: all of them are millionaires, at the worst, half-millionaires; there is no life there, but paradise, blue or pink" (Sulkin, 1986: 10).

As necessary measures to correct this situation, it was proposed to put a decisive barrier to films that are empty, vulgar, tasteless, glorifying, sometimes openly, sometimes in the subtext, the notorious bourgeois values (Sulkin, 1986: 10).

And here, quite in the spirit of the traditional Soviet film criticism approaches of previous decades, it was emphasized that it was necessary to "give the green light" to "socially significant films, works in the credits of which appear the names of masters of world cinema art" (Sulkin, 1986: 10), although it was stipulated that foreign films of entertainment genres "in their best examples, we need in our "time of stress and passion" (Sulkin, 1986: 10).

Further, O. Sulkin touched upon in his article the problem of censorship cuts in Western films that were released in the Soviet film distribution, and gave a rather impressive list of masterpieces of the world screen that never made it to the Soviet mass film distribution ...

In one of his following articles in the *Soviet Screen*, O. Sulkin clarified his position on the topic of film distribution: "The main conclusion is as indisputable as it is banal: we go to foreign cinema mainly to have fun. We love to be entertained with quality, and we are very indignant at hack work. And then he pointed out the need to straighten a quivering doe from a rolling cart, that is, difficult, complicated films. Let her out of financial difficulties be taken out by a strong, full of energy horse of a sharp plot and bright entertainment available to millions. ... But [films that are difficult for a mass audience] should be delicately and cleverly screened separately, in parallel or in clubs... In the system of differentiated distribution, they will definitely find their grateful audience" (Sulkin, 1987: 18-19).

Shortly after the first of O. Sulkin's articles cited above, the editors of the *Soviet Screen* returned to the topic of Western film distribution in the USSR, asking the then head of the repertoire planning and film distribution department of the Main Directorate of Film Production and Film Distribution of the USSR Goskino L. Veraksa.

In his response, L. Veraksa tried (in our opinion, very unconvincingly) to get around all the sharp corners of the problem, concentrating the attention of the magazine's readers on the imminent release of several films by "famous masters of Western cinema" (F. Truffaut, S. Lumet) into Soviet distribution and box office films *Spartacus* (1960) S. Kubrick, *It's a Mad, Mad, Mad, Mad World* (1963) S. Kramer, *Italian Divorce (Divorzio all'italiana)*, (1961) P. Germi, *Great maneuvers (Les Grandes manoeuvres)*, (1955) R. Clair (Veraksa, 1986: 3).

Continuing the discussion about the system of Soviet film distribution, film critic S. Lavrentiev recalled that "there is a department for editing and dubbing foreign films in the Main Directorate of Film and Film Distribution. From the name it is clear what is preferred here, what comes first, but this does not bother anyone. It would never occur to anyone to ask: why do you need to "edit" foreign films at all? Such a question, obviously, seems blasphemous to the authorities. How could it be, after all, this is a tradition, and an old one at that!.. "Our Soviet viewer does not need this" – this is the main slogan of the work of the "editors". Armed with it, uncles and aunts with scissors withdraw episodes, characters, entire storylines from purchased films..." (Lavrentiev, 1987: 21).

Further, S. Lavrentiev drew attention to the fact that often not film critics and historians wrote about Western cinema in the Soviet press, but political observers, staff correspondents of newspapers and magazines, who, on duty, are forced to stay in the bourgeois world for a long time, but at the same time they often make amateurish mistakes, confusing the names of directors and actors and reporting other false information (Lavrentiev, 1987: 19).

The same film critic also recalled another unpleasant Soviet tradition of the press, this time "cancelling", hushing up this or that foreign cinematic figure: "Yves Montand has ceased to be sympathetic to our country – forget about the *Pay for Fear!* Simone Signoret made unfriendly remarks – no *Thérèse Raquin!* ... In this absurdity it is easy to trace a peculiar logic. Since almost any foreign filmmaker can, if desired, find a film or a statement that bureaucratically should be qualified as "hostile", on the basis of this "point" one can constantly narrow the repertoire of the cinema (Lavrentiev, 1988: 20).

A kind of response to the articles by O. Sulkin and S. Lavrentiev was a conversation organized by the *Soviet Screen* of the director of the *Soyuzkinofond* A. Wesker, the head of the department for editing and duplicating films G. Inozemtsev and the former head of this department G. Bogolepov.

G. Inozemtsev hastened to reassure the readers of the *Soviet Screen*: Editing does not mean 'cutting' films. Such judgments come from ignorance of our profession. In his article, S. Lavrentiev gives examples of 15 years ago... These movies have not been in the box office for a long time, and there are no people who crippled them. So the pathos of the article is turned rather into the past...

A. Wesker added to the words of his colleague: The reductions were provided for by a standard contract for the purchase of films by capitalist countries. The Main Directorate of Film Production and Film Distribution was instructed: To make changes and cut films in accordance with the requirements of the Soviet screen without changing the meaning and content of the film. Why did you have to shorten the movies? One of the most significant is the shortage of film. Because of him, it happened at one time to release color paintings in black and white. Many episodes were cut if there was violence and pornography: their propaganda is prohibited by our Constitution. Unfortunately, there were also abbreviations that destroyed the meaning of the works, their artistic fabric (Quoted by: [Nenasheva, 1987: 21-22](#)).

Film critic A. Erokhin (1954-2000) also wrote about the problems of film distribution in his characteristic ironic and mocking manner. He recalled how the Soviet audience, like a little boy, for many decades "they tirelessly frightened with the predatory jaws of an unknown man-eating shark - with taste, they frightened on a large scale, so that even in Serebryany Bor it was scary to go into the water. Thanks to all the same kind uncles, departmental miracle heroes who defeated this movie monster even on the distant approaches to our territorial waters. And desperate hand-to-hand combat with bad King Kong! Only shreds flew from a primate alien to us. "There are sharks in Africa, gorillas in Africa... Don't go, children, to walk in Africa!" ... And indeed: why lure into your cinema networks, picking up a reasonable price with a creak, representatives of their products are known, if they can be dealt with alone (after an intimate date in some secluded corner like Cannes or Venice) our valiant plenipotentiary taster in suede jacket, riddled with all sorts of *Godfathers*, our unbending exerciser, cheerfully exorcising the devil from the world's movie screen, which came into his field of vision on duty, which is "both dangerous and difficult." The plenipotentiary to this, of course, and the cards in hand: he is an initiate, after all, he knows both Fellini and Bergman, and Kubrick and Coppola like the back of his hand, and so sensibly stated everything about them in books with harsh titles, that in the films themselves the boy has just no longer needed.

A convenient system, the boy thought: now I'll buy guidebooks and I don't have to go anywhere, and if I also get a cookbook, I can do without a grocery store with a restaurant. This boy grew up and received the proud name of a "mass viewer", causing the quiet tenderness of film distributors because of his understandability and understanding" ([Erokhin, 1987: 3](#)).

As can be seen from this text, without naming specific names and surnames, the relatively young at that time film critic Alexei Erokhin rather caustically walked through the "elite", "ideologically consistent" film critics of the older generation (V. Baskakov, G. Kapralov, A. Karaganov, R. Yurenev and others), who regularly visited key Western film festivals, and, consequently, who then had the exclusive right to share their impressions of the films they saw there (inaccessible to the mass Soviet audience) in the Soviet press in the "correct way".

In the same 1987, a completely sensational event took place on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*: in the December issue, an article by film critic V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) was published under the defiant title "Let's talk about erotica", and even accompanied by a photograph, where depicted, albeit rather modestly presented, but still a naked female body.

In his article, V. Dmitriev dared to break the taboo that had been held in the USSR for many decades, and declared the right of Soviet viewers to watch erotic films.

To "accelerate", V. Dmitriev began with a horror film, the beloved child of fighters against cinematic infection on the ideological front": , a mystical picture, although depending on the position of the author, it can be pathological and mystical, and a movie with monsters – fabulous, folklore, literary ([Dmitriev, 1987: 20](#)).

And then it was about the right of Soviet viewers to watch erotic episodes that have a plot and semantic character in the pictures (eroticism, used solely to raise the commercial potential

of the picture, and we will not discuss pornography: their inadmissibility on our screens, I think, doubts does not cause). We are unlikely to achieve anything if we oppose [cinema erotica] sexless cinema and the sterile "purity" of relationships constructed in the silence of studio offices. And we can expect success if, calling on the help of the traditions of art, discarding cowardice and hypocrisy, we offer the audience high eroticism, which is high because it is based on morality. ... I vote for the right of our viewer to see on the screen the beauty of not only the soul, but also the human body. The term "eroticism" must finally be stripped of its veil of ambiguous mystery (Dmitriev, 1987: 20-21).

It is logical that this article (as well as previous articles about film distribution) caused a storm of opposite emotions among the readers of the *Soviet Screen*, many of whom later wrote letters to the editors of the magazine and personally to film critic V. Dmitriev.

Here are just a few quotes from readers' letters cited on the pages of the magazine:

"What would be the style of our museums if some "guardian of morality" had the idea to dress or smash the sculptures of Rodin, cut or paint over the "shameful places" on the canvases of Rubens?" (Y. Chernenko).

"Why do they decide for us: what we can watch and what we can't?" (A. Popov).

"Thanks for your article! I thought I would not live to see the years when they finally talk about erotica with respect".

"And you are talking about erotica! Disgusting to read! Let's talk about promiscuity! How can you not be ashamed? I despise you after that!" (A. Ovcharenko).

"Someone is rooting for production, another is struggling with various negative phenomena, but V. Dmitriev will now fight to ensure that there are as many naked women and sex scenes on our screen as possible" (O. Marfenko).

It is interesting that the readers, who bravely fought against sex on the screen, supported in many ways in his sarcastic feuilleton "Where is the sex? I don't see sex!", published in the newspaper *Soviet Culture*, journalist E. Grafov (Grafov, 1988).

Film expert V. Dmitriev decided to answer the readers. At first he noted that he was surprised by "the degree of frankness, enthusiastic or hostile, disproportionate, in my opinion, with a very modest task of publication", and then once again emphasized that cinematic "high erotica" is still not "artistically executed sexual acts", but the situation of the transition of sex from the biological to the spiritual, that state of sensual delight, which is familiar to any loving couple and which is a constant subject of depiction in art" (Dmitriev, 1988: 20-21).

One of the authors of these lines also joined this discussion: "I have long been convinced that filmmakers are very well aware of the real audience demand. ... for the sake of financial gain, they are ready to release in all cinemas without exception any picture that contradicts their views and aesthetic tastes. They just know the "market" well: what is interesting today and what is not interesting to the audience. As for erotic films, they are also different. And I don't think, for example, that after watching F. Zeffirelli's beautiful and sentimental erotic melodrama *Endless Love* (1981), bad inclinations will wake up in young viewers. And the beautiful erotic scenes in the films of L. Visconti, M. Jancsó, F. Mazelli? Undoubtedly, in other paintings – by I. Bergman, M. Ferreri, P.P. Pasolini, D. Makaveev, the sexual sphere of human life is sometimes given in harsh manifestations. So what, to deprive these works of any significance, to brand them with "darkness"? Another thing is that these films are not designed for children and viewers with weak nerves ... And everyone is already tired of the bans – both viewers and filmmakers. ... The spring festival of Italian films in Moscow was held without full houses and queues. I remember that at one of the "stagnant" festivals, crowds of spectators who dreamed of "breaking through" to Fellini's *Sweet Life* were held back almost by mounted police. And in April of this year, in the capital's cinemas, where, in addition to *La Dolce Vita* (1960), there were *Satyricon* (1969), *City of Women (La Città delle donne)*, 1980) and *Casanova* (1976), there were many empty seats ... Here you have the "forbidden" erotica in Fellini's films. Many viewers prefer the spicy clarity of *Emmanuelle* to his whimsical and ambiguous fantasy. However, why be surprised here – with the help of video, our viewers, who were sitting on a starvation ration, enter into a situation of choice that is normal for the rest of the world. Each of us chooses what he can do without, and what he can't do without..." (Fedorov, 1990: 10).

Film critic A. Plakhov continued the discussion about the "forbidden film fruit" on the pages of the *Soviet Screen*: "For the third year now, I have been watching how our domestic erotic business is getting on its feet. At first, only a naked female bust could be seen on calendars

and posters, then tender buttocks, and now the most cherished frontal projection. So the title of the notorious novel *All Ahead*, imbued with a sacred horror of the power of pornography, turned out to be prophetic. They say that this is supposedly erotica, and pornography in our rule of law state is prohibited by law ... This, of course, can be consoled, forgetting for a moment that laws are powerless in front of the underlying springs that guide the course of life. ... All peoples who were lucky enough to taste the taste of totalitarianism are also familiar with its aftertaste, expressed in the suppression of normal sexuality, driven into the framework of rigid taboos. Religious precepts and national shrines, political doctrines and state-family moral codes were called to help. But the oppressed erotic energy, breaking through in underground ugly outbursts, was accumulating for a big explosion. It was experienced by Italy after Mussolini, and Spain after Franco, and Japan, which ceased to be a samurai reserve ... But the erotic boom fades faster than the generation that provoked it has time to grow old. And the faster, the more unconditionally the freedom granted to him. ... You might think that Western society is de-erotizing. Nothing happened. It simply passes into the next stage, when sex ceases to be a subject of public excitement, it becomes an individual affair of each person, free to choose any form of sexual behavior, except for violence. Violence is suppressed not only direct, but also indirect – psychological. Aggressive sexuality in magazines, on television, in films is not so much censored as localized, limited in circulation and distribution methods. ... On the other hand, we are afraid to hurt the feelings of the elderly and give the young what they should not be deprived of by definition – youth erotic films. In the West they are produced in abundance, they are not at all expensive to buy, and many of them are not in bad taste at all. These films are not vulgar, they are not "heavy porn" and could serve to increase the erotic culture of our youth. And maybe not only her" (Plakhov, 1991: 25-26).

At the turn of the 1990s, another article by film critic S. Lavrentiev was published in the *Soviet Screen*, where he summed up the results of the short campaign of the USSR Goskino to release some masterpieces of Western cinematography: An attempt to systematically familiarize the Soviet audience with the greatest achievements of world cinema, undertaken at the dawn of film perestroika, can, apparently, be considered complete. Our audience saw Fellini and Kurosawa, Renoir and Clair, Coppola and Foreman.. Well, that's enough! Cinematography has entered the era of self-financing. You need to make money, you have to buy commerce abroad. After all, people don't really look at masterpieces. While *Seven Samurai* is playing in the empty halls of our largest cinemas in the world, the box office of video salons is filling up, offering the people works like *Go, girl, take off your clothes* (Lavrentiev, 1990: 27-28).

But on the other hand, by the end of the 1980s, a system of "pirated" video rentals and private video viewings of recently banned Western film products arose in the USSR. Film critic S. Kudryavtsev wrote in 1988 that "you can't pretend all the time that the contingent of VCR owners is insignificant! ... Let's say roughly that there are 5-7 million video viewers in the country. ... But now, thanks to the "parallel" rental, the viewers also receive such outstanding films that were previously blatantly classified as pornographic, such as L. Bunuel's *Beauty of the Day*, B. Bertolucci's *Last Tango in Paris*, M. Ferreri's *Big Grub*, *Casanova* by F. Fellini, all films by P.P. Pasolini, starting with *The Decameron*; *The Night Porter* by L. Cavani, *Empire of the Senses* by N. Oshima. And the viewer can now cleanse them himself of the husk that has stuck to them because of the preconceived interpretations of the prudes of art" (Kudryavtsev 1988: 22).

In addition, it turned out that it was at this time that "documents similar to the Methodological Recommendations of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs appeared in the USSR, in which films falling under articles 228 and 2281 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR (and corresponding to them in the Criminal Code of other republics) include such films of world classics, as *Last Tango in Paris*, *Beauty of the Day*, *The Godfather* or *Once Upon a Time in America* (Bolezni..., 1988: 16-17).

As V. Borev and A. Morozov wrote, such articles of the Criminal Code dealt with responsibility for distribution or storage for the purpose of distribution of objects of a pornographic nature, in particular video films, on the basis of which some Soviet video amateurs received real prison terms (Borev , Morozov, 1989: 22-23).

A milder measure to combat the "wrong" Western videos was their confiscation from Soviet citizens at customs inspections: in 1988, more than 80,000 video cassettes with recordings were checked at the country's customs when entering the USSR. About 9 thousand of them were confiscated (Morozov, 1989: 19).

In 1989, on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* was published a document entitled "Methodological recommendations for article 228 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR on the conduct of art criticism examinations of photo-film and television production", developed by several candidates of art history, philosophical and medical sciences (Podsydimy..., 1989: 15, 29).

In these recommendations, the following signs of pornographic films were defined: Auto-attribution is the assignment of a film by its creators or distributors to the "x" category (porn). The anonymity of the filmmakers, the lack of a list of performers. Use of pseudonyms to refer to performers and directors. Significant features include the inherent value of showing sex scenes outside of any artistic task: the main screen time is devoted to showing in a naturalistic form of copulation; the absence of the concept of the film and the artistic principles of its construction; as a rule, the lack of plot, intrigue, context; purely conditional connection of individual scenes and episodes; detailed development and predominant use of close-ups and directional lighting, direct shooting angles when showing scenes of sexual intercourse (Podsydimy..., 1989: 15, 29).

The editorial staff of the *Soviet Screen* magazine reacted ironically to these methodological recommendations: The description of the examination technology itself is of particular admiration. A picture is vividly drawn in the imagination: priests in white coats, sitting in easy chairs around a video recorder, look at various sexual acts "frame by frame" all day long, strictly comparing them with a "control group of artistic images", making sure that no more is seen than at Resting Venus - well, at the very least, at the very least - so that the video characters behave no more cheekily than the Romans of the Decline. Wow job! (Podsydimy..., 1989: 15, 29).

But the Soviet video amateurs sent on the basis of this kind of "expertise" probably had no time for irony ...

For example, in 1985, two video amateurs were convicted by the Leninsky People's Court of the city of Yaroslavl under Article 228 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR "for distributing pornography." The fact of the "distribution" of two videos: *Papaya*, *The Adventures of a Taxi Driver* and a *Plumber*, which the local expert commission recognized as pornographic, was established. My friends served their time – one and a half, the other two years (Pinsky, 1990: 24-25).

In addition, cases were recorded when a criminal case was opened for the demonstration and possession of so-called "anti-Soviet" films (KGB ..., 1990: 22-23).

However, the situation with video viewing changed very quickly in the USSR. Here is what film critic A. Zorky (1935-2006) wrote about this in 1991: "In the old village ..., next to the ruined Church of the Epiphany, there is a cinema, videos are playing: *Mad Max*, *Love Boarding House* (only for adults!), etc., erotica, adventure, horror. Here, film distribution services are practically dispensed with. Provincial grimaces? But even in the metropolitan cinema "Meeting" on the Garden Ring, formerly an elite one, famous for its brilliant repertoire ... now there are commercial video programs, only the first screening at 9.20 is given "for blazir" and an empty hall to some Soviet film. Today, for example, all day "Fanny Hill" (USA, erotica) with a moronic alert: "Children under 18 years old are not allowed". But back to Ples. On its compact cinema sites (4,500 residents plus tens of thousands of vacationers), a kind of battle between cinema and video takes place. Today, with Matveev's *Cup of Patience* competed *Love Passion and Ecstasy* and *Girls on Wheels*... Further more. Everything you want to know about sex, *Love by subscription*, *Queen of the Barbarians* (everything was honorary, the fourth category of "sexual complexity") was played in the video salon ... today you can burst from the belly" (Zorky, 1991: 18-19).

In the same 1991, film critic O. Goryachev echoed Andrei Zorky: "Video is seriously crowding cinema. He has something to offer the viewer. Another question is where these treasures come from. ... While we do not have a properly functioning box office, it was piracy that first provided our world's most disadvantaged viewer with the opportunity to choose. ... What genres are leading? – You still need to name the champions. The most popular genre so far is erotica. Erotic movies go wherever the owners want to squeeze the maximum profit out of their establishment, because erotica today is one hundred percent sold out. Full house in any situation and at any time of the day. In the video salon at the Moscow *Art Cinema*, for example, they start at ten: the box office opens at half past nine, and by noon there are no tickets. And so month after month. "We had different films," they say here, "but the erotic ones last the longest: they played the *Greek Fig Tree* (*Griechische Feigen*, 1976), for three months, now the *Wild*

Orchid has entered the third month. And they add, lowering their eyes: "The men are knocking down the shaft, they almost demolish the doors." ... This is in the center of Moscow. And how many of these mini-pornosalonchikov huddle in different corners. Their posters are designed, in my opinion, for an exciting effect. Here is one that I rewrote in a working hostel: Video salon "Success": 10.00 – 11 days, 11 nights. 12.0 – *Sex Star*. 14.0 – *Insatiable wife*. 16.0 – *Bangkok sex*. 18.0 – *Turkish fruit*. 20.0 – 6 Swedes on the island of Ibiza. 22.0 – optional. It is not difficult to imagine what this desire will be. There is no shortage of those who wish themselves" (Goryachev, 1991: 26-27).

Film scholar and culture expert K. Razlogov (1946-2021) argued with O. Goryachev on *Screen*: I will begin with a statement that may seem paradoxical: we know nothing about the video repertoire in our country. It only seems that the situation is insanely simple. All we have to do is use the "commercialization" picklock and we will get an unambiguous answer. One such answer is offered by my young colleague in the pages of this journal. He imagines that Satan "rules the ball" with the help of erotica and pornography. I categorically disagree: there is no pornography in video salons and video libraries at all. Perhaps it is shown clandestinely or, as in the rest of the world, it is preferred to be viewed at home. I am not one of those who consider this a criminal offense - I think that human curiosity about one's own nature is quite natural and should not be persecuted. But I repeat: knowing that there is an article in the penal code, pornography is not shown openly.

As for erotica, I don't think it prevails either. ... I don't think I would be wrong to say that it takes up less than a third of the repertoire.

But that's where the most curious thing comes in. Indeed, which erotic films (there are hundreds if not thousands of them) are the most popular with our viewers? At the first stage of the video business development this question could be answered more or less unambiguously. The most popular films were simply the first ones that caught our eye. An example of that was the famous *Greek fig tree* (*Griechische Feigen*, 1976), which for a while became an absolute bestseller on Russian video screens, and then ... American *Nine ½ Weeks* (1985)...

Let's look around and try to figure out what the structure of the rest of the non-erotic repertoire is. I don't think it would be wrong to say that American adventure films make up the lion's share of it. ... And, perhaps, the most important thing. In all current projects for creating a system of censorship and combating video piracy, one should always keep in mind that the elimination of the created video system is not only impossible in principle, but can also have fatal consequences from the point of view of cultural development. It is not necessary to demand bans, but to carry out persistent work to legalize the video market. If its repertoire expands, if critics regularly and skillfully write about video production, maybe someday in the future everything that happens in this very specific area will finally take civilized forms (Razlogov, 1991: 27).

A curious consequence of the Soviet video boom at the turn of the 1990s was the mass production of video catalogs, carelessly, with a huge number of errors, compiled by anonymous amateurs. One of the authors of these lines also wrote about this peculiar phenomenon on the pages of *Soviet Screen* (Fedorov, 1990: 22).

Articles about international film festivals and weeks of foreign cinema in the USSR and reviews of Western national cinemas

During the "Perestroika" period in the *Soviet Screen* there were radical changes in the articles about international film festivals. Firstly, the usual scheme of the past decades was violated, when among the films shown at foreign festivals, "progressive works of cinematography" were singled out and the rest were sharply criticized. And secondly, the circle of "travelling" film critics has changed: "ideologically consistent" film critics and international journalists of the older generation have been replaced by film critics of a "perestroika" orientation.

Of course, this did not happen immediately. For example, in an article by film critic N. Savitsky about the Karlovy Vary Film Festival in 1986, the ideological rules of the game in the presentation of the material were traditional: he praised the anti-war drama Bill Bennett *A Street to Die* (1985) and *Rosa Luxemburg* (1985) by Margaret von Trotta for revolutionary pathos and for the main "dignity – the image of the main character, unusually reliable and truly humane, completely devoid of "textbook gloss" (Savitsky, 1986: 20-21).

But already in the article of the film critic and film critic V. Demin (1937-1993), devoted to

the West Berlin Film Festival, a departure from the previous ideological stereotypes was indicated. For example, it was emphasized that the West Berlin fest the main thing in character is reasonable efficiency. It was conceived not as a festival, but as an important cultural event, and then there was an analysis of the competition films, without any division into “progressive” and “reactionary” ones (Demin, 1987: 20-21).

There was no criticism of bourgeois cinema in the report of film critic F. Andreev (1933-1998) from the 1988 Munich Film Festival (Andreev, 1988: 20-21).

And in the even more “perestroika” year of 1989 also film critic F. Andreev joyfully corresponded to the *Soviet Screen* from America: “Thank God, the time of tenacious, commonplace stereotypes has passed. ... I only went to three very different screenings of the long American summer. My friends joked that you can live the whole year practically without leaving the cinema, taking a break from viewing only during flights from one city to another. There is a lot of truth in this joke. Several dozen film festivals are held in the United States every year. Some of them deservedly won international fame” (Andreev, 1989: 28-29).

In 1989, the last censorship barriers at the Moscow International Film Festival practically disappeared. Due with which film critic Andrei Dementiev (1957-2023) described one of the sexual innovations of this festival as follows: “No, of course, it’s wonderful that dogmas and stereotypes are collapsing. Only here you sometimes wonder at yourself: they collapse, collapse, but something still does not dry out. How many have accumulated there! ... Here is another one. I sit in a crowded festival hall and watch the American avant-garde short film *Hermes Bird*, that is, for ten minutes

I watch the full process of erection, shot in close-up in rapid motion and in profile so that you can see it better. And on a dark background, so that nothing random distracts from the main content. Vague verses are spoken behind the scenes, something about closeness to nature, about the unity of all principles – I didn’t make out, I was carried away by the main content. And after all, what is interesting: if I watched something like that at someone’s house on video, I probably would not have paid attention, I would have forgotten right there - after all, anything can be seen on the video. Here, the very situation struck me, the very idea that this is being shown today at the Moscow International Film Festival. Here is the stereotype for you: “This is not allowed at our Soviet festival” (Dementiev, 1989: 3-6).

In the same 1989 in Moscow was organized retrospective of American erotic films. At the same time, there were almost no complaints about obscenity ... But disappointment was strongly felt that in most of the films the promised “strawberry” was not at all, or, in any case, in frankness, it was much inferior to the latest searches of Lenfilm, Mosfilm or the Gorky Studio . The rumor that in Moscow they show solid pornography turned out to be, to put it mildly, greatly exaggerated. Mostly serious films were shown, reflecting on the vicissitudes of the biological nature of man, and not just demonstrating its charms (Razlogov, 1989: 7).

Going to a foreign cinema adulation, film critic E. Tirdatova already gave her positive assessment of the title of her article: “Berlin: a symphony of a big festival” (Tirdatova, 1989: 28-29), and then there was also an analysis of the competitive and non-competitive program, devoid of any ideological bias...

E. Tirdatova retained the same positive approach to this festival a year later, when in the title of her article she reflected the significant political changes in then Germany: “The time when the walls are falling down. Berlin is an open city” (Tirdatova, 1990: 26-27).

This positive perception of the political situation in Germany could easily be felt at the very beginning of this article: “...The Berlin Wall has collapsed. Its remnants in the area of the Brandenburg Gate were already dismantled with us on one of the rainy days of February. Today, pieces of the wall are sold as souvenirs. And for the first time in the festival’s forty years, the program was shown on both sides of the former wall. It is not surprising that the jubilee Berlinale gathered a lot of people” (Tirdatova, 1990: 26-27).

Approximately the same positive perestroika moods of change towards a “common European home” were filled with an article by film critic E. Stishova: “It all depends on how soon we get over wall syndrome. The International Film Festival in Oberhausen, which chose the motto “The way to the neighbor” three and a half decades ago, has waited in the wings. The Berlin Wall is no more. In a physical sense. The wall syndrome is still there, and it will be for a long time, but it has finally become really obvious what close neighbors we are in our cramped European home. Oberhausen-90 retained its inherent dryish correctness. ... The spirit of the collapsed wall, the spirit of freedom, the rules are also in the competition program, placing the

focus on works reflecting the theme of totalitarian despotism. There is nowhere to go – this theme has become the superplot of the festival” (Stishova, 1990: 27).

But in the report of the film critic V. Kichin, who visited the Montreal Film Festival in 1990, behind the ironic presentation, a bitter feeling of the crisis (or already the collapse?) of socialist "perestroika" was seen through. At the beginning of the article, it was described how “an Air Canada plane carried us across the ocean. He gave Irish liquor and Scotch whiskey to drink, he showed movies and made you listen to eight stereo music programs to choose from. The stewardesses smiled (we knew: fake), gave souvenirs all the time (we knew: for promotional purposes) - they did their business, unsuccessfully trying to lull people into a class instinct. But, of course, we did not compromise our principles. Although they ate, also for appearances, "brochette New Orleans." In the meantime, the World Film Festival began...". And after the end of the festival, it was good to “plunge into a comfortable Air Canada chair”. Put on fluffy bourgeois socks kindly offered by the stewardess – so as not to blow. Have a last drink of a bourgeois gin and tonic, watch some bourgeois nonsense on a video screen. The soul rejoices: home! Home, home, to empty shelves and native problems. To the unceasing debate about whether we are faithful to the holy ideas of socialism” (Kichin, 1991: 24-25).

Yes, film critic T. Khlopyankina (1937-2003) was right: Before, twenty years ago, we read reports from international festivals excitedly, trying to get some information about what was happening in the world from under the husk of cheap denunciations. movie. Now the situation has changed. The words "foreign film" or even "American action movie" do not excite anyone anymore. Films “from behind the hillock”, translated into video, bought many years late or almost new – a stream that is not always good quality, carrying a lot of garbage, but quite full-flowing, has finally rushed to us (Khlopyankina, 1991: 30-31).

And regarding the program of the Moscow International Film Festival in 1991, film critic E. Tirdatova reasonably stated that “gone are the days when the Moscow Festival had to provide its screen to friendly Zimbabwe or struggling Kampuchea. We are no longer afraid of the enemy's ideology. We ourselves are now hard to outdo in terms of anti-Sovietism; in eroticism, the world screen that has grown cold towards it will not overwhelm us either. So it became easier for the festival selection committee. But... The Moscow festival is not in the best shape. And, of course, it is impossible to imagine that Spielberg or Bertolucci would hold their new painting especially for him. What is left of solid Berlin, magnificent Cannes is coming to us, which is not reserved for luxurious Venice” (Tirdatova, 1991: 12).

Approximately in the same spirit, but with an emphasis on the motives of the belated, but still reaching the USSR, “sexual revolution”, film critic A. Gerber wrote about the same Moscow Film Festival: “They say that the screen of the festival shocked the volume of the bed theme. I think that he rather shocked the viewer not only with the looseness of love adventures, not only with vivid pictures for lectures of Freud, who was recently banned in our country, but now available (on all stalls) and therefore unnecessary. He, I am sure, helped many to liberate themselves, to discover their complexes, to look at sexual problems not with the curious eye of a dirty trickster who looked into the crack, but with the eye of an artist who knows that it is here, in the mysteries of love, that a person rediscovers himself every time. The whole mystery, everything in us is an abyss. To understand this, one had to at least spend the night with the films of Liliana Cavani. Agree, that after the ultimate openness of on-screen love, I wanted to dress her, love, take it in my hands, return it to spiritual purity. Such love came to us as a gift in the impeccable farewell film of Agnès Varda (in memory of her deceased husband, the famous Jacques Demy). The film was the closing chord of the festival” (Gerber, 1991: 2-3).

And the film critic V. Kichin was very strict about this event: “The festival passed, but no one noticed it. There was no usual national holiday, with fairs at the cinema "Russia", with posters: I change Buñuel for Spielberg. There were no full, and often half-full halls. Those who wish wandered from boredom – what do they give there today? France? Depardieu? Do we have time for the Vesti program? No? Then well, to hell with him, Depardieu, we'll see by the video. ... Except for a few outstanding retrospectives – Polanski, Russell ... – the program caused mixed feelings. They took what they gave. So there were no sensations” (Kichin, 1991: 4).

However, further on V. Kichin made an essential film/geopolitical, albeit also a very pessimistic reservation: “I don't think, however, that the lack of good cinema at the 17th Moscow International Film Festival is the festival's fault. This is the misfortune of today's cinematography, which is universally affected by anemia. Quiet period: there are no new Fellinis

and Bergmans, the luminaries took a timeout, there are no past shocks, and our souls are not ready for them. In essence, this festival reflected reality better. He was a workhorse in the dull field of world cinema. Weekdays. But this is how most of the festivals of the planet live, in fact – they work, and do not rejoice at a visit to noble collective farmers. Cod lovers now back off. There remain people who are faithful to cinema, faithful both in joy and in a moment of hypochondria. ... And maybe what we, in our apocalyptic mood, take for agony, and there is a return to the normal state of our festival. When there is no shortage of tickets. When everyone can come without blat. And when it reflects not the brotherhood of progressive working people approved by the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, but the real state of the film process. Of the abnormalities – only our native rudeness and unprecedented poverty. But these are typical birthmarks of socialism” (Kichin, 1991: 4).

To some extent, however, also on a sad note, film critic L. Dularidze tried to oppose these conclusions, who wrote that, in her opinion, the festival nevertheless took place. And if someone again says something about a feast during a plague, one can answer that if someone has a chronic plague, then cinema has nothing to do with it (Dularidze, 1991: 5).

As we can see, during the “perestroika” period, it was mainly film critics who traveled to foreign film festivals, who had previously been deprived of such an opportunity for one reason or another. But as is well known, there are exceptions to every rule. So in 1990, on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* was published an article by a festival regular of previous decades, a well-known film critic and one of the leading television *Cinema Panorama* G. Kapralov (1921-2010).

It was about the review of the films of the International Film Festival of Fantastic and Strange Films in Avoriaz.

It is clear from the text of G. Kapralov's article that at the turn of the 1990s he decided to completely abandon the party-ideological approaches familiar to him, the long-term head of the culture department of the *Pravda* newspaper, and to show that he was completely in the stream of “perestroika” changes.

What can we say, even the then leaders of cinema perestroika, the film critics Demin (1937-1993) and A. Plakhov did not dare by 1990 to write with such politically revealing pathos these lines: “For decades, the guilty rulers' guilty conscience, burdened by total suspicion that promised no one anything but the apocalyptic Gulag, in every fantastic picture they saw an ideological treachery, a threat to socialist virginity, which had never existed, and in the images of evil spirits the vampires of the party and state suddenly recognized themselves and protected the people from such destructive spectacles. As a result of this all-round care for the working people, we had no more science-fiction, let alone boots on the ground and so on. Cinema fiction became invisible: in all civilized countries it was seen firsthand, but in our country one could only guess by unverified rumors that it was still out there somewhere” (Kapralov, 1990: 26).

Further G. Kapralov gave an unexpected (for him and his past publications) high praise to a rather mediocre and now almost completely forgotten picture: “The Grand Prize in the fiction section was awarded to the picture *I, Madman* (1989) by the Hungarian-born American director Tibor Takács. An impressionable reader of novels about a homicidal maniac finds herself caught up in her own hallucinations from this reading, which tragically coincide with the sadistic crimes going on in the city. The film is elegantly and wittily constructed and directed” (Kapralov, 1990: 26).

And absolutely unexpected for the readers of the *Soviet Screen*, who are familiar with the previous publications of G. Kapralov, from year to year exposing bourgeois cinematography, along with its horror films that corrupt the consciousness of fragile spectator souls, were the following lines: “I personally prefer Brian de Palma's *Carrie* – the prize of the same Avoriaz-77 – the best of the film adaptations of King's books, which our box office should have bought” (Kapralov, 1990: 26).

- short informational materials about events in Western cinema (from neutral messages to “yellow” gossip).

The section of brief news of foreign cinema at the beginning of “perestroika” as a whole kept within the ideological framework of the previous decade.

So film critic E. Tirdatova wrote in 1986 that actress B. Bardo “managed to express in their screen images the ideals of a whole generation, to convey the atmosphere of the time. Her heroines are simple, natural girls, independent, often protesting against bourgeois morality. ... Unfortunately, the talent of the actress was mercilessly exploited by purely commercial cinema”

(Tirdatova, 1986: 21).

And the film critic F. Andreev (1933-1998) noted Dean Reed's participation in mass anti-imperialist and anti-war demonstrations in front of the American embassies in Lima, Caracas, Santiago, Mexico City, the appearance in his work of new songs of protest against social oppression and inequality, songs calling for they led the unity of good people in the face of the threat of war, a nuclear catastrophe (Andreev, 1986: 22).

But at the turn of the 1990s, "yellowness" came to the news feed of the magazine (Braginsky, 1991: 30; Kokorev, 1991: 20-21, etc.).

Moreover, even the scandalous everyday details of the Moscow International Film Festival began to penetrate the pages of *Screen* (which had never happened before): Canadian director Atom Egoyan only knocked on the door. It was in a hotel, and Atom was confused by its many corridors. Immediately there were the security officers, who thought the knocking was too loud and that the person knocking was too much fun. Under the threat of physical violence, the Canadian was taken to the hotel basement. The only thing that saved him from going to jail was his foreign appearance – they would have taken ours there for sure... During a cruise on a motor vessel a famous actor from Georgia had a quarrel with a guest from Germany. The guest did not like our festival as well as the Soviet cinema and the Soviet nature surrounding the ship" (Scandaly..., 1991: 15).

Conclusion. Based on the content analysis (in the context of the historical, socio-cultural and political situation, etc.) of the texts published during the "perestroika" period of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1986-1991), we came to the conclusion that materials on the subject of Western cinema on this stage can be divided into the following genres:

- ideologized articles emphasizing criticism of bourgeois cinema and its harmful influence on the audience (1986-1987);
- articles on the history of Western cinema;
- biographies and creative portraits of Western actors and directors (as a rule, with positive ratings);
- interviews with Western filmmakers (as a rule, with those who came to Moscow film festivals);
- reviews of Western films (here we can note a violation of the old tradition: if in 1986-1987 the magazine still often negatively evaluated some "politically harmful bourgeois" films, then later Western film production was evaluated without regard to ideological stereotypes, moreover, even received a positive interpretation films that were previously rejected for ideological reasons);
- articles about international film festivals and weeks of foreign cinema in the USSR, reviews of the current repertoire of Western national cinematographies (no longer divided into "progressive" and "bourgeois" cinematography);
- short informational materials about events in Western cinema (from neutral reports to "yellow" gossip).

As a kind of curiosity, but somewhat symptomatic, it can also be noted that a considerable number of employees or authors of the *Soviet Screen*, who often vividly exposed "bourgeois cinematography" on the pages of the magazine, eventually emigrated precisely to the countries of this most actively criticized Soviet press of the West: V. Matusevich (1937-2009), S. Chertok (1931-2006), F. Andreev (1933-1998), M. Shaternikova (1934-2018), I. Lishchinsky, V. Golovskoy, O. Surkova, I. Kokarev, O. Sulkin, M. Yampolsky and others.

Appendix. The main dates and events related to the historical, political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural and cinematic context in which the publication of the *Soviet Screen* magazine was carried out in 1925-1991

Appendix 1. The main dates and events related to the historical, political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural and cinematic context in which the publication of the *Soviet Screen* magazine was carried out in 1925-1927

1925

January 15: leaving Trotsky (1879-1940) from the post of People's Commissar for Military and Naval Affairs.

January 16-17: the first meeting of the workers of the "Left Front of the Arts" (LEF).

February 23: a first meeting on the organization of the "Society of Friends of Soviet Cinema" (ODSK).

March 1: creation of the All-Russian Photo-Cinematic Joint Stock Company "Soviet Cinema" (Sovkino).

March 12: by decision of the Press Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the publishing houses "Soviet Film", "Cinema-week", "Proletarian Cinema" and others were merged into a single "Film Publishing House of the RSFSR" (hereinafter "Cinema Print"), headed by V. Uspensky (1880-1929), who kept this post until his suicide.

March 24: in connection with the creation of the Film Publishing House of the RSFSR, magazines and newspapers are reorganized. The magazine *Screen Cinema Journal* was reorganized into the *Soviet Screen*, and *Cinema Journal* was reorganized into the newspaper *Cinema* (Kino. 1925. 1: 1. March 24).

March 24: publication of the first issue of the weekly newspaper *Cinema*.

March 24: publication of the first issue of the *Soviet Screen* magazine. Chief Editor - Kirill Shutko (1884-1941).

April 1: publication of the first issue of the magazine *Soviet Cinema*, an organ of the artistic council for cinema under the Glavpolitprosvet.

April 7: death of Patriarch Tikhon.

April 10: Tsaritsyn is renamed Stalingrad.

June 18: Resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party "On the policy of the party in the field of fiction".

10 July: establishment of the Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union (TASS).

May 12: Kirill Shutko, editor of the *Soviet Screen*, appointed deputy Chairman of the Artistic Council for Cinema at the Main Political Education Department.

May 21: elected to the new board of the Association of Revolution Cineasts: N.A. Lebedev (1897-1978), V.A. Erofeev (1898-1940), Ratner, N.O. Bravko (1900-1972), I.S. Kobozev (1893-1973), B.E. Guzman (1892-1944), H.N. Khersonsky (1897-1968), A.M. Room (1894-1976) and the future editor of the *Soviet Screen* A.L. Kurs (1892-1937) (Kino. 1925. May 26; *Cinema magazine* ARC. 1925. 4-5: 37).

May 25-31: Congress of Union of Art Workers, which adopted a resolution on cinema based on the report of Sovkino and VUFKU.

July 24: the NKVD approved the charter of the ODSK. The Organizing Bureau of the ODSK was created under the chairmanship of F. Dzierżyński (1877-1926).

September 7: Alexander Kurs (1892-1937) succeeded Kirill Shutko (1884-1941) in his position of editor of the *Soviet Screen* magazine.

October 12: signing of the Soviet-German trade treaty.

November 12: organizing meeting of the ODSK (Society of Friends of Soviet Cinema).

December 28: death of the poet S. Yesenin (1895-1925).

December 18-31: XIV Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, which adopted a course towards industrialization.

1926

January 18: premiere of S. Eisenstein's film "Battleship Potemkin".

February 5: armed attack on Soviet diplomatic couriers in the territory of Latvia. Diplomatic courier T. Nette (1896-1926) killed.

April: L. Kamenev (1883-1936), G. Zinoviev (1883-1936) and L. Trotsky (1879-1940), at the head of the so-called “united opposition”, insist on the dominant development of heavy industry, an uncompromising struggle against the “kulaks” and assistance to the revolutionary movement in other countries of the world.

April 3: plenum of the Central Council of the ODSK, chairman - F. Dzierżyński (1877-1926).

April 23: the Berlin Treaty between the USSR and Germany was signed, which confirmed mutual obligations under the 1922 Rappalo Treaty.

May 12-15: a coup d'état in Poland, the establishment of an authoritarian “sanation” regime, in which the actual power in the country was in the hands of Minister Józef Piłsudski (1867-1935).

July 20: death of the chairman of the Cheka and ODSK F. Dzierżyński (1877-1926).

July 20: Vyacheslav Uspensky (1880-1929) succeeded Alexander Kurs (1892-1937) in his position of editor of the *Soviet Screen* magazine.

July 20-22: Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks arrive in Moscow.

July 14-23: plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, which removed G. Zinoviev (1883-1936) from the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks and elected Y. Rudzutak (1887-1938) to the Politburo, who, after the death of F. Dzierżyński led to everything else and ODSK.

July: Glavrepertkom report, which, among other things, discussed a significant expansion of the range of censorship in cinema.

August 16: liquidation of “Goskino”, “Leningradkino” (formerly “Sevzapkino” and “Kino-Sever”) and “Proletkino” as independent film organizations of the RSFSR, with the transfer of their film production to “Sovkino”. As a result, the entire film production of the RSFSR turned out to be concentrated in “Sovkino”, “Mezhrabpom-Rus” and “Gosvoenkino”.

August 27: Resolution of the Presidium of the Central Committee of Rabis on the merger of the Rabis publishing house with the Kinopechat (Cinema Print) publishing house.

September 21: Nikolai Yakovlev succeeded Vyacheslav Uspensky (1880-1929) in his position of editor of the *Soviet Screen* magazine.

October 16: the United Opposition criticized its “splitting activities”.

October 18: publication in *The New York Times* of Lenin's so-called “testament”.

October 23: the joint plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party removed L. Trotsky from the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and relieved L. Kamenev of his duties as a candidate member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

November 2-13: first All-Russian Conference of Filmmakers-Political Enlighteners. The conference adopted a resolution on the report of “Sovkino” on the rental, training and retraining of personnel, etc.

November 9: direction of Agitprop of the Central Committee of the Communist Party to the Glavrepertkom on the need to close access to the Soviet screen for “white émigré films”.

December 11: Resolution of the Presidium of the Central Committee of Rabis on the procedure for the implementation of the ideological leadership of filmmaking by the film production bodies of the People's Commissariat of Education and the expediency of maintaining the artistic council for cinema as an auxiliary body under the artistic department of the Main Political Education (*Bulletin of the Central Committee of Rabis*. 1927. 1: 21).

December 13: Resolution of the Collegium of the People's Commissariat of Education on the liquidation of the artistic council for cinema at the Main Political Education and on the transfer of its functions to the Main Repertoire Committee in terms of control and supervision of film production and consideration of scripts.

1927

February 23: Great Britain sent the “Chamberlain note” to the USSR.

April 18-26: The principle of five-year planning was approved at the IV Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

May 26: Great Britain annuls the trade agreement and severed diplomatic relations with the USSR due to the “hostile activities” of the Comintern.

June 7: assassination in Warsaw of the Plenipotentiary of the USSR in Poland P. Voikov

(1888-1927).

June 10: according to the Decree of the OGPU, twenty representatives of the nobility of the former Russian Empire were shot as a response to the murder of P. Voikov.

September 3: "Platform of the 83's" brings together opposition leaders who criticize Stalin.

October 6: premiere of the first full-length sound film *The Jazz Singer* (USA).

October 15: Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR "On the transformation of the Partnership on the shares of the Film Publishing House of the RSFSR into Teakinopechat". The publishing house is still headed V. Uspensky (1880-1929).

October 21-23: plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party excludes L. Trotsky and G. Zinoviev from the Central Committee.

November 7: the USSR solemnly celebrated the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution. On this occasion, the United Opposition organized street demonstrations in Moscow and Leningrad.

November 7: premiere of S. Eisenstein's film *October*.

November 10-12: World Congress of Friends of the USSR in Moscow.

November 14: L. Trotsky and G. Zinoviev are expelled from the Communist Party.

December 2 - December 19: XV Congress of the Communist Party, which approved the program of collectivization of agriculture. Another defeat of the oppositionists: 75 representatives of the "Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc" (L. Kamenev, G. Pyatakov, K. Radek, C. Rakovsky and others) and supporters of the "democratic centralism" group were expelled from the Communist Party.

December 12-17: First All-Union Conference of Film and Photo Workers.

Appendix 2. The main dates and events related to the historical, political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural and cinematic context in which the publication of the *Soviet Screen* magazine was carried out in 1928-1930

1928

January 17: L. Trotsky was expelled from Moscow to Alma-Ata. Against this background, oppositionists were arrested.

February 28: A report is published on the results of the trial of a group of Leningrad filmmakers – "plunderers of socialist property", including director N. Forreger (1892-1939): "The case is about embezzlement, forgery, fictitious accounts, statements, etc., made during the filming of the film: *Northern Lights*, *Minaret of Death* and *January 9th*. ... The main defendant, director Forreger, was found guilty of forgery and embezzlement and sentenced to three years in prison. Administrator Rapoport was sentenced to two years in prison, assistant director Dombrovsky – to 6 months in prison, Medvedev – to 1 year 6 months. The rest of the defendants were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment up to 1 year" (*Kino*, 1928, 9: 1, 4, February 28).

March 1: in a circular letter "On the spring sowing campaign" J. Stalin proclaimed a course towards intensive collectivization.

March: J. Stalin advocated accelerated development of heavy industry and the collectivization of agriculture. The "rightists" (N. Bukharin, A. Rykov, M. Tomsy, and others) insist on continuing the New Economic Policy and an alliance with the entire peasantry.

March 15-21: First All-Union Party Conference on Cinema, convened by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, approved the Resolution "The results of the construction of cinema in the USSR and the tasks of Soviet cinematography". The following reports were heard and discussed: "The results of the construction of cinema in the USSR", "Publicity and cinema", "Print and cinema".

March 23-28: trial of a group of Mezhrabpom-Rus workers. "In the dock were 17 employees of Mezhrabpom-Rus, headed by the former director Z. Darevsky. The main method of embezzling money invented by Darevsky was the production of fictitious accounts, which paid for the work of non-existent artists, as well as invented services and fictitious losses. According to the verdict of the court Z. Darevsky was sentenced to 8 years in prison (*Izvestia*. 1928. 75: 7. March 29; *Kino*. 1928. 14: 1. April 3).

April 7: A meeting was held at the Glavrepertkom to revise the fund of films and clear the screen of "ideologically harmful" films.

April 10: At a meeting of the joint plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, J. Stalin delivered a speech about the “sabotage activities” of the leaders and specialists of the coal industry of Donbass.

April 25: The first plenum of the Central Council of the ODSK (Society of Soviet Cinema Friends), which discussed the results of the All-Union Party Conference on cinema.

April 30: A meeting on Kulturfilm was held at the People's Commissariat for Education of the RSFSR, convened by the Glavrepertkom.

May 1: at the post of editor of the *Soviet Screen* magazine Nikolai Yakovlev was replaced by Vasily Russo (1881-1942), who until his departure from this post (June 1928) was designated on the pages of the magazine as a temporary responsible editor.

May 9: Resolution of the Press Department of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party on the report on the work of the publishing house Teakinopechat (News of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party. 1928. 15: 9).

May 15: The Glavrepertkom began reviewing all feature film production, both foreign and Soviet production. The reasons for the prohibition of a number of films: “the idealization of the pathological and decadent moods of the decaying bourgeoisie; popularization of hidden prostitution and debauchery; romance of naked trickery and criminality; display of unjustified cruelty and sadism, designed to fray the nerves and unhealthy interest of the philistine audience; preaching bourgeois morality, mysticism, etc.” (*Kino*. 1928. May 15; *Soviet Screen*. 1928. 26. June 26).

May 20: In Germany, in the parliamentary elections, the Social Democrats increased the number of their representatives from 131 to 154 deputies. The Communists received 54 seats, the National Socialists 12 seats.

May 25 – July 12: the disaster of the airship “Italia” under the command of Umberto Nobile (1885-1978) in the Arctic, the search and rescue of the surviving crew members.

May 28: Resolution of the Board of the People's Commissariat of Education of the RSFSR on the creation of the artistic and political council of the Glavrepertkom, which is an advisory body.

May 30 – June 3: An All-Union Conference on the tasks of agitation, propaganda and cultural construction, including in the field of cinema, was held at the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

May: The Press Department of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party adopted a resolution on the report of the Teakinopechat publishing house.

July 1: at the post of editor of the *Soviet screen* Vasily Russo (1881-1942) was replaced by Vyacheslav Uspensky (1880-1929), who, heading Teakinopechat, again became the head of this magazine.

July 4 – July 12: Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, where J. Stalin delivered a speech “On industrialization and the grain problem”. Criticism of Stalin for the rejection of New Economic Policy by the “right” Bolsheviks (N. Bukharin, M. Tomsky, A. Rykov).

July 26: The first ever transmission of a moving image using a cathode ray tube by inventors B. Grabovsky (1901-1966) and I. Belyansky (1907-1979).

July 17 – September 1: VI Congress of the Comintern.

September 30: The conflict between the “right” Bolsheviks and J. Stalin continued after the publication in *Pravda* of the article by N. Bukharin (1988-1938) “Notes of an Economist”.

November 6: US presidential election, Republican candidate H. Hoover wins.

November 16-24: Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, which condemned the “right opportunist deviation”.

1929

January 24: Resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party “On measures to strengthen anti-religious work”.

January 29: Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR “Regulations on the Film Committee under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR”.

January 31: L. Trotsky is expelled from the USSR.

February: Agitprop of the Central Committee of the Communist Party adopted a

resolution on the work of the Teakinopechat publishing house.

March 4: H. Hoover (1874-1964) succeeded C. Coolidge (1872-1933) as President of the United States.

March 14: the public trial of the head of the publishing house Teakinopechat V. Uspensky (*Izvestia*. 1929. 62: 8. March 16; *Kino*. 1929. 12: 2. March 19; *Evening Moscow*. 61: 1. March 15; *Komsomolskaya Pravda*. 1929. 62: 6. March 16).

March 28: Suicide editor of the Soviet Screen magazine V. Uspensky (1880-1929).

April 6: Fascist victory in the general parliamentary elections in Italy.

April 16: After the suicide of V. Uspensky (1880-1929) Yakov Rudoy (1894-1978) became the editor of the *Soviet Screen*.

April 16 – 23: Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, where the “right deviation” in power structures was condemned. As a result, N. Bukharin was removed from his posts in *Pravda* and in the Comintern.

April 23-29: The 16th Conference of the Communist Party, which called for the development of “socialist emulation” and a “purge” in the party. The program of the first five-year plan was adopted.

May 19: Ulysses Sanabria (1906-1969) was the first to use the same range of radio waves to transmit image and sound, that is, in fact, this date can be considered the beginning of television broadcasting.

October 6: Opening of the first sound cinema in the USSR in Leningrad.

October 24-29: stock market crash in the USA, the beginning of the global economic crisis (1929-1933), the so-called “Great Depression”.

November 15: an announcement is posted on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (Nos. 44-45) that from next year the magazine will change its name to *Cinema & Life* and will be published three times a month.

November 10-17: at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, N. Bukharin (188-1938), A. Rykov (1881-1938) and M. Tomsky (1880-1936) were again accused of “right deviation”. The plenum advocated accelerated collectivization.

November 21: The “law on defectors” is adopted in the USSR, declaring the refusal to return to the country as high treason.

December 27: J. Stalin proclaimed the policy of “eliminating the kulaks as a class”.

1930

January 1: Publication of the first issue of the magazine *Cinema & Life*, which became the successor of the magazine *Soviet Screen*. Yakov Rudoy (1894-1978), who headed the *Soviet Screen* (since April 1929), retained the editor of the *Cinema & Life* magazine.

January 5: Decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party “On the pace of collectivization and measures of state assistance to collective farm construction”.

January 11: The People’s Commissariat of the Workers and Peasants Inspectorate began a “cleansing” of the apparatus of the publishing house Teakinopechat and checking the implementation of the instructions of the Workers and Peasants Inspectorate on the restructuring of the work of Teakinopechat.

January 30: Resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party “On measures to eliminate kulak farms in areas of complete collectivization”.

February 13: Decree No. 56 of the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR “On the Formation of an All-Union Association for the Film and Photo Industry”.

March 1: Approval of the Model Rules of the Agricultural Artel, according to which land, livestock and implements were socialized.

March 2: Publication in *Pravda* of Stalin’s article “Dizzy with Success”, in which he blamed the negative consequences of collectivization on local authorities.

March 13: The Moscow Labor Exchange is closed.

March 30: The German Center Party forms a right-wing coalition government in Germany that succeeds the Social Democrats.

April 7: Decree to expand the system of labor camps, they are administered by the GULAG (Main Directorate of Camps) and subordinate to the OGPU.

April 14: suicide of the poet V. Mayakovsky (1893-1930).

April 25: Resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party

“On the charter of the All-Union Photo-Cinema Association and the composition of its enterprises and organizations”.

May 6: The results of the purge of Teakinopechat are published: “The publishing house focused mainly on the audience of commercial films and “big” theaters. A direct reflection of this was the absence in the literature published by Teakinopechat of products intended to serve the next political slogans and campaigns. ... the presence in the past of the publishing house’s intention to publish so-called “light” literature (postcards, librettos, biographies). All this was calculated for the petty-bourgeois tastes of the philistine masses, apolitically, devoid of a Marxist character. Only in 1930 was there a turning point in the history of mass literature in the direction of bringing it closer to the present” (*Kino*. 1930. No. 26: 1. May 6).

June 15: *Kino* newspaper published materials under the general heading “The Class Enemy in the Trenches of Teakinopechat” (*Kino*. 1930. 34. June 15).

June 26 – July 13: XVI Congress of the Communist Party, which crushed the right opposition. The following were elected to the Politburo: the General Secretary of the Communist Party J. Stalin (1878-1953), K. Voroshilov (1881-1969), L. Kaganovich (1893-1991), M. Kalinin (1875-1946), S. Kirov (1886-1934), S. Kosior (1889-1939), V. Kuibyshev (1888-1935), V. Molotov (1890-1986), A. Rykov (1881-1938), Y. Rudzutak (1887-1938).

July 1: Teakinopechat publishing house transferred its editorial functions to “Land and Factor” publishing house.

July 22: Kolhoz Center USSR established the assessment and payment of collective farmers in workdays instead of money.

14 September: The Social Democrats win the German parliamentary elections (143 seats). The second place belongs to the National Socialist Party (107 seats). In third place are the Communists (77 seats).

November 15: in the newspapers *Pravda* (No. 314) and *Izvestia*, M. Gorky's article “If the enemy does not surrender, he is exterminated” is published.

November 25 – December 7: the trial of the “Industrial Party”.

December 19: V. Molotov became chairman of the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR instead of A. Rykov.

December 17-21: The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party removed A. Rykov from the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Appendix 3. The main dates and events related to the historical, political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural and cinematic context in which the publication of the *Soviet Cinema Screen* magazine was carried out in 1939-1941

1939

January 1: the abolition of the system of remuneration of cinematographers based on the principle of royalties from the results of the film’s distribution and the number of viewers who watched it: directors from 6 to 50 thousand rubles for a full-length feature film, cameramen: from 2 to 15 thousand rubles per film, plus a monthly salary: from 1.2 thousand to 2 thousand rubles for directors and from a thousand to 1.5 thousand rubles for cameramen (*Kino*. 05.01.1939). Somewhat later, similar orders were issued regarding filmmakers who worked in other types of cinema (documentary, popular science and animation).

January 29: a report is published about the completion of the trial, which began in December 1938, in the criminal case of a large group of workers from the filmstrip factory and other film organizations who received sentences of up to ten years in prison.

January: After a long hiatus (1931-1938), the cinema magazine for a mass audience again began to appear. Now – under the name *oviet Cinema Screen* with a frequency of twice a month.

February 10: the first test television broadcast took place in Kiev.

February 26-27: A conference dedicated to the theoretical issues of Soviet film drama was held at the Moscow Cinema House.

March 10-21: XVIII Congress of the Communist Party.

March 10: J. Stalin, in his report at the 18th Congress of the Communist Party, gave statistical information on the growth of film installations: if in 1933/1934 there were only 24 technical devices for showing movies in the villages of the USSR, then in 1938/1939 – 6670 (that is, 278 times more).

March 20: the 18th Congress of the Communist Party adopted a resolution indicating the need to develop a network of cinemas and a six fold increase in stationary and other sound installations.

April 1: end of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), which ended with the complete defeat of the Republicans.

April 10: arrest of the former People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR N. Yezhov (1895-1940).

May 15: Writer, screenwriter I. Babel (1894-1940) arrested on charges of Trotskyism and espionage.

May 24: The so-called television theater opens in Moscow.

June 3: The Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party adopted a resolution appointing Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR I. Bolshakov (1902-1980), who previously worked as the manager of the affairs of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.

June 20: director and actor V. Meyerhold (1874-1940) arrested on charges of Trotskyism and anti-Soviet activities.

June 24-26: visit to Moscow by Mary Pickford.

July 19: Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR approved the "Regulations on the Directorate for Controlling Film Repertoire" and "Instructions on the Procedure for Controlling the Release, Distribution and Demonstration of Films".

August 19: joint meeting Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the Central Committee of the Komsomol, dedicated to the problems of children's cinema.

August 23-24: People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the USSR V. Molotov and German Foreign Minister J. von Ribbentrop signed a non-aggression pact between the USSR and Germany in Moscow. Because of this, the negative reference to fascism disappeared from all media, including cinema. All Soviet anti-fascist films were removed from the screen (*The Oppenheim Family*, *Professor Mamlock*, etc.), and historical films with a negative image of the Germans (*Alexander Nevsky* by S. Eisenstein, etc.).

31 August: Nazi staged attack on a German radio station in Gleiwitz, which became the pretext for the German attack on Poland.

September 1: Nazi German troops invade Poland: World War II begins.

September 17: by agreement with Germany, the Red Army occupied the eastern territories of Poland, inhabited mainly by the Ukrainian population.

September 18: joint Soviet-German communiqué, which states that the task of the Soviet and German troops "is to restore order and tranquility in Poland, disturbed by the collapse of the Polish state".

September 20: Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR formed a brigade of film workers sent to the regions of Western Ukraine and Western Belarus, which had gone to the USSR under an agreement with Germany.

September 21: a Soviet-German protocol is signed on the procedure for the withdrawal of troops to the final demarcation line in Poland.

September 28: Treaty of Friendship and Border signed between the USSR and Germany.

October 7: by order Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR all film studios are prohibited from showing to unauthorized persons and holding public screenings of films accepted by the Committee but not yet released to the screen. In addition, it is forbidden to give press reports about films completed but not accepted by the Committee.

November 21-25: II All-Union Congress of Trade Unions of Film and Photo Workers.

November 26: the USSR announced a provocation by the Finnish border guards.

November 29: rupture of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Finland.

November 30: beginning of the Soviet-Finnish War.

December 16: the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR adopted a resolution "On the liquidation of the All-Union Film Distribution Office (Soyuzkinoprokat)". Its functions are entrusted to the Main Directorate of Mass Printing and Film Distribution of Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR (Glavkinoprokat).

Glavkinoprokat received full self-supporting rights and the monopoly right to distribute films throughout the USSR.

December 21: J. Stalin's 60th birthday is solemnly celebrated in the USSR.

1940

January 1-2: meeting of the Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR on the reorganization of Glavkinoprokat.

January 27: the execution of the writer and screenwriter I. Babel (1887-1940), the author of the scripts for the films *Benya Krik*, *Wandering Stars*, *Odessa*, etc.

February 2: the execution of the theater and film director, actor, screenwriter V. Meyerhold (1874-1940), the director of the films *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, *The Strong Man* (where he also acted as an actor), the performer of one of the roles in the film *The White Eagle*.

February 4 or 6: execution of the former People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR N. Yezhov (1895-1940).

February 8: creative meeting on historical and historical-revolutionary film.

February 16: Soyuzdetfilm hosted an experimental demonstration of a new Soviet invention: "glassless stereo cinema".

March 12: conclusion of a peace treaty between the USSR and Finland.

March 19-23: plenum of the Central Committee of the Union of Film and Photo Workers of the USSR.

April 21-23: meeting of the active workers of the Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.

June 14: Paris is occupied by German troops.

June 22: the French government signs an armistice with Germany.

August 3: the Supreme Soviet of the USSR accepted Lithuania into the USSR.

August 5: the Supreme Soviet of the USSR accepted Latvia into the USSR.

August 6: the Supreme Soviet of the USSR accepted Estonia into the USSR.

September 27: the Tripartite Pact on the military-economic alliance of Germany, Italy and Japan is signed.

October 8: A. Zhdanov's speech at a meeting of the Organizing Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party with a report "On improving the production of feature films", where it was stated that "the absence of real ideological control in cinematography itself, control over the ideological direction of paintings" (RGASPI, 77, 3, 23: 1-5).

November 18-21: All-Russian meeting of heads of regional, regional and republican departments of cinematography.

1941 (first semester)

February 4: the first stereo cinema in the USSR was opened in Moscow.

March 3: the Organizing Bureau of the Communist Party discussed the results of the work of the Film Commission of the Central Committee.

March 5: All-Union conference on film distribution.

March 25: a meeting of film workers was held at the Main Directorate of Political Propaganda of the Red Army on the question of the defense theme in cinema.

April 8-9: a meeting of the activists of art cinematographers was held at the Moscow Cinema House.

April 12: the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR adopted a resolution on the further development of stereo cinema.

May 14-15: an extended conference on cinema, convened on the initiative of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, at which A. Zhdanov sharply criticized the leadership of cinematography.

May 15: the secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party adopted a resolution on the inadmissibility of publishing reviews of films prohibited for release (RGASPI, 17, 1 16, 88: 1).

May 23: meeting of the commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party to develop proposals for the further development of the industry.

June 22: Nazi German troops invaded the USSR. Beginning of the Great Patriotic War.

June 22: in connection with the outbreak of the Great Patriotic War, I. Bolshakov,

chairman of the Committee for Cinematography under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, was instructed to urgently change the repertoire of cinemas by releasing films on screens: *Alexander Nevsky*, *Chapaev*, *Minin and Pozharsky*, *Shchors*, *Suvorov*, as well as all anti-fascist films *The Oppenheim Family*, *Professor Mamlok* and others, as well as urgently organize filming of military operations.

June 23: the above films have been reopened.

July: temporary cessation (due to the outbreak of war) of the publication of the *Soviet Cinema Screen* magazine.

Appendix 4. The main dates and events related to the historical, political, economic, ideological, sociocultural and cinematic context in which the publication of the *Soviet Screen* magazine was carried out in 1957-1968

1956

February 14-25: XX Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Speech by N.S. Khrushchev, exposing the "cult of personality" of I.V. Stalin.

April 17: Dissolution of Komiinform.

June 30: Resolution of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On overcoming the cult of personality and its consequences".

October 23 - November 9: anti-communist uprising in Hungary and its suppression by Soviet troops.

October 30 - December 22: Suez Crisis in Egypt.

1957

January 12: The first issue of the renewed *Soviet Screen* magazine is signed for publication. Nikolai Kastelin (1904-1968) became the editor of the magazine, who remained in this post until July 1958.

February 27: All-Union Conference of Soviet Cinematographers, Moscow.

May 13: N. Khrushchev's speech at a meeting of writers in the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party.

May 19: N. Khrushchev's speech at the reception of writers, artists, sculptors and composers.

June 3: at the suggestion of director I.A. Pyryev (1901-1968), the secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party approved the creation of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR.

June 18-21: meeting of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, at which V. Molotov and G. Malenkov, dissatisfied with the course towards de-Stalinization, made an unsuccessful attempt to deprive N. Khrushchev of power.

June 28-29: First Plenum of the Organizing Bureau of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR, Moscow (Chairman was I. Pyryev, Deputy Chairman: A. Zguridi, Chairmen of sections and commissions are elected: M. Romm, I. Kopalin, E. Gabrilovich, I. Ivanov-Vano, R. Yurenev, B. Konoplev, G. Roshal, S. Yutkevich.

July 28 - August 11: World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow.

August 21: test of the first Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching the United States.

October 4: The USSR launched the world's first artificial Earth satellite into orbit.

December 12-18: First conference of cinematographers of the socialist countries (Prague).

1958

28th of February-March 4: Conference of workers of Soviet cinematography.

May 18: awarding the film *The Cranes Are Flying* by M. Kalatozov (1903-1973) and S. Urusevsky (1908-1974) with the main prize of the Cannes Film Festival: "Palme d'Or".

May 28: Decree of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On the correction of errors in the evaluation of the operas *Great Friendship*, *Bogdan Khmel'nitsky* and *From the bottom of my hear*".

June 16-4th of July: All-Union Film Festival, Moscow.

August: Elizaveta Smirnova (1908-1999) succeeded Nikolai Kastelin (1904-1968) as editor

of *Soviet Screen*. She held this post until June 1961.

October 4: Decree of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On the note of the Department of Propaganda and Agitation of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party for the Union Republics". On the shortcomings of scientific-atheistic propaganda obliging party, Komsomol and public organizations to launch an attack on "religious survivals" in the USSR.

October 23: Award of the Nobel Prize in Literature to Boris Pasternak: for significant achievements in modern lyric poetry, as well as for continuing the traditions of the great Russian epic novel (*Doctor Zhivago*).

October 23: Resolution of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On B. Pasternak's slanderous novel".

October 25: meeting of the party group of the Board of the Writers' Union: N. Gribachev (1910-1992), S. Gerasimov (1906-1984), V. Inber (1890-1972), L. Oshanin (1912-1996), S. Mikhalkov (1913-2009), S. Sartakov (1908-2005), M. Shaginyan (1888-1982), A. Yashin (1913-1968) and others demanded to expel B. Pasternak (1890-1960) after a "nationwide discussion in the press" from the Union of Writers of the USSR, to deprive him of his citizenship and expel him from the USSR.

October 27: decision joint meeting of the Presidium of the Board of the Union of Writers of the USSR, the Bureau of the Organizing Committee of the Union of Writers of the RSFSR and the Presidium of the Board of the Moscow Branch of the Union of Writers of the RSFSR exclusion of B. Pasternak from the Writers' Union of the USSR (this decision was supported by V. Azhaev (1915-1968), S. Antonov (1915-1995), G. Markov (1911-1991), S. Mikhalkov (1913-2009), G. Nikolaeva (1911-1963), V. Panova (1905-1973), N. Tikhonov (1896-1979), Y. Smolich (1900-1976), L. Sobolev (1898-1971), N. Chukovsky (1904-1965) and other writers).

October 28: Note from the Department of Culture of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party on the results of the discussion at the meetings of writers of the issue "On the actions of a member of the Union of Writers of the USSR B.L. Pasternak, incompatible with the title of a Soviet writer", according to which V. Ermilov (1904-1965), V. Kozhevnikov (1909-1984), V. Kochetov (1912-1973) and others joined the recommendations of the party group of writers.

October 31st: All-Moscow meeting of writers chaired by S. Smirnov, at which B. Pasternak's novel *Doctor Zhivago* and the Nobel Prize were opposed by: S. Smirnov (1915-1976), S. Antonov (1915-1995), S. Baruzdin (1926-1991), A. Bezymensky (1898-1973), L. Martynov (1905-1980), L. Oshanin (1912-1996), B. Polevoy (1908-1981), B. Slutsky (1919-1986), V. Soloukhin (1924-1997), A. Sofronov (1911-1990) and others.

December 12: Second Conference of Cinematographers of the Socialist Countries (Sinai, Romania).

1959

January 1: Pro-communist revolutionaries rise to power in Cuba.

January 27 - February 5, 1959: XXI Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

April 11 - 26: All-Union Film Festival, Kyiv.

July 24-September 4, 1959: holding a American exhibition in Moscow.

August 3-17: Moscow International Film Festival. Main prize: *The Fate of a Man* (USSR, directed by Sergei Bondarchuk).

September 15-27: negotiations between N. Khrushchev and D. Eisenhower in the USA.

1960

February 16-19: Plenum of the Organizing Committee of the Union of Workers of Soviet Cinematography.

May 1: An American spy plane is shot down in the skies of the USSR.

May 4: N. Mikhailov (1906-1982) dismissed from the post of Minister of Culture of the USSR. Appointment as Minister of Culture of the USSR E. Furtseva (1910-1974).

May 14-25: All-Union Film Festival, Minsk.

May 18-23: Third Congress of Soviet Writers.

May 30: death of the writer B. Pasternak (1890-1960).

July: recall of Soviet specialists who worked in the China under the program of international cooperation in connection with the deterioration of relations between the USSR and the Communist China.

August 17: Plenum of the Organizing Committee of the Union of Workers of Soviet Cinematography, at which I. Pyryev (1901-1968) was deprived of the status of chairman of the organizing committee. He was replaced by director L. Kulidzhanov (1924-2002).

November 15-20: Third International Conference of Cinematographers of the Socialist Countries, Sofia (Bulgaria).

1961

February 24: Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On measures to increase the material interest of film workers and film studios in creating films of a high ideological and artistic level".

April 8: N. Khrushchev sent a note of protest to US President John F. Kennedy against the anti-Castro landing in Cuba.

April 12: The USSR launched the world's first spacecraft with a man on board (cosmonaut Yury Gagarin) into low Earth orbit.

June: Dmitry Pisarevsky (1912-1990) succeeded Elizaveta Smirnova (1908-1999) as editor of the *Soviet Screen* magazine. D. Pisarevsky held this post more than all the other editors of the *Soviet Screen*: from 1961 to 1975.

July 9-23: Moscow International Film Festival. Main prizes: *Naked Island* (Japan, directed by Kaneto Shindo) and *Clear Sky* (USSR, directed by Grigory Chukhrai).

August 13: Construction of the Berlin Wall begins.

October 17-31: XXII Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, which approved the slogan that a base of communism would be built in the USSR by 1980, and actually announced the second wave of de-Stalinization (in particular, the body of I. Stalin was removed from the Mausoleum on October 31).

1962

February 6-9: Plenum of the Organizing Committee of the Union of Workers of Soviet Cinematography.

June 1-3: armed suppression of protests in Novochoerkassk caused by rising food prices.

July 19: Decree of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On measures to improve the management of the development of artistic cinematography".

September 8: Golden Lion of St. Mark" at the XXIII International Film Festival in Venice was awarded to the film *Ivan's Childhood* (directed by A. Tarkovsky).

October 14 - November 20: After the installation of Soviet missiles in Cuba, the United States declares a naval blockade of the island. A politically tense Caribbean crisis begins, which forces the USSR to remove missiles from Cuba in exchange for a US promise to abandon the occupation of the "Island of Freedom".

November: publication (approved by N. Khrushchev) in the journal *New World* (No. 11, 1962) of A. Solzhenitsyn's (1918-2008) story *A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, which directly reflected the theme of Stalin's camps.

December 1: N. Khrushchev's visit to the exhibition of avant-garde artists of the New Reality studio in the Manege (Moscow), which served as the beginning of the party-state campaign against formalism and abstractionism.

December 17: N. Khrushchev's meeting with the creative intelligentsia in the Reception House of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party (Moscow), at which he again spoke out against abstractionism and other "bourgeois influences".

1963

January 5: The first issue of the weekly journal *Soviet Cinema* was published (supplement to the newspaper *Soviet Culture*).

March 7-8: meeting of N. Khrushchev, members of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party and the government of the USSR with the creative intelligentsia.

March 23: Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR "On the formation of the State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for cinematography." A.

Romanov (1908-1998) was appointed chairman of the Goskino.

June 19: The USSR temporarily canceled the jamming of *Voice of America*, *BBC* and *Deutsche Welle* broadcasts in Russian in the USSR.

June 18-21: Plenum of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, which criticized the film *Zastava Ilyicha (I'm 20 years old)* by M. Khutsiev.

June 20: conclusion of an agreement between the USSR and the USA on the establishment of a "hot" telephone line between Moscow and Washington.

June 21: Resolution of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On the Immediate Tasks of the Party's Ideological Work".

June 25: F. Yermash (1923-2002) approved head the cinema sector of the ideological department of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party.

July 7-21: Moscow International Film Festival. The main prize is 8 ½ (Italy-France, director Federico Fellini).

November 24: Assassination of US President John F. Kennedy in Dallas.

1964

May 14: Decree of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On the work of the Mosfilm film studio" was published.

August 2: The USA starts the Vietnam War.

July 31 - August 8: All-Union Film Festival, Leningrad.

October 14: The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party dismissed N. Khrushchev (1894-1971) from the post of First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and removed him from the Presidium of the Central Committee. L. Brezhnev (1906-1982) was elected the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party on the same day.

October 15: Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Khrushchev on the release of N. Khrushchev from the post of head of the government of the USSR.

1965

January: The first issue of the illustrated advertising monthly *Moviegoer's Companion* was published, with a circulation of 50,000 at first.

April 5: The USSR supplied North Vietnam with missiles.

July 5-20: Moscow International Film Festival. The main prize is *War and Peace* (USSR, directed by Sergei Bondarchuk) and *Twenty Hours* (Hungary, directed by Zoltan Fabri).

October 9: State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for Cinematography renamed the Cinematography Committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

November 23-26: The First Congress of Cinematographers of the USSR. Director L. Kulidzhanov (1924-2002) became the head of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR, and G. Maryamov became the organizing secretary. S. Gerasimov, R. Karmen, A. Kapler, A. Zguridi, G. Chukhrai, A. Karaganov and M. Kalatozov were appointed heads of creative commissions under the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR.

December 10: presentation of the Nobel Prize in Literature to M. Sholokhov (1905-1984) for the novel *Quiet Flows the Don*.

1966

March 29 - April 8, 1966: XXIII Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Renaming the post of 1st Secretary of the Central Committee to General Secretary of the Central Committee, restoration of the Politburo of the Central Committee instead of the Presidium of the Central Committee.

May 21-31: All-Union Film Festival, Kiev.

June 20 - July 1: visit of French President General de Gaulle to Moscow.

October 6: France withdraws from the NATO military organization.

The film distribution ban was imposed on the films *Andrei Rublev* (directed by Andrei Tarkovsky) and *A Bad Joke* (directed by Alexander Alov and Vladimir Naumov).

1967

April 21: Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On the economic results of the

work of enterprises and organizations of the Committee on Cinematography for 1963-1966".

May 16: A. Solzhenitsyn (1918-2008) circulated his open letter scheduled for the end of May IV Congress of the Union of Soviet Writers, in which he spoke out against censorship and the confiscation of his archive.

May 22-27: IV Congress of Writers of the USSR, Moscow.

July 5-10: Six-day war in the Middle East, break in diplomatic relations between Israel and the USSR.

August 14: Resolution of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On measures for the further development of the social sciences and increasing their role in communist construction."

July 5-20: Moscow International Film Festival. The main prizes are *Journalist* (USSR, directed by Sergei Gerasimov) and *Father* (Hungary, directed by István Szabó).

1968

January 4: A. Dubček (1921-1992) became the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, who initiated reforms aimed at liberalizing and democratizing the country.

April: The leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia launched a reform program that included a policy of "ideological pluralism" and "socialism with a human face."

April 9-10: Plenum of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party. Report of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party L. Brezhnev. Decree of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On Topical Problems of the International Situation and on the Struggle of the Soviet Communist Party for the Cohesion of the World Communist Movement".

May: mass unrest in France, the reason for which was the dismissal of the director of the Paris cinémathèque. The unrest, in particular, involved the youth of anarchist, Trotskyist, Maoist and other leftist political orientations.

May - September: publication in the West of A. Solzhenitsyn's novels *In the First Circle* and *Cancer Ward*.

May 18-27: All-Union Film Festival, Leningrad.

August 20: The USSR resumed jamming of *Voice of America* and other Western radio stations in Russian in the USSR.

August 21: Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

October-November: Soviet magazine *Ogonyok* published articles by Prof. Dr., member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and the Soviet Communist Party V.A. Razumny (1924-2011) and People's Artist of the USSR, member of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR and the Soviet Communist Party N.A. Kryuchkov (1911-1994), in which they sharply criticized the magazines *Cinema Art* and *Soviet Screen* for promoting Western cinema and hushing up Soviet cinema, urging the authorities to urgently restore order in the leadership and editorial line of these publications in order to "put these printed organs at the service of Soviet cinematography and Soviet audiences" (Kryuchkov, 1968: 17).

December: preparation Decree of the secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On increasing the responsibility of the leaders of the press, radio, television, cinema, cultural and art institutions for the ideological and political level of published materials and repertoire", which, soon (January 7, 1969) was approved as a guide to action to strengthen the ideological control and censorship, including in the field of cinema and the press.

The film distribution ban was imposed on the films *Commissar* (directed by Alexander Askoldov), *Intervention* (directed by Gennady Poloka) and the film almanac *The Beginning of an Unknown Age*.

Appendix 5. Key dates and events relating to the historical, political, economic, ideological, sociocultural, and cinematic context in which *Soviet Screen* magazine was published in 1969-1985

1969

January 7: Resolution of the Central Committee Secretariat of Soviet Communist Party "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of press, radio, television, cinematography,

cultural and art institutions for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire".

January 16: In Prague, student J. Palach (1948-1969) performs self-immolation as a protest against the introduction of the Warsaw Pact troops into Czechoslovakia.

January 20: R. Nixon (1913-1994), who won the elections, officially replaced L. Johnson (1908-1973) as president of the USA.

January 22: In Moscow, a junior lieutenant V. Ilyin made an unsuccessful attempt on the General Secretary of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party, Leonid Brezhnev (1906-1982).

March 2-15: Soviet-Chinese border armed conflict on Damansky Island.

April 15: The American Academy of Motion Picture Arts awards an Oscar to the Soviet film *War and Peace* (directed by S. Bondarchuk) as the best foreign film of the year.

April 17: A. Dubček (1921-1992) is removed as first secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. H. Husak (1913-1991) is elected as the new first secretary.

April 28: the resignation of President Charles de Gaulle (1890-1970) of France.

April 28: A. Dubček is elected president of the Czechoslovak National Assembly.

May: The film *Andrei Rublev* (directed by A. Tarkovsky) is awarded the FIPRESCI Prize at the Cannes International Film Festival.

May: The Communist magazine (n 9, 1969) published an article against the film *The Sixth of July* (screenwriter M. Shatrov, director Y. Karasik).

June 15: Georges Pompidou (1911-1974) is elected president of France.

July 7-22: International Film Festival in Moscow. Gold prizes: *Till Monday* (USSR, directed by S. Rostotsky), *Lucia* (Cuba, directed by U. Solas), *Serafino* (Italy-France, directed by P. Germi).

July 20-21: The landing of American astronauts on the Moon.

August: The USSR celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of Soviet cinematography.

September 25-26: Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which removes A. Dubček supporters from state posts, cancels a number of decisions made in July-August 1968 by the Czechoslovak leadership and the Extraordinary XIV Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

October 15: A. Dubček is deprived of his position as Chairman of the Czechoslovak National Assembly.

November 4: A. Solzhenitsyn is expelled from the USSR Union of Writers.

November 17: after an inspection by the People's Control Committee, V. Surin (1906-1994), director of the Mosfilm studio, is relieved of his post. N. Sizov (1916-1996) was appointed the new director of Mosfilm.

November 24: The USSR and the United States ratify the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

1970

March 19: Open letter by Academician A. Sakharov (1921-1989) demanding democratization of the USSR.

March 28: *Ogonyok* magazine publishes an article by the historian N. Savinchenko and A. Shirokov "About the film *The Sixth of July*", which finally dashed the hope of awarding the Lenin Prize to the film.

April 22: USSR solemnly celebrated the centenary of the birth of Vladimir Lenin (1870-1924).

May 12-22: All-Union Film Festival (Minsk).

October 8: writer A. Solzhenitsyn (1918-2008) is announced the winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature.

October 15: Aeroflot plane hijacking from the USSR to Turkey (hijackers and murderers of flight attendant N. Kurchenko: father and son Brazinskas).

October 24: S. Allende (1908-1973) is elected president of Chile.

December 13: Increase in prices of meat and other foodstuffs initiated unrest and the resignation of the country's leadership in Poland.

December 17: The culmination of workers' protests in Poland.

1971

March 30-April 9: XXIV Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

May 11-13: II Congress of Soviet Cinematographers.

June 29 - July 2: The Fifth Congress of Soviet Writers.

July 20-August 3: Moscow International film Festival. Golden prizes: *The White Bird with a Black Mark* (USSR, directed by Y. Ilyenko), *The Confession of the Police Commissioner to the Public Prosecutor* (Italy, directed by D. Damiani), *Live Today, Die Tomorrow* (Japan, directed by K. Shindo).

1972

January 21: Resolution of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On literary and art criticism".

February 22-29: All-Union Film Festival (Tbilisi).

August 2: The Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party decree "On measures for further development of the Soviet cinematography".

August 4: Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR on transformation of the Committee on Cinematography under the Council of Ministers of the USSR (Film Committee of the USSR) into the Union-Republic State Committee on Cinematography (Goskino USSR).

December 30: The USSR celebrated its fiftieth anniversary.

1973

April: All-Union Film Festival (Alma-Ata).

June 18-25: Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the USA, signing a number of agreements.

May 27: The USSR joined the World (Geneva) Copyright Convention.

July 3: Opening of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki).

July 10-23: International film Festival in Moscow. Gold prizes: *That Sweet Word: Freedom!* (USSR, director V. Žalakevičius), *Love* (Bulgaria, director L. Staikov), *Oklahoma Crude* (USA, director S. Kramer).

August 29: The publication in the newspaper *Pravda* open letter of Soviet scientists, condemning the anti-Soviet actions and speeches of Academician A. Sakharov (1921-1989). The letter was signed by academicians: N. Basov (1922-2001), N. Belov (1891-1982), N. Bogolyubov (1909-1992), A. Braunstein (1902-1986), A. Vinogradov (1895-1975), S. Vonsovsky (1910-1998), B. Vul (1903-1985), N. Dubinin (1907-1998), N. Zhavoronkov (1907-1990), B. Kedrov (1903-1985), M. Keldysh (1911-1978), V. Kotelnikov (1908-2005), G. Kurdyumov (1902-1996), A. Logunov (1926-2015), M. Markov (1908-1994), A. Nesmeyanov (1899-1980), A. Obukhov (1918-1989), Y. Ovchinnikov (1934-1988), A. Oparin (1894-1980), B. Paton (1918-2020), B. Petrov (1913-1980), P. Pospelov (1898-1979), A. Prokhorov (1916-2002), O. Reutov (1920-1998), A. Rumyantsev (1905-1993), L. Sedov (1907-1999), N. Semenov (1896-1986), D. Skobeltsyn (1892-1990), S. Sobolev (1908-1989), V. Spitsyn (1902-1988), V. Timakov (1905-1977), A. Tikhonov (1906-1993), V. Tuchkevich (1904-1997), P. Fedoseev (1908-1990), I. Frank (1908-1990), A. Frumkin (1895-1976), Y. Khariton (1904-1996), M. Khrapchenko (1904-1986), P. Cherenkov (1904-1990), V. Engelhardt (1894-1984).

August 31: The publication in the *Pravda* newspaper of an open letter from Soviet writers condemning the anti-Soviet actions and speeches of Academician A. Sakharov (1921-1989) and writer A. Solzhenitsyn (1918-2008). The letter was signed by: Ch. Aitmatov (1928-2008), Y. Bondarev (1924-2020), R. Gamzatov (1923-2003), O. Gonchar (1918-1995), N. Gribachev (1910-1992), S. Zalygin (1913-2000), V. Kataev (1897-1986), V. Kozhevnikov (1909-1984), G. Markov (1911-1991), S. Mikhalkov (1913-2009), S. Narovchatov (1919-1981), B. Polevoy (1908-1981), A. Salynsky (1920-1993), S. Sartakov (1908-2005), K. Simonov (1915-1979), S. Smirnov (1915-1976), A. Sofronov (1911-1990), M. Stelmakh (1912-1983), A. Surkov (1899-1983), N. Tikhonov (1896-1979), K. Fedin (1892-1977), A. Chakovsky (1913-1994), M. Sholokhov (1905-1984), S. Shchipachev (1899-1980) and other famous Soviet writers.

September 3: Publication in the *Pravda* newspaper of an open letter by Soviet composers condemning the anti-Soviet actions and speeches of Academician A. Sakharov (1921-1989). The letter was signed by: D. Kabalevsky (1904-1987), K. Karaev (1918-1982), G. Sviridov (1915-1998), S. Tulikov (1914-2004), A. Khachaturian (1903-1978), T. Khrennikov (1913-2007),

D. Shostakovich (1906-1975), A. Eshpai (1925-2015), R. Shchedrin, and other famous Soviet composers.

September 5: The publication in the newspaper *Pravda* of an open letter of Soviet filmmakers, condemning the anti-Soviet actions and speeches of Academician A. Sakharov (1921-1989). The letter was signed by G. Alexandrov (1903-1983), A. Alov (1923-1983), V. Artmane (1929-2008), S. Bondarchuk (1920-1994), S. Gerasimov (1906-1985), E. Dzigan (1898-1981), S. Dolidze (1903-1983), M. Donskoy (1901-1981), V. Žalakevičius (1930-1996), A. Zarkhi (1908-1997), A. Zguridi (1904-1998), A. Karaganov (1915-2007), R. Carmen (1906-1978), L. Kulidzhanov (1924-2002), T. Levchuk (1912-1998), E. Matveev (1922-2003), A. Medvedkin (1900-1989), V. Monakhov (1922-1983), V. Naumov (1927-2021), Y. Ozerov (1921-2001), Y. Reisman (1903-1994), G. Roshal (1898-1983), V. Tikhonov (1928-2009), V. Sanayev (1912-1996), I. Heifits (1905-1995), D. Khrabrovitsky (1923-1980), S. Yutkevich (1904-1985), L. Chursina.

September 10: Temporarily stopping the jamming of *BBC*, *DW* and *Voice of America* broadcasts on Soviet territory.

September 11: A military coup in Chile. President S. Allende (1908-1973) commits suicide. The military led by General A. Pinochet (1915-2006) seized power.

December 29: Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union "On Measures for Further Development of the Soviet Cinematography".

December: The first volume of Solzhenitsyn's anti-Soviet/anti-communist book *The Gulag Archipelago* is published in Paris.

1974

January 4: Resolution of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party "On the exposure of the anti-Soviet campaign of bourgeois propaganda in connection with the publication of Solzhenitsyn's book *Gulag Archipelago*.

February 13: writer A. Solzhenitsyn was deported from the USSR.

April 12-19: All-Union Film Festival (Baku).

May 19: V. Giscard d'Estaing (1926-2020) is elected president of France.

July 3: U.S. President Richard Nixon's visit to the USSR. The treaty limiting underground nuclear tests is signed.

July 15-19: the docking of the Soyuz and Apollo spacecraft.

August 9: As a result of the Watergate scandal, President Nixon (1913-1994) resigns. Vice-President Gerald Ford (1913-2006) becomes president of the United States.

October 24: Soviet Minister of Culture E. Furtseva (1910-1974) commits suicide.

November 23-24: U.S. President G. Ford's visit to the USSR.

1975

January 15: the USSR withdrew from a trade treaty with the United States, protesting the statements of the U.S. Congress on the subject of Jewish emigration.

March: Anatoly Golubev (1935-2020) replaced Dmitry Pisarevsky (1912-1990) as editor of Soviet Screen magazine. A. Golubev held this post until 1978.

April 18-25: All-Union Film Festival (Kishinev).

April 30: end of the Vietnam War.

May 9: the USSR celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany.

July 10-23: Moscow International Film Festival. Gold prizes: *Dersu Uzala* (USSR-Japan, directed by A. Kurosawa), *Promised Land* (Poland, directed by A. Wajda), *We So Loved Each Other* (Italy, directed by Ettore Scola).

August 1: the USSR together with 35 other countries signs the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Helsinki.

October 9: One of the most active Russian dissidents, Academician A. Sakharov (1921-1989) was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

1976

February 24 - March 5: the XXV Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

April 18-25: All-Union film festival (Frunze).

May 11-13: III Congress of Cinematographers of the USSR.

May 28: The USSR and the USA sign a treaty on the prohibition of underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes with a yield of more than 150 kilotons.

21-25 June: The Sixth Congress of Soviet Writers.

October 12: Decree of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party "On work with creative young people".

1977

January 20: U.S. President J. Carter took office.

May 19-26: All-Union Film Festival (Riga).

July 7-21: Moscow International Film Festival. Golden prizes: *Mimino* (USSR, directed by G. Danelia), *The Fifth Seal* (Hungary, directed by Z. Fabri), *Weekend* (Spain, directed by J.-A. Bardem).

October 4: Opening of the Belgrade Conference to oversee implementation of decisions of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

October 7: The Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopts the Constitution (Basic Law) of the USSR.

November 7: The sixtieth anniversary of the 1917 Revolution is solemnly celebrated in the USSR.

1978

April 17: Coup d'état in Afghanistan, supported by the USSR.

May 5-13: All-Union Film Festival (Yerevan).

July 5: By decree of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the State Committee on Cinematography of the USSR Council of Ministers (Goskino USSR) was transformed into the State Committee on Cinematography of the USSR (Goskino USSR).

July: Dal Orlov (1935-2021) replaced Anatoly Golubev (1935-2020) as editor of *Soviet Screen* magazine. D. Orlov held this post until 1986.

1979

May 6: Resolution of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party "On Further Improvement of Ideological, Political and Educational Work".

May 11-20: All-Union Film Festival (Ashkhabad).

June 18: The USSR and the United States concluded a treaty on limiting strategic offensive arms.

August 14-28: Moscow International Film Festival. Gold prizes: *Christ Stopped at Eboli* (Italy-France, directed by F. Rosi), *Seven Days in January* (Spain-France, directed by J.-A. Bardem), *Amateur* (Poland, directed by K. Kieslowski).

August: the USSR celebrated the 60th anniversary of Soviet cinematography.

September 16: The second coup d'etat in Afghanistan, again supported by the USSR.

December 16-17: Soviet troops are brought into Afghanistan.

1980

January 3: U.S. President J. Carter postpones ratification of the U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (START II) due to Soviet troops entering Afghanistan.

January 4: U.S. President J. Carter announces that he is curtailing ties with the USSR and intends to boycott the 1980 Olympics in Moscow.

January 22: Academician A. Sakharov is exiled to Gorky. By the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR he was deprived of the title of thrice Hero of Socialist Labor and by the decree of the USSR Council of Ministers, of the title of laureate of the Stalin (1953) and Lenin (1956) prizes.

April 8-15: All-Union Film Festival (Dushanbe).

April 22: The USSR solemnly celebrated 110 years since the birth of Vladimir Lenin (1870-1924).

July 19 - August 3: the XXII Summer Olympic Games in Moscow.

July 25: death of actor and bard V. Vysotsky (1938-1980).

August 14: strike in Poland at the Gdansk Shipyard, start of the Solidarity mass movement and mass strikes.

August 20: The resumption of jamming of *BBC*, *DW* and *Voice of America* broadcasts on Soviet territory.

November: World oil prices reach their highest peak in the Soviet era (\$41 per barrel).

1981

January 20: R. Reagan (1911-2004) takes office as president of the United States.

February 23-March 3: XXVI Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

March 27: Poland's largest national warning strike in history, involving about 13 million people.

March 27: The USSR declares the Polish Solidarity trade union a counterrevolutionary organization.

March 31: The American Academy of Motion Picture Arts awards the Oscar for Best Foreign Film of the Year to the Soviet film *Moscow Doesn't Believe in Tears* (directed by V. Menshov).

April 24: U.S. President R. Reagan lifted the embargo on grain shipments to the USSR.

May 13: Political film directed by A. Wajda, *Man of Iron*, which supported the Solidarity movement, received the Palme d'Or at the Cannes International Film Festival.

May: All-Union Film Festival (Vilnius).

May 19-21, 1981: IV Congress of Filmmakers of the USSR.

May 21: After winning the elections, François Mitterrand (1916-1996) takes office as President of France.

June 30 - July 3: The Seventh Congress of Soviet Writers.

July 7-21: International Film Festival in Moscow. Gold prizes: *Tehran 43* (USSR-France-Switzerland, directed by A. Alov, V. Naumov), *Squeezed Man* (Brazil, directed by J.B. di Andradi), *Wasted Field* (Vietnam, directed by N. Hong Sheng).

October 27: Resolution of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party "On Improving the Production and Screening of Films for Children and Teenagers".

November 20: The USSR signed contracts for the supply of natural gas from Siberia to Western European countries.

December 13: Chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers W. Jaruzelski (1923-2014) declared martial law in Poland. Beginning of mass arrests and restrictions of civil and trade union rights in Poland.

December 29: U.S. President Reagan's statement concerning the inadmissibility of Soviet interference in Poland and the announcement of new U.S. sanctions against the USSR.

1982

January 20: Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR "On Improving the Production and Screening of Films for Children and Teenagers in the RSFSR".

January 23: The signing of the contract between the USSR and France for the supply of Siberian gas.

April 12-22: All-Union film festival (Tallinn).

July 23: Resolution of the Plenum of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party."On the creative links of literary and art magazines with the practice of communist construction".

November 10: Death of Leonid Brezhnev (1906-1982), general secretary of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party., Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

November 12: Y. Andropov (1914-1984).

November 13: U.S. President R. Reagan repeals the sanctions he imposed in connection with the events in Poland.

December 30: The USSR solemnly celebrates its sixtieth birthday.

1983

May 17-26: All-Union Film Festival (Leningrad).

June: Resolution of the Plenum of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party "Topical Issues of Ideological, Mass-Political Work of the Party".

July 4-6: a visit to the USSR by Chancellor G. Kohl (1930-2017).

July 20: the Polish government announced the end of martial law and an amnesty for political prisoners.

July 7-21: International Film Festival in Moscow. Gold prizes: *Vassa* (USSR, directed by Gleb Panfilov), *Amok* (Morocco-Guinea-Senegal, directed by S. Ben Barca), *Alcino and the Condor* (Nicaragua-Cuba-Mexico-Costa Rico, directed by M. Littin).

August 20: U.S. President Reagan imposed a ban on shipments of pipeline construction equipment to the USSR.

September 1: a South Korean passenger plane is shot down by a Soviet fighter jet.

November 18: a Soviet plane is seized in Georgia with the purpose of hijacking it abroad. Among those who unsuccessfully tried to hijack the plane was the young actor G. Kobakhidze (1962-1984, shot 3.10.1984), son of the famous Soviet director M. Kobakhidze (1939-2019), who directed the films *Wedding* and *Umbrella*. Shortly before that Kobakhidze had played one of the roles in Abuladze's yet-to-be-released film *Repentance* (the episodes with his participation were removed from the final version of the film and the role was given to another actor).

November 24: Yuri Andropov issued a statement against the deployment of Pershing-2 missiles in Europe and cancelled the moratorium on the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

1984

January 17: A conference on disarmament in Europe opened in Stockholm.

February 9: death of Yuri Andropov (1914-1984), General Secretary of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party.

February 13: K. Chernenko (1911-1985) becomes General Secretary of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party.

April 19: Resolution of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party and the USSR Council of Ministers "On measures for further improvement of the ideological and artistic level of films and strengthening of the material and technical basis of the cinematography".

May 8: USSR statement on the boycott of the Olympic Games in Los Angeles.

May 7-16: All-Union Film Festival (Kiev).

June 21-23: French President François Mitterrand visits the USSR.

June 29: the USSR protested against the U.S. military program "Star Wars".

July 10: at a press conference in Milan, filmmaker A. Tarkovsky (1932-1986) announces that he has decided to remain in the West. Also present at this press conference was theater director Yuri Lyubimov (1917-2014), who was soon stripped of his Soviet citizenship and also remained in the West.

December 15-21: visit of Politburo member M. Gorbachev (1931-2022) to Great Britain, his meeting with Prime Minister M. Thatcher (1925-2013).

1985

March 10: Death of K. Chernenko (1911-1985), General Secretary of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

March 11: Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee elected M. Gorbachev (1931-2022) as General Secretary of the Central Committee of Soviet Communist Party.

March 12: the resumption of the negotiations on arms limitation in Geneva.

April 20: M. Gorbachev put forward the slogan of "acceleration" (raising industry and the welfare of the population in a foreseeable short time, including at the expense of the cooperative movement).

May 9: The USSR celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany.

May 16: Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR "On Intensifying the Battle against Drunkenness", beginning of the anti-alcohol campaign, which raised the price of alcohol by 45 % and reduced its production (also by destroying vineyards), intensified samovanivir (which in turn led to a shortage of sugar); simultaneously began increasing the life span of the USSR population and there was a slight decrease in crimes committed under the influence of alcohol.

May 13-20: All-Union film festival (Minsk).

June 28-July 12: Moscow International Film Festival. Gold prizes: *Come and See* (USSR, directed by Elem Klimov), *A Soldier's Story* (USA, directed by N. Jewison), *End of Nine* (Greece,

directed by H. Chopahas).

July 14: In Schengen (Luxembourg), seven Western European countries sign the Schengen Agreement.

July 30: M. Gorbachev (1931-2022) announces a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions by the USSR.

19-21 November: U.S. President R. Reagan and General Secretary of the of Soviet Communist Party M. Gorbachev met in Geneva.

December: B. Yeltsin (1931-2007) is appointed First Secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the Soviet Communist Party.

Appendix 6. The main dates and events related to the historical, political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural and cinematic context in which the publication of the *Soviet Screen* magazine was carried out in 1986-1991

1986

February 25 - March 6, 1986: XXVII Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

April 21-28: All-Union Film Festival (Alma-Ata).

April 26: Accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant.

May 13-15: The 5th Congress of Soviet Cinematographers, which proclaimed a course towards the restructuring of Soviet cinema.

May 29: meeting of the secretariat of the Union of Cinematographers, dedicated to the state of affairs in the *Soviet Screen* magazine, where there was sharp criticism of the editorial office and editor-in-chief of the magazine D. Orlov(1935-2021).

June 24-28: Eighth Congress of Writers of the USSR.

June: M. Gorbachev (1931-2022) announces the beginning of "perestroika".

June: a three-fold drop in world oil prices (from \$ 29 per barrel, noted the previous year, to \$ 10), sharply intensifying the economic crisis in the USSR.

July 7-10: visit to the USSR of French President François Mitterrand (1916-1996).

October 11-12: meeting of M. Gorbachev (1931-2022) and R. Reagan (1911-2004) in Reykjavik.

November 4: Opening of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Vienna.

November 19: The law "On individual labor activity" is adopted in the USSR.

December 23: Academician A. Sakharov (1921-1989) returns from exile to Moscow.

December: Yuri Rybakov (1931-2006) succeeds Dal Orlov (1935-2021) as editor of *Soviet Screen*. Y. Rybakov retained this position until 1990.

1987

January 13: Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On the procedure for the creation on the territory of the USSR and the activities of joint ventures with the participation of Soviet organizations and firms of capitalist and developing countries."

January 27-28: "Perestroika" Plenum of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, which decided to develop cooperatives and alternative elections.

February 5: Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On the establishment of cooperatives for the production of consumer goods."

March 28—April 1: British Prime Minister M. Thatcher (1925-2013) visits the USSR.

May 1: The "Law on individual labor activity" came into force in the USSR.

May 18-24: All-Union Film Festival (Tbilisi). The main prize was awarded to the film *Repentance* by T. Abuladze (1924-1994).

May 23: USSR cancels jamming of most Western radio stations on its territory.

May 28: 18-year-old amateur pilot M. Rust made an illegal flight from Hamburg (via Helsinki) to Moscow (he landed practically on Red Square).

July 6-17: Moscow International Film Festival. Gold Prize: *Interview* (Italy, director F. Fellini).

October 22: Joseph Brodsky (1940-1996) is awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature.

November 7: The USSR solemnly celebrated the 70th anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power.

December 1-10: M. Gorbachev's visit to Washington. The signing of the treaty on the elimination of medium-range nuclear missiles.

M. Gorbachev (1931-2022) was declared Man of the Year in the West.

World oil prices generally remain low, which leads to a further decline in the economy of the USSR and the standard of living of its population.

1988

March 8: The Ovechkin family makes an unsuccessful attempt to hijack and hijack a passenger plane from the USSR to the West.

March 13: The newspaper *Sovetskaya Rossiya* published a letter from N. Andreeva (1938-2020) "I cannot compromise my principles", in which she actually opposed "perestroika".

April 19-25: All-Union Film Festival (Baku).

May 15: Beginning of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

May 29 – June 2: meeting of M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in Moscow.

May: Boris Pasternak's novel *Doctor Zhivago* was published for the first time in the USSR.

October 24-27: visit to the USSR of German Chancellor G. Kohl (1930-2017).

November 25-26: visit to the USSR of French President François Mitterrand (1916-1996).

November 30: The USSR canceled the jamming of *Radio Free Europe* on its territory.

December 6-8: M. Gorbachev's visit to New York (UN). His statement about the reduction of the Soviet armed forces and the beginning of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe.

World oil prices generally remain low, which leads to a further decline in the economy of the USSR and the standard of living of its population, the desire of the most active part of it to emigrate to the West, now permitted.

1989

January 20: George Bush Sr. (1924-2018) becomes President of the United States.

February 15: End of Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan.

March 26: the first in the history of the USSR alternative elections of delegates to the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR.

April 9: A rally in Tbilisi was violently dispersed by Soviet troops demanding Georgia's independence.

April 18: The Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR proclaimed the republic's state sovereignty.

May 23: Decree on the restoration of Soviet citizenship for theater director Y. Lyubimov (1917-2014).

May 25 - June 9: First Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. M. Gorbachev (1931-2022) was elected to the post of Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

June 4: A student demonstration in Tiananmen Square is dispersed in Beijing.

June 4: Solidarity wins parliamentary elections in Poland.

July 7-18: Moscow International Film Festival. Golden George: *Soap Thieves* (Italy, director M. Niketti).

July 28: The Supreme Soviet of the Latvian SSR proclaimed the republic's state sovereignty.

August: *Novy Mir* magazine, for the first time in the USSR, began publishing A. Solzhenitsyn's book *The Gulag Archipelago*.

November 9: Beginning of the destruction of the Berlin Wall.

November 10: The overthrow of T. Zhivkov (1911-1998) in Bulgaria.

November 24: Victory of the "Velvet Revolution" in Czechoslovakia.

November 18: Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR "On the restructuring of creative, organizational and economic activities in Soviet cinematography", which practically approved the previously given permission to create cooperatives, including cooperatives for the production and distribution of films.

November 26: The victory of the anti-communist opposition in the elections in Hungary.

December 12-24: II Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. The congress condemned the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact (1939), as well as the Soviet troops in Afghanistan and the use of military force in Tbilisi on 1989.

December 14: death of academician A. Sakharov (1921-1989).
December: victory of anti-communist forces in Romania.
Numerous meetings of M. Gorbachev with Western leaders (including US President George W. Bush) and his statements about further disarmament.
Mass riots in a number of union republics.
World oil prices generally remain low, which leads to a further decline in the economy of the USSR and the standard of living of its population.

1990

January 30: The USSR agrees to the unification of Germany.
February 27-28: The founding congress of the Union of Cinematographers of Russia.
March 25: Soviet authorities send troops to Vilnius to stop Lithuania from secession from the USSR.
April: Victor Demin (1937-1993) succeeded Yuri Rybakov (1931-2006) as editor of Soviet Screen.
May 29: B. Yeltsin (1931-2007) was elected Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR.
June 12: The Declaration on State Sovereignty of the RSFSR is adopted. The priority of Russian laws over all-Union legislation has been introduced.
July 2-13, 1990: the last XXVIII Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. During the congress, B. Yeltsin defiantly announces his withdrawal from the Soviet Communist Party.
July 14-16: The USSR agrees to the entry of a united Germany into NATO.
September 12: Signing of the German unification treaty.
September 18: The newspaper *Komsomolskaya Pravda* published an article by A. Solzhenitsyn "How can we equip Russia?".
October 15: M. Gorbachev was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.
Numerous meetings of M. Gorbachev with Western leaders.
Mass riots in a number of union republics.
The Union republics one by one declared their sovereignty.
World oil prices generally remain low, which leads to a further decline in the economy of the USSR and the standard of living of its population.

1991

January 16-19: War in Kuwait between the US and Iraq.
May 20: The Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted the Law "On the Procedure for Exiting the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Entry into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of Citizens of the USSR", allowing free travel of citizens of the USSR abroad.
June 12: B. Yeltsin is elected President of the RSFSR. A. Rutskoy was elected Vice-President.
July 1: The elimination of the military bloc of the Warsaw Pact countries.
July 8-19: Moscow International Film Festival. Golden George: *Piebald dog running along the edge of the sea* (USSR-FRG, director K. Gevorkyan).
August 19-22: Failed coup attempt in the USSR.
August 24: M. Gorbachev resigned from the post of General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and called on the Central Committee Soviet Communist Party to announce the self-dissolution of the party.
Mass riots in a number of union republics. A number of republics of the USSR declared their independence.
December 8: the actual dissolution of the USSR as a result of the "Belovezhskaya agreements" between the Republic of Belarus, the Russian Federation (RSFSR) and Ukraine as the founding states of the USSR, which signed the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR (1922).
December 25: voluntary resignation of M. Gorbachev (1931-2022) from the post of President of the USSR, transfer of power to B. Yeltsin (1931-2007).
December 26: Official liquidation of the USSR.
World oil prices remain low, which leads to a further decline in the economy of the USSR and the standard of living of its population.

References

- A gde...? 1964 – A gde zhe Moravia? [Where's Moravia?] (1964). *Sovetskij ekran*. 5. [In Russian]
- A Look..., 1929 – Smotr *Sovetskogo ekrana* [A Look at the Soviet Screen] (1929). *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 4. [In Russian]
- Abdrashitov, 1978 – *Abdrashitov, A.* (1978). Catherine Deneuve. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 20-21. [In Russian]
- About..., 1926 – O Harry Peel [About Harry Peel] (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 6-7. [In Russian]
- About..., 1929 – O klassovoj bor'be v kino [About the Class Struggle in Cinema] (1929). *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 3. [In Russian]
- Abramov, 1925 – *Abramov, A.* (1925). Tanec v kino [Dance in the cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 28: 11. [In Russian]
- Abramov, 1926 – *Abramov, A.* (1926). Lyudi pered ekranom [People in front of the screen]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 43: 6. [In Russian]
- Abramov, 1972 – *Abramov, N.* (1972). Gnevnoe oko Dzhozefa Strika [The Wrathful Eye of Joseph Strick]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1972. 21: 18. [In Russian]
- Advertising, 1925 – Reklama [Advertising] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 12. [In Russian]
- Ageev, 1990 – *Ageev, M.* (1990). Prosto ego vyveli iz sebya [They just took him out of his mind]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 15. [In Russian]
- Aitmatov, 1969 – *Aitmatov, C.* (1969). Zametki s XXII Kanskogo [Notes from the XXII Cannes Film Festival]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16. [In Russian]
- Alatri, 1967 – *Alatri, P.* (1967). Nado byt' geroyami [We must be heroes]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11. [In Russian]
- Alexandrov, 1961 – *Alexandrov, A.* (1961). O lyudyah i hishchnikah [About people and predators]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7. [In Russian]
- Alexandrov, 1962 – *Alexandrov, G.* (1962). "K miru bez oruzhiya, k miru bez vojn" ["To the world without guns, to the world without wars"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 2. [In Russian]
- Alexandrov, 1962 – *Alexandrov, G.* (1962). Perom i fotoapparatom [Pen and Camera]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19. [In Russian]
- Alexandrov, 1964 – *Alexandrov, G.* (1964). Novye vstrechi s Chaplinom [New meetings with Chaplin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 19. [In Russian]
- Alexandrov, 1964 – *Alexandrov, G.* (1964). Otkrytie Cheloveka [Opening of the Man]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [In Russian]
- Alexandrov, 1974 – *Alexandrov, A.* (1974). Pora shit' novuyu formu [It's time to sew a new form]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 16-17. [In Russian]
- Alexandrov, 1977 – *Alexandrov, A.* (1977). Dolgaya, dolgaya ispoved' [Long, long confession]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 4. [In Russian]
- Alexandrov, 1978 – *Alexandrov, A.* (1978). Syr bri i francuzskij harakter [Brie cheese and French character]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 5. [In Russian]
- Alexandrov, 1982 – *Alexandrov, V.* (1982). Strazh i plennik [Guard and prisoner]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 8-9. [In Russian]
- Alf, 1926 – *Alf, A.* (1926). Srednyaya nemeckaya kartina [Average German movie]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 40: 5. [In Russian]
- Alf, 1927 – *Alf, A.* (1927). Neu-Babelsberg. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 6. [In Russian]
- Alf, 1927 – *Alf, A.* (1927). Novejshie kinoteatry na Zapade [New cinemas in the West]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 8. [In Russian]
- Alf, 1927 – *Alf, A.* (1927). Zhivopis' v zapadnoj fil'me [Painting in Western Film]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 6-7. [In Russian]
- Algunov, Orlov, 1987 – *Algunov, Y., Orlov, V.* (1987). Boevaya raskraska Gollivuda, ili Muzhskie priklyucheniya na amerikanskij maner [Combat Coloring of Hollywood, or Men's Adventures in American Manner]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 20-22. [In Russian]
- Algunov, Ustimenko, 1985 – *Algunov, Y., Ustimenko, Y.* (1985). Prizyv k bor'be [Call to fight]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 19. [In Russian]
- Allan..., 1926 – *Allan Duen* (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 41: 13. [In Russian]
- Allov, 1959 – *Allov, S.* (1959). Vstrechi v Gollivude [Meetings in Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 3. [In Russian]
- Almendros, 1989 – *Almendros, N.* (1989). Glasnost' v Gollivude ["Glasnost" in Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 14. [In Russian]
- Amashukeli, 1990 – *Amashukeli, N.* (1990). Catherine Deneuve. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 16-17. [In Russian]
- Amashukeli, 1990 – *Amashukeli, N.* (1990). Renoir, Gabin and Montmartre. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1990. 10: 28. [In Russian]
- America..., 1925 – Amerika proizvodit [America produces] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 11. [In Russian]
- American..., 1925 – Hronika po-amerikanski [American Chronicle]. (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 15. [In Russian]
- Amlinsky, 1983 – *Amlinsky, V.* (1983). Neyubilejnoe [Non-jubilee]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 18-19. [In Russian]
- Anatoliev, 1987 – *Anatoliev, O.* (1987). Anthony Hopkins. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 15. [In Russian]
- Andreev, 1964 – *Andreev, F.* (1964). "Bednaya Liza i vse ostal'nye..." ["Poor Liza and all the rest..."]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 17. [In Russian]
- Andreev, 1978 – *Andreev, F.* (1978). Dramy na "ohote za ved'mami" [Dramas on the "hunt for witches"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 6-7. [In Russian]
- Andreev, 1979 – *Andreev, F.* (1979). Drama, detektivy, komedii [Drama, detectives, comedies]. *Sovetskij*

- ekran. 3: 18-19. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1979](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1979). Zhertvy principa domino [Victims of the domino principle]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 14. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1982](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1982). Istoriya i sovremennost' [History and Modernity]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 16-17. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1983](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1983). Ne sklonivshij golovy [Not bowing his head]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 16-17. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1984](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1984). Lyudi, fil'my, vstrechi [People, films, meetings]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 20-21. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1985](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1985). Horoshie idei Normana Dzhyuisona [Norman Jewison's Good Ideas]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 20-21. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1986](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1986). Ostanetsya molodym. Pamyati Dina Rida [Remains young. To the memory of Dean Reed]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 22. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1987](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1987). Fantastika i real'nost' [Fantastic and Reality]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 20. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1988](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1988). Fil'my Myunhenskogo festivalya [Films of Munich Festival]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 20-21. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1989](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1989). Kinomotr syurprizov [Cinematofest of Surprise]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 28. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1989](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1989). SSHA: fil'my, lyudi, vstrechi [USA: films, people, meetings]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 28-29. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1990](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1990). Am'en: vyhod v segodnyashnij den' [Amiens: a way out to the present day]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 4: 28-29. [in Russian]
[Andreev, 1990](#) – *Andreev, F.* (1990). Novoe imya, novoe slovo [New name, new word]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 28. [in Russian]
[Anikst, 1969](#) – *Anikst, A.* (1969). Klubok strastej chelovecheskih [A tangle of human passions]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20. [in Russian]
[Anikst, 1970](#) – *Anikst, A.* (1970). Razvlechenie – delo ser'eznoe! [Entertainment is a serious matter!]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 14-15. [in Russian]
[Anikst, 1973](#) – *Anikst, A.* (1973). Samoe prekrasnoe – tvorchestvo [The most beautiful thing is creativity]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22. [in Russian]
[Anikst, 1975a](#) – *Anikst, A.* (1975). Bez vdohnoven'ya [Without inspiration]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 24: 4. [in Russian]
[Anikst, 1975b](#) – *Anikst, A.* (1975). Kamen' okazalsya ne dragocennym [The stone turned out to be not precious]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 4. [in Russian]
[Anna..., 1975](#) – Anna Karina: Ostavat'sya soboj [Anna Karina: Remain yourself] (1975). *Sovetskij ekran.* 13: 16-17. [in Russian]
[Anninsky, 1965](#) – *Anninsky, L.* (1965). Voprosy bez otvetov [Unanswered Questions]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 24: 16-17. [in Russian]
[Anninsky, 1970](#) – *Anninsky, L.* (1970). Pochernevshij tyul'pan [Blackened tulip]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 15. [in Russian]
[Anninsky, 1972](#) – *Anninsky, L.* (1972). Pavel Vlasov iz Florencii [Pavel Vlasov from Florence]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1972. 7: 16. [in Russian]
[Anoshchenko, 1930](#) – *Anoshchenko, N.* (1930). Biografiya kino [Biography of Cinema]. *Kino i zhizn'.* 1: 16. [in Russian]
[Anoshchenko, 1930](#) – *Anoshchenko, N.* (1930). Tekhnicheskaya pomoshch' zagranicy nashemu kino [Technical assistance from abroad to our cinema]. *Kino i zhizn'.* 9: 14. [in Russian]
[Anti..., 1971](#) – *Anti-tragediya Marilyn Monroe* [Anti-tragedy of Marilyn Monroe] (1971). *Sovetskij ekran.* 17. [in Russian]
[Antonioni, 1986](#) – *Antonioni, M.* (1986). Snimat' fil'm – eto zhit' [To make a film is to live]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1: 20-21.
[Antonov, 1972](#) – *Antonov, O.* (1972). Yolande DuLuart: Nado imet' bol'shoe muzhestvo... [Yolande DuLuart: One must have great courage...]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 14. [in Russian]
[Antonov, 1977](#) – *Antonov, R.* (1977). Jack Nicholson. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5. [in Russian]
[Ardov, 1926](#) – *Ardov, V.* (1926). Razvesistaya klyukva i razvesistyj kovboj [Spreading cranberry and spreading cowboy]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 8-9. [in Russian]
[Aristarco, 1951](#) – *Aristarco, G.* (1951). Storia delle teorie del film. Torino: Einaudi.
[Arnshtam, 1961](#) – *Arnshtam, L.* (1961). Veneciya-61 [Venice 61]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18. [in Russian]
[Aronson, 2003](#) – *Aronson, O.* (2003). Metakino [Meta Cinema]. Moscow. [in Russian]
[Asafova, 1925](#) – *Astafova* (1925). Perepiska Meri s publikoj [Mary's correspondence with the public]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 31: 14. [in Russian]
[Asarkan, 1965](#) – *Asarkan, A.* (1965). Umberto D. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 16. [in Russian]
[Asarkan, 1973](#) – *Asarkan, A.* (1973). Pryamo v glaza zhizni [Directly into the eyes of life]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19. [in Russian]
[Aseev, 1925](#) – *Aseev, N.* (1925). James Kruse – luchshij rezhisser Ameriki [James Kruse – America's Best Director]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 30: 4. [in Russian]
[Asenin, 1971](#) – *Asenin, S.* (1971). Vernye revolyucii [Faithful revolution]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 17. [in Russian]
[Asenin, 1972](#) – *Asenin, S.* (1972). Podskazano vremenem. Karlovy Vary-72 [Prompted by time. Karlovy Vary-72]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 16-17. [in Russian]
[Attasheva, 1925](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1925). Fortelisty i Harold Lloyd [Forteley's people and Harold Lloyd]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 34: 14. [in Russian]

- [Attasheva, 1925](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1925). Gamlet ot komedii [Hamlet from comedy]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 36: 16. [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1925](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1925). Kaprizy kinozvezd [Whims of movie stars]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 37: 13-14. [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1925](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1925). Spiski zapolneny [The lists are full]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1925. 32: 10-11. [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1926](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1926). Erich Stroheim. *Sovetskij ekran.* 33: 14. [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1926](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1926). Murnau. *Sovetskij ekran.* 40: 14. [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1927](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1927). "Nishchenskiy ryad" Gollivuda ["The Beggar's Row" of Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 38: 13. [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1927](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1927). E. DuPont. *Sovetskij ekran.* 32: 13). [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1927](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1927). Novye tarakan'i bega [New cockroach races]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 4. [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1927](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1927). Rezhim ekonomii po-amerikanski [Savings mode in American style]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 34: 13. [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1928](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1928). Chem zhivet Amerika? [What is the life of America?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 41: 10. [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1928](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1928). Govoryashchaya vakkhanaliya [Talking Bacchanalia]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 32: 6. [in Russian]
- [Attasheva, 1929](#) – *Attasheva, P.* (1929). S.O.S. iz Gollivuda [S.O.S. from Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 14. [in Russian]
- [Avdeenko, 1977](#) – *Avdeenko, S.* (1977). Novyj supermif Gollivuda [New super myth of Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 15: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Avdeenko, 1978](#) – *Avdeenko, S.* (1978) Mnogie amplua Barbary Strejzand [Many Roles of Barbara Streisand]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Avdeenko, 1979](#) – *Avdeenko, S.* (1979). Charles Bronson. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 18. [in Russian]
- [Avenarius, 1940](#) – *Avenarius, G.* (1940). Amerikanskaya kinokomediya [American film comedy]. *Sovetskij kinoekran.* 18: 18. [in Russian]
- [Avenarius, 1940](#) – *Avenarius, G.* (1940). Muzykal'nye fil'my na Zapade [Musical films in the West]. *Sovetskij kinoekran.* 15: 15. [in Russian]
- [Avenarius, 1941](#) – *Avenarius, G.* (1941). Mul'tiplikacii Walta Disneya [Walt Disney animation]. *Sovetskij kinoekran.* 3: 12-13. [in Russian]
- [Avenarius, 1958](#) – *Avenarius, G.* (1958). Charli Chaplin opyat' na nashem ekrane [Charlie Chaplin on our screen again]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 10-11. [In Russian]
- [Babenko, 1986](#) – *Babenko, E.* (1986). Monica Vitti: Vlyublena v svoyu professiyu [Monica Vitti: In love with her profession]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 23. [in Russian]
- [Babichenko, 1960](#) – *Babichenko, D.* (1960). Annecy-60. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 10-11. [In Russian]
- [Bachelis, 1964](#) – *Bachelis, T.* (1964). Marcello Mastroianni. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 16-17. [In Russian]
- [Bachelis, 1966](#) – *Bachelis, T.* (1966). Kino po-ital'yanski [Cinema in Italian]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 16-17, 20. [In Russian]
- [Bachelis, 1966](#) – *Bachelis, T.* (1966). Sud'i pered sudom Judges before the Court]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 16-17. [In Russian]
- [Bachelis, 1967](#) – *Bachelis, T.* (1967). Voprositel'nyj znak [Question Mark]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11. [In Russian]
- [Bachelis, 1978](#) – *Bachelis, T.* (1978). Dvizhenie k absurdu [Movement towards the absurd]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 4. [in Russian]
- [Bachelis, 1987](#) – *Bachelis, T.* (1987). Kuda plyvet "Gloriya "N"? [Where is "Gloria "N" going?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 6-8. [in Russian]
- [Bachelis, 1988](#) – *Bachelis, T.* (1988). Fellini prodolzhaetsya [Fellini goes on]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Bakhtin, 1996](#) – *Bakhtin, M.* (1996). Sobranie sochinenij [Collected Works]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- [Balázs, 1935](#) – *Balázs, B.* (1935). Duh fil'my [The spirit of film]. Mocsow. [in Russian]
- [Barabanova, 1971](#) – *Barabanova, M.* (1971). Dustin Hoffman – "netipichnyj amerikanec" [Dustin Hoffman – "an atypical American"]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 17. [in Russian]
- [Baskakov, 1973](#) – *Baskakov, V.* (1973). Smotr mirovogo kinoiskusstva [Review of world cinematography]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 2. [in Russian]
- [Basmanov, 1976](#) – *Basmanov, N.* (1976). Stefania Sandrelli. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20. [in Russian]
- [Bauman, 1979](#) – *Bauman, E.* (1979). S pozicij gumanizma [From the standpoint of humanism]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 5-7. [in Russian]
- [Bauman, 1983](#) – *Bauman, E.* (1983). S veroj v cheloveka, s veroj v budushchee [With faith in man, with faith in the future]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 1-2. [in Russian]
- [Bauman, 1985](#) – *Bauman, E.* (1985). Vo slavu duha chelovecheskogo [For the glory of the human spirit]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bazin, 1971](#) – *Bazin, A.* (1971). What is Cinema? Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [Belenky, 1976](#) – *Belenky, I.* (1976). Fernando Rey. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 17. [in Russian]
- [Belov, 1972](#) – *Belov, F.* (1972). Kak priobretayutsya zarubezhnye fil'my [How foreign films are acquired]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 17. [in Russian]
- [Belova, T. et al., 1961](#) – *Belova, T. et al.* (1961). Dva chasa s Chaplinym [Two Hours with Chaplin]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 18-19. [In Russian]
- [Belyaeva, 1976](#) – *Belyaeva, T.* (1976). Don Kihot iz Irlandii [Don Quixote from Ireland]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 16-17. [in Russian]

- [Bereznitsky, 1975](#) – *Bereznitsky, Y.* (1975). Mesto pod solncem [A place under the sun]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bereznitsky, 1975](#) – *Bereznitsky, Y.* (1975). Poltora chasa udovol'stviya [An hour and a half of pleasure]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Berlin..., 1927](#) – Berlinskije pis'ma [Berlin Letters] (1927). *Sovetskij ekran.* 27: 4. [in Russian]
- [Bernadsky, 1978](#) – *Bernadsky, R.* (1978). Metamorfozy i dejstvitel'nost' [Metamorphoses and Reality]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bernadsky, 1978](#) – *Bernadsky, R.* (1978). Samyj cennyj priz [The most valuable prize]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bernardo..., 1977](#) – Bernardo Bertolucci: Dialektika zhizni [Bernardo Bertolucci: The Dialectic of Life] (1977). *Sovetskij ekran.* 19. [in Russian]
- [Bibler, 1990](#) – *Bibler, V.* (1990). Ot naukoucheniya - k logike kul'tury: dva filosofskih vvedeniya v dvadcat' pervyj vek [From science-teaching to the logic of culture: two philosophical Introductions to the twenty-first century]. Moscow. [in Russian].
- [Birukov, 1982](#) – *Birukov, A.* (1982). Tajna brentvudskogo osobnyaka [The mystery of the Brentwood mansion]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 17. [in Russian]
- [Bleiman, 1960](#) – *Bleiman, M.* (1966). Iskusstvo na kanikulah [Art on vacation]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 14-15. [In Russian]
- [Bleiman, 1966](#) – *Bleiman, M.* (1966). "Poka ne trebuet poeta..." ["Until it requires a poet..."]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 17-18. [In Russian]
- [Bobikov, 1973](#) – *Bobikov, A.* (1973). Stenley Kramer: V poiskah pravdy o cheloveke [Stanley Kramer: In Search of the Truth About Man]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1973. 13. [in Russian]
- [Bobrova, 1983](#) – *Bobrova, O.* (1983). Fontamara: chto delat'? [Fontamara: what to do?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Bobrova, 1983](#) – *Bobrova, O.* (1983). Maestro Federico. *Sovetskij ekran.* 3: 17-18. [in Russian]
- [Bocharov, 1972](#) – *Bocharov, Y.* (1972). Dva polyusa: kommerciya i politika [Two poles: commerce and politics]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 15. [in Russian]
- [Bogatyreva, 2013](#) – *Bogatyreva, E.* (2013). Kinoobraz "a-lya ryus": iz istorii vospriyatiya po obe storony granicy [Film image "a la russe": from the history of perception on both sides of the border]. *Mezhdunarodnyj zhurnal issledovaniy kul'tury.* 4(13). [in Russian]
- [Bogatyreva, 2017](#) – *Bogatyreva, E.* (2017). Zhurnal *Sovetskij ekran* v yubilejnom 1927 godu [Soviet screen magazine in the anniversary year 1927]. *Hudozhestvennaya kul'tura.* 4(22): 4. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1966](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1966). Uvideno v zhizni [Seen in life]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 18. [In Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1971](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1971). Samorazoblachenie "sil'nogo cheloveka" [Self-disclosure of a "strong man"]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1971](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1971). Sdelano v Italii [Made in Italy]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 13-14. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1972](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1972). Cesare Zavattini. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1972](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1972). Tak li prost "Serafino"? [Is *Serafino* so simple?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1973](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1973). Palatka na ploshchadi. Rabochij klass na ekrane Italii [Tent on the square. The working class on the screen of Italy]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1973](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1973). Uzhasy po-ital'yanski [Horrors in Italian]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 18. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1974](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1974). Amarcord. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 14. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1974](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1974). Franco Nero: ot "zvezdy" – k borcu [Franco Nero: from the "star" to the wrestler]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1974](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1974). Ital'yanskie portrety [Italian portraits]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1975](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1975). Detektiv v Rime [Detective in Rome]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 17. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1979](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1979). Cesare Zavattini. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 19-20. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1979](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1979). Stefania Sandrelli. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1979](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1979). Vestern-spagetti plyus komediya ["Western spaghetti" plus comedy]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 12-13. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1979a](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1979). Adriano Celentano. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 18. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1980](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1980). Nashestvie mirazhej [Invasion of mirages]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1980](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1980). Neobychnaya sud'ba Gavino Leddy [The Unusual Fate of Gavino Ledda]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1981](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1981). Michelangelo Antonioni. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 17. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1983](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1983). ...I romantichnyj Antonio [...And romantic Antonio]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 13: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1983](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1983). Udivitel'nyj Nino Manfredi [Amazing Nino Manfredi]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 19-20. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1985](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1985). Repeticiya shedevra [Rehearsal of a masterpiece]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1986](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1986). Slezy i ulybka Dzhul'etty Maziny [Tears and smile of Julietta Masina]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1987](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1987a). Celentano v Moskve [Celentano in Moscow]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 12-13, 15.

- [Bogemsky, 1987](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1987b). Vstrechi s komissarom Cattani [Meetings with Commissar Cattani]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Bogemsky, 1990](#) – *Bogemsky, G.* (1990). Ornella Muti. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1: 16-18. [in Russian]
- [Bogolepova, 1981](#) – *Bogolepova, D.* (1981). Ornella Muti. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Bogolepova, 1982](#) – *Bogolepova, D.* (1982). Melodii Nino Rota [Melodies of Nino Rota]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 18. [in Russian]
- [Bogolepova, 1984](#) – *Bogolepova, D.* (1984). Eleonora Giorgi. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 18. [in Russian]
- [Bogomolov, 1972](#) – *Bogomolov, Y.* (1972). "Zadumchivost' – ego podrug..." ["Perspective is his friend..."]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 4: 15. [in Russian]
- [Bogomolov, 1973](#) – *Bogomolov, Y.* (1973). Pochti kak v avtomate [Almost like in an automaton]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 4. [in Russian]
- [Bogomolov, 1975](#) – *Bogomolov, Y.* (1975). Mister muzhchina [Mister Man]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 3-4. [in Russian]
- [Bogomolov, 1976](#) – *Bogomolov, Y.* (1976). Del'fin-sapiens [Dolphin sapiens]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6. [in Russian]
- [Bogomolov, 1989](#) – *Bogomolov, Y.* (1989). Bol'shaya igra s uchastiem rabyni Izaury, guvernantki Dzhen i pisatelya Stepanova [Big game with slave Isaura, governess Jane and writer Stepanov]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 7. [in Russian]
- [Bogomolov, 1989](#) – *Bogomolov, Y.* (1989). Osiroiteli?! [Orphaned?!]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 17: 10. [in Russian]
- [Bogomolov, 1990](#) – *Bogomolov, Y.* (1990). O, Fellini! O, Gosteleradio! [Oh, Fellini! Oh, Gosteleradio!]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 30. [in Russian]
- [Bogomolov, 1991](#) – *Bogomolov, Y.* (1991). Prishestvie so vtoroj popytki [Coming with the second attempt]. *Ekran.* 18: 29. [in Russian]
- [Bogomolov, 1991](#) – *Bogomolov, Y.* (1991a). Dallas: pervye vpechatleniya [Dallas: first impressions]. *Ekran.* 13: 23. [in Russian]
- [Bolezni..., 1988](#) – *Bolezni rosta* (1988). Kto pod stat'ej hodit? [Diseases of Growth. Who is under criminally liable?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 10: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Boltyansky, 1926](#) – *Boltyansky, G.* (1926). Kakie uroki nam daet zagranichnaya kinohronika [What lessons does foreign newsreel give us]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 15: 6. [in Russian]
- [Bondarchuk, 1960](#) – *Bondarchuk, S.* (1960). USA, Mexico, Italy... *Sovetskij ekran.* 11. 12: 2-3. 13. 14. 15: 3-4. 18. [In Russian]
- [Borev, Morozov, 1989](#) – *Borev, V., Morozov, A.* (1989). Sud da delo [Judgment is a case]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 22-23. [in Russian]
- [Borisov, 1926](#) – *Borisov, E.* (1926). Kinoparad monarhistov [Film Parade of Monarchists]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 51-52: 3. [in Russian]
- [Borisov, 1977](#) – *Borisov, M.* (1977). Krest zheleznyj – krest berezovyj [Iron Cross - Birch Cross]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12. [in Russian]
- [Bosenko, 1991](#) – *Bosenko, V.* (1991). Popurri na russkie temy [Popurri on Russian themes]. *Ekran.* 18: 6-7. [in Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1960](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1960). Pervymi pogibayut deti... [The first to die children...]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 12-13. [In Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1960](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1960). Protiv «nepokornyh» [Against the "unruly"]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 17. [In Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1962](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1962). Dolgaya noch' 1943 goda [The Long night of 1943]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16. [In Russian] [In Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1962](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1962). I eto vsyo zoloto francuzskogo kino [And that's all the gold of French cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 3: 18-20. [In Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1966](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1966). Jean Gabin. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 18-19. [In Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1966](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1966). Ugasanie chuvstv [Fading feelings]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 17-18. [In Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1967](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1967). Kuda vedet doroga? [Where the road leads?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 14-15. [In Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1967](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1967). Vittorio De Sica. *Sovetskij ekran.* 3. [In Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1975](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1976). Bozhovich, V. Novye priklyucheniya vysokogo blondina [New adventures of a tall blond]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 4. [in Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1977](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1977). Bozhovich, V. O Vremena! O nrawy!.. [O Times! About morals!..]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 15: 5. [in Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1979](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1979). [Yves Boisset obvinyaet... [Yves Boisset accuses...]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 18. [in Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1981](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1981). Mir Rene Klera [The world of René Clair]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 15: 18. [in Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1986](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1986). Uroki Francois Truffaut [Lessons of Francois Truffaut]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 10. [in Russian]
- [Bozhovich, 1991](#) – *Bozhovich, V.* (1991). Ulybka svobody [A Smile of Freedom]. *Ekran.* 18: 10-11. [in Russian]
- [Bragin, 1986](#) – *Bragin, A.* (1986). Neunyvayushchaya chetverka [The four who do not get discouraged]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 21. [in Russian]
- [Braginsky, 1959](#) – *Braginsky, A.* (1959). Obmanshchiki [Deceivers]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5. [In Russian]
- [Braginsky, 1960](#) – *Braginsky, A.* (1960). Istoriya "Malen'kogo soldata" [The Story of "Little Soldier"]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 17. [In Russian]
- [Braginsky, 1961](#) – *Braginsky, A.* (1961). Amerika glazami francuza [America through the Eyes of a Frenchman]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 24. [In Russian]

- Braginsky, 1962 – *Braginsky, A.* (1962). Rene Clair. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 16-17. [In Russian]
- Braginsky, 1973 – *Braginsky, A.* (1973). Jean-Paul Belmondo. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1973 – *Braginsky, A.* (1973). Pokushenie. Kto zhertva? [Attempt. Who is the victim?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 13. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1979 – *Braginsky, A.* (1979). Sochetanie talantov [Combination of talents]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1981 – *Braginsky, A.* (1981). Gerard Depardieu. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1981. 20: 17. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1982 – *Braginsky, A.* (1982). Victor Lanoux. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 18. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1986 – *Braginsky, A.* (1986). Lino Ventura. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1987 – *Braginsky, A.* (1987). Fanny Ardant. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 18. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1987 – *Braginsky, A.* (1987). Pamyati Lino Ventury [In memory of Lino Ventura]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 24: 18. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1987 – *Braginsky, A.* (1987). Philippe Noiret. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1987 – *Braginsky, A.* (1987). Russkoe imya [Russian Name]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 20. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1989 – *Braginsky, A.* (1989). Parizhskie zametki [Parisian notes]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 4: 30-31. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1990 – *Braginsky, A.* (1990). Vstrecha cherez 20 let [Meeting after 20 years]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 13: 14. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1991 – *Braginsky, A.* (1991). Dorogostoyashchaya shutka Gerard Depardieu [Expensive joke of Gerard Depardieu]. *Ekran.* 13: 30. [in Russian]
- Braginsky, 1991 – *Braginsky, A.* (1991). U sten Mapalagi [At the Walls of Mapalaga]. *Ekran.* 18: 13. [in Russian]
- Branitsky, 1929 – *Branitsky, N.* (1929). Kar'era Roberta Penfol'da [Career of Robert Penfold]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 30: 8. [in Russian]
- Budenny, 1984 – *Budenny, A.* (1984). "Sto dnei Palermo" ["One Hundred Days of Palermo"]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 4: 19. [in Russian]
- Budushchee..., 1969 – Budushchee Ameriki [Future of America] (1969). *Sovetskij ekran.* 1. [in Russian]
- Bulba..., 1962 – Bulba protiv Bulby [Bulba v. Bulba] (1962). *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 18. [In Russian]
- Businessmen..., 1929 – Del'cy iz "Teakinopechati" [Businessmen from Teakinoprint] (1929). *Krasnaya gazeta.* 67: 4. 15.03.1929. [in Russian]
- Cannes, 1963 – Cannes, 63 (1963). *Sovetskij ekran.* 13. [In Russian]
- Case..., 1929 – Delo kino-tea-pechati [Case of Teakinoprint] (1929). *Rabis.* 13: 11. 26.03.1929. [in Russian]
- Casetti, 1999 – *Casetti, F.* (1999). Theories of Cinema, 1945–1990, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Catherine..., 1966 – Catherine Deneuve (1966). *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 13. [In Russian]
- Cecil..., 1926 – Cecil DeMile (1926). *Sovetskij ekran.* 36: 14. [in Russian]
- Chaplin, 1965 – *Chaplin, Ch.* (1965). O vremeni i o sebe [About time and about himself]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1. [In Russian]
- Chaplin..., 1969 – Chaplin rabotaet nad novym fil'mom [Chaplin working on a new film] (1969). *Sovetskij ekran.* 22. [In Russian]
- Chekin, 1961 – *Chekin, I.* (1961). Svet i teni Parizha [Light and Shadows of Paris]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 16-17. [In Russian]
- Chernenko, 1965 – *Chernenko, M.* (1965). Fernadel. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 18-19. [In Russian]
- Chernenko, 1966 – *Chernenko, M.* (1966). Znakom'tes': Anna Karina [Meet: Anna Karina]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23. [In Russian]
- Chernenko, 1969 – *Chernenko, M.* (1969). Valerio Zurlini: Protiv duhovnogo oskudeniya! [Valerio Zurlini: Against spiritual impoverishment!]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 16. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, 1973 – *Chernenko, M.* (1973). Krakow-73. *Sovetskij ekran.* 17. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, 1973 – *Chernenko, M.* (1973). Shestnadcat' monologov o sovesti [Sixteen monologues about conscience]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1976. 16: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, 1975 – *Chernenko, M.* (1975). Neobhodimye koordinaty [Necessary coordinates]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 13: 8-9. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, 1976 – *Chernenko, M.* (1976). Jacques Tati: Velikaya professiya – kloun [Jacques Tati: A great profession is a clown]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 15. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, 1981 – *Chernenko, V.* (1981). Bezzvinnyj i vinovatyj Kramer [Innocent and guilty Kramer]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 13: 16. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, 1983 – *Chernenko, V.* (1983). "Novye modeli" agressii ["New Models" of Aggression]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, 1985 – *Chernenko, M.* (1985). Amplua – Belmondo [Role – Belmondo]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, 1985 – *Chernenko, M.* (1985). Irene Papas. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 21. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, 1987 – *Chernenko, M.* (1987a). Neveroyatnyj Keaton [Unbelievable Keaton]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, 1987 – *Chernenko, M.* (1987b). Pod plankoj [Under the bar]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 4-5. [in Russian]
- Chernenko, Chertok, 1972 – *Chernenko, M., Chertok, S.* (1972). Marcel Carnet: Spasenie v politicheskom fil'me [Marcel Carnet: Salvation in a political film]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 17-18. [in Russian]
- Chernousov, 1979 – *Chernousov, M.* (1979). Pravo govorit' o pravah [The right to speak about rights]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 16-18. [in Russian]
- Chernyj..., 1962 – Chernyj gravij [Black Gravel] (1962). *Sovetskij ekran.* 1. [In Russian]
- Chertok, 1969 – *Chertok, S.* (1969). "Podsolnuhi". Idut s'emki [Sunflowers. Filming in progress]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 10-12. [in Russian]

- Chertok, 1971 – Chertok, S. (1971). Stenley Kramer: protiv bezumnogo mira [Stanley Kramer: Against the Mad World]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Chertok, 1972 – Chertok, S. (1972). Ne tol'ko akter [Not only an actor]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Chertok, 1972 – Chertok, S. (1972). Sidney Pollak: Moral'nyj krizis Ameriki [Sydney Pollack: America's Moral Crisis]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 14. [in Russian]
- Chertok, 1974 – Chertok, S. (1974). Jean-Louis Barrault: Kino – eto poeziya [Jean-Louis Barrault: Cinema is poetry]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 16. [in Russian]
- Chertok, 1974 – Chertok, S. (1974). Mario Filipp Azzopardi: pervyj fil'm [Mario Philipp Azzopardi: the first film]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 17. [in Russian]
- Chertok, 1974 – Chertok, S. (1974). Yves Boisset: politicheskij detektiv [Yves Boisset: political detective]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 12-13. [in Russian]
- Chertok, 1974 – Chertok, S. (1974). Zhivye tradicii [Living Traditions]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 18. [in Russian]
- Chertok, 1975 – Chertok, S. (1975). Ricardo Cucciolla: Akter – lico politicheskoe [Ricardo Cucciolla: An actor is a political person]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 12-13. [in Russian]
- Chto..., 1969 – Chto Gollivud sdela s Judy Garland [What Hollywood did to Judy Garland] (1969). *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 17. [in Russian]
- Chto..., 1976 – Chto skazat' lyudyam? [What to say to people?] (1976). *Sovetskij ekran*. 24. [in Russian]
- Chudo..., 1966 – “Chudo” naiznanku [“Miracle” inside out] (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 24. [In Russian]
- Chudov, 1974 – Chudov, V. (1974). Strasti po Montaldo [Passion for Montaldo]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 17. [in Russian]
- Chudov, 1974 – Chudov, V. (1974). Vtoroe dyhanie (zametki o kino FRG) [Second wind (notes about the cinema of West Germany)]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 16. [in Russian]
- Chudov, 1975 – Chudov, V. (1975). Fantastika shutit i oblichaet [Fiction jokes and denounces]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 17. [in Russian]
- Chudov, 1975 – Chudov, V. (1975). Pod snezhnikami v sentyabre [Snowdrops in September]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 13. [in Russian]
- Chudov, 1975 – Chudov, V. (1975). Strelyaj i ne razdumyvaj [Shoot and don't hesitate]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 13. [in Russian]
- Chusov, 1991 – Chusov, Y. (1991). Vozhdelenaya statuetka [Magic statuette]. *Ekran*. 8: 19. [in Russian]
- Cinema..., 1926 – Kino i huliganstvo [Cinema and hooliganism] (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 43: 3. [in Russian]
- Claude..., 1981 – Claude Jade (1981). *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 17. [in Russian]
- Claudia..., 1967 – Claudia Cardinale (1967). *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [In Russian]
- Claudia..., 1980 – Claudia Cardinale (1980). *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 17-18. [in Russian]
- Cleopatra..., 1962 – Cleopatra – v dvuh variantah [Cleopatra in two versions] (1962). *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 21. [In Russian]
- Cries..., 1929 – Kriki o pomoshchi [Cries for help] (1929). *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 15. [in Russian]
- David..., 1926 – David Griffith (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 13. [in Russian]
- Day..., 1929 – Den' boevogo internacionalizma [Day of Fighting Internationalism] (1929). *Sovetskij ekran*. 30: 3. [in Russian]
- De Santis, 1985 – De Santis, G. (1985). Otryvki iz dnevnika [Excerpts from the diary]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Dementiev, 1989 – Dementiev, A. (1989). Daj deficit! [Gimme a deficit!]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 3-6. [in Russian]
- Dementiev, 1989 – Dementiev, A. (1989). *Odinochka i my* [*Le Solitaire* and us]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 28. [in Russian]
- Demi, 1926 – Demi, Y. (1926). Ob Abel Ganse [About Abel Ganse]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 51-52: 13. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1965 – Demin, V. (1965). Levaya, pravaya gde storona? [Left, right where is the side?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 19-20. [In Russian]
- Demin, 1966 – Demin, V. (1966). Fil'm bez intrigi [Film without intrigue]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1972 – Demin, V. (1972). Priglasenie k tancu [Invitation to dance]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 19. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1973 – Demin, V. (1973). Istoriya – politika – sovremennost' [History – Politics – Modernity]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 4. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1973 – Demin, V. (1973). Uroki “Mgnovenij” [Lessons of “Moments”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 4-5. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1975 – Demin, V. (1975). Personazh – vremya [Character – time]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 8-9. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1975 – Demin, V. (1975). Trudno byt' mamontom [It's hard to be a mammoth]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1976 – Demin, V. (1976). Hleb, lyubov' i slezy [Bread, love and tears]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 4-5. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1987 – Demin, V. (1987). № 475. Priznanie chlena zhyuri [No. 475. Recognition of a Jury member]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1990 – Demin, V. (1990). Itak, vzdorozhanie. Ob'yasnimsya [So, the rise in price. Let me explain myself]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 3. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1991 – Demin, V. (1991). Greshnoe protivoyadie [Sinful antidote]. *Ekran*. 18: 2-3. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1991 – Demin, V. (1991). Tol'ko otkrovenno! [Only frankly!]. *Ekran*. 14: 14. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1991 – Demin, V. (1991). V nash ogorod [In our garden]. *Ekran*. 3: 22. [in Russian]
- Demin, 1991 – Demin, V. (1991). Vy skazali: proshchaj? [You said: farewell?]. *Ekran*. 6: 4. [in Russian]
- Devushka..., 1958 – Devushka v chernom [The Girl in black (1958)]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 12. [In Russian]
- Ditte..., 1957 – Ditte – ditya chelovecheskoe [Ditte is a human child] (1957). *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 6. [In Russian]

- [Dmitriev, 1960](#) – *Dmitriev, G.* (1960). Sila synovej lyubvi [The Power of son's love]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 15. [In Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1974](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1974). Vstrecha s vesternom [Meeting with a Western]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 5-6. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1975](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1975). Prostye istiny Dzhona Forda [John Ford's Simple Truths]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 5. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1975](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1975). Vozvrashchenie bludnogo syna [Return of the prodigal son]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1978](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1978). Klyuch k proze Agaty Kristi [Key to the prose of Agatha Christie]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 5. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1981](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1981). Rasplata [Retribution]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 5. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1981](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1981). Vybhor puti [Choosing a path]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1982](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1982). Ekologicheskaya vendetta [Ecological vendetta]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1983](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1983). Neobhodima nadezhda [Necessary hope]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1984](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1984). Lyudi protiv [People against]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 10-11. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1984](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1984). Poiski i nadezhdy Alena Rene [The Quest and Hope of Alain René]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 20. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1986](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1986). Pravo na ushedshee vremya [The right to the bygone time]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 10. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1987](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1987). Po povodu "Anzheliki" [Concerning *Angélique*]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1987](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1987). Pogovorim ob erotike [Let's talk about eroticism]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1987](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1987). Slovo o Luchino Visconti [Word about Luchino Visconti]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 21. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1988](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1988). Ot shopota do krika [From whispering to shouting]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1989](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1989). Rezhissery ustali [Film directors are tired]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 10-11. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1989a](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1989a). Nevostrebovannaya dusha [The Unclaimed Soul]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 28-29. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1990](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1990). 27 let nazad [27 years ago]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 3: 29-30. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, 1990](#) – *Dmitriev, V.* (1990). Amerikanskoe kino po-sovetski [American movie in a Soviet way]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 26. [in Russian]
- [Dmitriev, Mihalkovich, 1964](#) – *Dmitriev, V., Mihalkovich V.* (1964). Detektiv ishchet geroya [Detective looking for a hero]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 18-19. [In Russian]
- [Dobrohotov, 1958](#) – *Dobrohotov, Y.* (1958). Kakie amerikanskije komedii my uvidim. "Rimskie kanikuly" [What American comedies we will see. *Roman Holiday*]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23. [In Russian]
- [Dolinsky, Chertok, 1964](#) – *Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S.* (1964). Soldat, slozhivshij oruzhie [The Soldier who laid down his arms]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 18-19. [In Russian]
- [Dolinsky, Chertok, 1965](#) – *Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S.* (1965). Giuseppe De Santis: Moj fil'm sluzhit chelovecheskoj solidarnosti [Giuseppe De Santis: My film serves human solidarity]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 4: 14-15. [In Russian]
- [Dolinsky, Chertok, 1965](#) – *Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S.* (1965). Mario Lanza. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 17. [In Russian]
- [Dolinsky, Chertok, 1965](#) – *Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S.* (1965). Odile Versois – Tatiana Vladimirovna. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 16-17. [In Russian]
- [Dolinsky, Chertok, 1965](#) – *Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S.* (1965). Zhitel' zamka Orli [The inhabitant of Orly castle]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 10: 18-19. [In Russian]
- [Dolinsky, Chertok, 1966](#) – *Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S.* (1966). Louis de Funes. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23. [In Russian]
- [Dolinsky, Chertok, 1966](#) – *Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S.* (1966). Nash korrespondent v gostyah u Anny Man'yanii [Our correspondent on a visit to Anna Magnani]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 9-10. [In Russian]
- [Dolinsky, Chertok, 1966](#) – *Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S.* (1966). Stihotvorenije v muzyke [Poem in music]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 12-13. [In Russian]
- [Dolinsky, Chertok, 1967](#) – *Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S.* (1967). P'ero iz derevni Burvil' [Pierrot from the village of Bourvil]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 17. [In Russian]
- [Dolmatovskaya, 1969](#) – *Dolmatovskaya, G.* (1969). Dva fil'ma Kloda Lelyusha [Two films by Claude Lelouch]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1969. 7: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Dolmatovskaya, 1972](#) – *Dolmatovskaya, G.* (1972). V zale ozhidaniya. Chto proiskhodit vo francuzskom kino? [In the waiting room. What happens in French cinema?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 14. [in Russian]
- [Dolmatovskaya, 1973](#) – *Dolmatovskaya, G.* (1973). Na polputi k kommercii [Halfway to Commerce]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 12-13. [in Russian]
- [Dolmatovskaya, 1975](#) – *Dolmatovskaya, G.* (1975). Slozhno i prsto kak v zhizni [It is difficult and simple as in life]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Dolmatovskaya, 1981](#) – *Dolmatovskaya, G.* (1981). Kontury portreta [Contours of a portrait]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 17: 16. [in Russian]
- [Dolmatovskaya, G.](#) Dva fil'ma Kloda Lelyusha [Two films by Claude Lelouch]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1969. 7: 14-15. [In Russian]
- [Doroshevich, 1973](#) – *Doroshevich, A.* (1973). Vernost' chuvstv [Fidelity of feelings]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 3. [in

- Russian]
- [Doroshevich, 1975](#) – Doroshevich, A. (1975). Kovboi v patrol'nyh mashinah [Cowboys in patrol cars]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 5. [in Russian]
- [Doroshevich, 1976](#) – Doroshevich, A. (1976). Nesentimental'noe puteshestvie [Non-sentimental journey]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3. [in Russian]
- [Doroshevich, 1984](#) – Doroshevich, A. (1984). Paul Newman. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Doroshevich, 1987](#) – Doroshevich, A. (1987). Ekho Marabarskih peshcher [Echo of the Marabar Caves]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 10-11. [in Russian]
- [Douglas..., 1925](#) – Douglas Fairbanks (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 12. [in Russian]
- [Down..., 1928](#) – Doloj! [Down with it!] (1928). *Sovetskij ekran*. 26: 3. [in Russian]
- [Drozdova, 1990](#) – Drozdova, M. (1990). Meryl Streep. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Drozdova, 1990](#) – Drozdova, M. (1990). Rasskazchik na dva etazha [The Narrator on two floors]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 29. [in Russian]
- [Dubensky, 1974](#) – Dubensky, B. (1974). Shvejcariya vblizi i bez prikras [Switzerland near and without embellishment]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 17. [in Russian]
- [Dularidze, 1972](#) – Dularidze, L. (1972). Neuzheli eto vser'yoz? [Is it serious?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 19. [in Russian]
- [Dularidze, 1974a](#) – Dularidze, L. (1974). Cena pravosudiya [The price of justice]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 4. [in Russian]
- [Dularidze, 1974b](#) – Dularidze, L. (1974). V centre Evropy [In the center of Europe]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Dularidze, 1975](#) – Dularidze, L. (1975). Prekrasnaya ledi Gollivuda [The Beautiful Lady of Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1975. 15: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Dularidze, 1991](#) – Dularidze, T. (1991). Esli bez pizhonstva [If without foppery]. *Ekran*. 14: 5. [in Russian]
- [Dumov, 1972](#) – Dumov, A. (1972). Chto smotrit Sven Svenson? [What is Sven Svenson watching?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 12-13. [in Russian]
- [Dunaev, 1983](#) – Dunaev, V. (1983). Strashnee fantazii [More terrible than fantasy]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 17. [in Russian]
- [Dva..., 1969](#) – Dva chasa s Marcello Mastroianni [Two Hours with Marcello Mastroianni] (1969). *Sovetskij ekran*. 4. [in Russian]
- [Eco, 1975](#) – Eco, U. (1975). Trattato di semiotica generale. Milano: Bompiani.
- [Eco, 1976](#) – Eco, U. (1976). A Theory of Semiotics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [Economy..., 1927](#) – Rezhim ekonomii v nemeckom kino [Economy Mode in German Cinema] (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 29: 13. [in Russian]
- [Egorov, 1973](#) – Egorov, A. (1973). Sto svidetel'stv o nashem mire [One Hundred Testimonies of Our World]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18. [in Russian]
- [Eisenstein, 1964](#) – Eisenstein, S. (1964). Izbrannye proizvedeniya [Selected Works]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- [Ejramdzhan, 1991](#) – Ejramdzhan, A. (1991). Uroki Eddi Bartleta [Lessons of Eddie Bartlett]. *Ekran*. 18: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Ekran..., 1971](#) – Ekran Ameriki [American Screen] (1971). *Sovetskij ekran*. 11. [in Russian]
- [Elizabeth..., 1927](#) – Elizabeth Bergner (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 13. [in Russian]
- [Ellen..., 1977](#) – Ellen Burstyn: "Vernite zhenshchinu v iskusstvo" [Ellen Burstyn: "Return woman to art"] (1977). *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 16. [in Russian]
- [Elvin, 1928](#) – Elvin, I. (1928). Psevdosocial'nye fil'my v Germanii [Pseudo-social films in Germany]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 5. [in Russian]
- [Endangered..., 1925](#) – Vymirayushchee kinoplemya [Endangered film tribe] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 11. [in Russian]
- [English..., 1927](#) – Anglijskij Gollivud [English Hollywood] (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 10. [in Russian]
- [Erge, 1925](#) – Erge (1925). Zagranichnye postanovki [Foreign productions]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Ermash, 1979](#) – Ermash, F. (1979). Kino v bor'be za idealy kommunizma [Cinema in the struggle for the ideals of communism]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 1-3. [in Russian]
- [Erofeev, 1925](#) – Erofeev, V. (1925). Po berlinskim ekranam [On Berlin screens]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 39: 12-13.
- [Erofeev, 1929](#) – Erofeev, V. (1929). Pis'ma iz Berlina. Novye tonfil'my [Letters from Berlin. New Tonfilms]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 30: 11. [in Russian]
- [Erokhin, 1987](#) – Erokhin, A. (1987). Detki v kletke [Kids in the Cell]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 3. [in Russian]
- [Ershtram, 1957](#) – Ershtram, A. (1957). Charlie Chaplin. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 12-13. [in Russian]
- [Eshpai, 1989](#) – Eshpai, V. (1989). Yappi v ritme priklyuchenij [Yuppies in the rhythm of adventure]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 28. [in Russian]
- [Esina, 1985](#) – Esina, V. (1985). Obvinyaetsya rasizm [Accused of racism]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 10-11. [in Russian]
- [Esli..., 1957](#) – Esli parni vsego mira... [If the guys of the whole world...] (1957). *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 7. [in Russian]
- [Everyday..., 1925](#) – Byt ekrana. Ochered' k slave [Everyday life of the screen. Queue to glory] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 5. [in Russian]
- [Everyday..., 1925](#) – Byt v zagranichnykh fil'mah [Everyday life in foreign films] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 3. [in Russian]
- [Failed..., 1927](#) – Neudavshayasya propaganda [Failed propaganda] (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 31: 7. [in Russian]
- [Falberg, 1925](#) – Falberg, I. (1925). Kompot iz Meri [Compote from Mary]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 35: 14-15. [in Russian]

- Faust, 1927 – Faust (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 4. [in Russian]
- Fedorov, 1987 – Fedorov, A. (1987). Nevidennye shedevry: eshche ili uzhe? [Unseen masterpieces: yet or already?]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 3: 87-89. [in Russian]
- Fedorov, 1990 – Fedorov, A. (1990). Bez seksa nekuda det'sya? [Without sex – nowhere to go?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 10. [in Russian]
- Fedorov, 1990 – Fedorov, A. (1990). Katalog s syurprizami [Catalogue with surprises]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 22. [in Russian]
- Fedorov, 1991 – Fedorov, A. (1991). Tak hochetsya tepla i dobroty [I want warmth and kindness]. *Ekran*. 5. [in Russian]
- Fedorov, 2002 – Fedorov, A. (2002). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in the Cinema Art Journal During the Perestroika Era: 1986–1991. *Media Education*. 18(4): 574-599.
- Fedorov, 2002 – Fedorov, A. (2002). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in the Cinema Art Journal During the Perestroika Era: 1986–1991. *Media Education*. 18(4): 574-599.
- Fedorov, 2022 – Fedorov, A. (2022). Luchshie i hudshie fil'my sovetskogo kinoprokata: mneniya chitatelej zhurnala *Sovetskij ekran* (1958-1991) [The best and worst films of the Soviet film distribution: the opinions of the readers of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1958-1991)]. Moscow. 330 p. [in Russian]
- Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022 – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A. (2022). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in the Cinema Art Journal in the First Decade (1931–1941) of Its Existence. *Media Education*. 18(2): 169-220.
- Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022 – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A. (2022). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in Cinema Art Journal: 1945–1955. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 7(1): 71-109.
- Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022 – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A. (2022). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in Cinema Art Journal in the First Post-Soviet Years: 1992–2000. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 7(2): 355-397.
- Fedorova, 1968 – Fedorova, N. (1968). Poseesh' veter... [Sowing the wind...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 15. [in Russian]
- Fefer, 1929 – Fefer, V. (1929). Neigrovaya vsego mira [Non-feature of the whole world]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 40: 15. [in Russian]
- Fefer, 1929 – Fefer, Y., V. (1929). Kino "osvyashchennoe cerkov'yu" [Movie "consecrated by the church"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 10. [in Russian]
- Fefer, 1929 – Fefer, Y., V. (1929). Kino vo Francii [Cinema in France]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 12. [in Russian]
- Fefer, 1929 – Fefer, Y., V. (1929). Klassicheskaya propaganda [Classical propaganda]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 31: 9. [in Russian]
- Fefer, 1929 – Fefer, Y., V. (1929). Sostaviteli yadov [Compilers of poisons]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 36: 10. [in Russian]
- Fefer, 1940 – Fefer, V. (1940). Kino i psixiatriya [Cinema and psychiatry]. *Sovetskij kinoekran*. 19: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Feldman, 1928 – Feldman, K. (1928). Kinokomediya za rubezhom [Film comedy abroad]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 29: 7. [in Russian]
- Feldman, 1928 – Feldman, K. (1928). Razval francuzskogo «levogo avangarda» [The collapse of the French "leftist avant-garde"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 8. [in Russian]
- Feldman, 1929 – Feldman, K. (1929). Pouchitel'naya istoriya. No povodu novoj kartiny Bastera Kitona *General* [A cautionary tale. But about the new film by Buster Keaton *General*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 25: 4. [in Russian]
- Filatova, 1981 – Filatova, L. (1981). Kto ubil Graziani? [Who killed Graziani?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 4-5. [in Russian]
- Filev, 1968 – Filev, P. (1968). Predosterezhenie [Caution]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [in Russian]
- Film..., 1965 – Film vyrabatyvaet sobstvennyj kinoyazyk (1908-1918) [The Film produces its own film language (1908-1918)] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Finally..., 1928 – Nakonec-to! (Iz informacionnogo soobshcheniya Glavrepertkoma) [Finally! (From the information report of the Glavrepertkom)] (1928). *Sovetskij ekran*. 26: 2. [in Russian]
- Florinda..., 1976 – Florinda Bolkan (1976). *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 18. [in Russian]
- Fomichev, 1978 – Fomichev, I. (1978). Romy Schneider. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Fomina, 1991 – Fomina, R. (1991). Paul Bartel: komediya – moj zhanr [Paul Bartel: Comedy is my genre]. *Ekran*. 8: 31. [in Russian]
- Foreign..., 1925 – Inostrannaya kinohronika [Foreign newsreel] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 7. [in Russian]
- Foreign..., 1930 – Zarubezhnaya kinohronika [Foreign newsreel] (1930). *Kino i zhizn'*. 1: 17. [in Russian]
- Foreign..., 1930 – Zarubezhnaya kinohronika [Foreign newsreel] (1930). *Kino i zhizn'*. 9: 17. [in Russian]
- Fradkin, 1941 – Fradkin, G. (1941). Liniya Mannergejma na zarubezhnyh ekranah [The Mannerheim Line on Foreign Screens]. *Sovetskij kinoekran*. 7: 13. [in Russian]
- Franzuzov, 1971 – Franzuzov, F. (1971). Rokovye strasti [Fatal passions]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 12. [in Russian]
- Freilikh, 1961 – Freilikh, S. (1961). Greciya [Greece]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6. [in Russian]
- Freilikh, 1980 – Freilikh, S. (1980). Strasti veka [Passions of the Century]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Freilikh, 1985 – Freilikh, S. (1985). Neprimirimy vospominaniya. Berlinale-85 [Irreconcilable memories. Berlinale-85]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Freilikh, 1990 – Freilikh, S. (1990). Hudozhnik i vlast' [The artist and the Power]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 12-13. [in Russian]
- Frez, 1982 – Frez, I. (1982). Mnogolikij Monreal [Many-sided Montreal]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 17. [in Russian]
- Fritz..., 1926 – Fritz Lang (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 26: 14. [in Russian]
- Frolov, 1978 – Frolov, G. (1978). Put' v niz [Way down]. *Sovetskij ekran*: 6-7. [in Russian]
- Frolov, 1979 – Frolov, G. (1979). Burt Lankaster: "Vysokie idealy mira" [Burt Lancaster: "High Ideals of the

- World"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 18. [in Russian]
- Frolov, 1980 – Frolov, G. (1980). Jane Fonda. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Gakov, 1984 – Gakov, V. (1984). S detstva – na vsyu zhizn' [From childhood – for life]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Galanov, 1961 – Galanov, B. (1961). V Gollandii [In Holland]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18. [In Russian]
- Galanov, 1963 – Galanov, B. (1963). Na ekranah idet spor [On the screens there is a dispute]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 16-17.
- Galanov, 1964 – Galanov, B. (1964). Greciya bez mramora [Greece without marble]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 17. [In Russian]
- Galanov, 1969 – Galanov, B. (1969). Fil'my nadezhdy [Films of hope]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17. [In Russian]
- Galanov, 1969 – Galanov, B. (1969). Fil'my nadezhdy [Films of hope]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17. [in Russian]
- Galanov, 1991a – Galanov, B. (1991a). Bol'shoj val's v staroj dobroj Vene [The big waltz in good old Vienna]. *Ekran*. 18: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Galanov, 1991b – Galanov, B. (1991b). Kogda v Cannes dul mistral' [When a mistral was blowing in Cannes]. *Ekran*. 16: 27. [in Russian]
- Galín, 1985 – Galín, A. (1985). Alberto Sordi: v Moskve kak doma [Alberto Sordi: at home in Moscow]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 20-22. [in Russian]
- Game..., 1925 – Igra Douglasa Fairbanksa [Game of Douglas Fairbanks] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 10. [in Russian]
- Garov, 1929 – Garov, N. (1929). Amerikanskoe kino [American cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 25: 10-11. [in Russian]
- Garov, 1929 – Garov, N. (1929). Evropa i my [Europe and us]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 34: 6. [in Russian]
- Gastev, 1961 – Gastev, A. (1961). Fil'my "tekushchego repertuara" [Films of the "current repertoire"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18. [In Russian]
- Geideko, 1972 – Geideko, V. (1972). Shakespeare po-ital'yanski [Shakespeare in Italian]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 15. [in Russian]
- Geiko, 1985 – Geiko, Y. (1985). Zachem prishla k nam Anzhelika. Polemicheskie zametki o kino [Why did Angélique come to us. Polemical notes about cinema]. *Komsomol'skaya pravda*. 16.11.1985. [in Russian]
- Gekht, 1926 – Gekht, S. (1926). Poslednij chelovek i tri epohi [The Last Man and Three Epochs]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 5. [in Russian]
- George..., 1966 – George Chakiris (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 21. [In Russian]
- Georgia..., 1966 – Georgia Moll (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 20. [In Russian]
- Gerard..., 1988 – Gerard Depardieu – akter, boyashchisya rutiny [Gerard Depardieu – actor who is afraid of routine] (1988). *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 22, 24. [in Russian]
- Gerber, 1975 – Gerber, A. (1975). My – vashi deti [We are your children]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Gerber, 1978 – Gerber, A. (1978). "Ispytanie svobodoy". Juan Antonio Bardem ["The Trial of Freedom". Juan Antonio Bardem]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Gerber, 1991 – Gerber, A. (1991). A pomnite, na semnadcatom?.. [And remember, on the seventeenth?..]. *Ekran*. 14: 2-3. [in Russian]
- Gerber, Klimov, 1987 – Gerber, P., Klimov, V. (1987). K detyam – na ispoved' [To the children – to confession]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 14. [in Russian]
- Gerd, 1990 – Gerd, Z. (1990). Poputnye mysli [Additional thoughts]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 14-15. [in Russian]
- German..., 1927 – Nemeckie kul'tur-fil'my [German cultural films] (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 33: 6-7. [in Russian]
- Gervinus, 1928 – Gervinus (1928). Knyazhna i revizor iz U.P.G. na nashej granice (iz novinok germanskogo kino) [The Duchess and the Auditor from the U.P.G. on our frontier (from the novelties of German cinema)]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 44: 14. [in Russian]
- Gervinus, 1928 – Gervinus (1928). Tri fil'my [Three films]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 46: 14. [in Russian]
- Gervinus, 1929 – Gervinus (1929). Chem zanimayutsya v Gollivude [What do they do in Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1929. 29: 13. [in Russian]
- Gervinus, 1929 – Gervinus (1929). Krutyat Asfal't [They spin Asphalt]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 39: 13. [in Russian]
- Gervinus, 1929 – Gervinus (1929). Pis'ma iz Pribaltiki [Letters from the Baltics]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 14. 20: 15. [in Russian]
- Gervinus, 1929 – Gervinus (1929). Pis'ma iz-za rubezha [Letters from Abroad]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1928. 52: 13. 1929. 2: 14. 3: 14. 22: 12. [in Russian]
- Gervinus, 1929 – Gervinus (1929). Segodnyashnij den' radio-kino [Today's Day of Radio-Cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 33: 12. [in Russian]
- Gervinus, 1929 – Gervinus (1929). Za rubezhom [Abroad]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1929. 15: 15. 28: 11. [in Russian]
- Giuliano..., 1971 – Giuliano Montaldo: protiv neterpimosti [Giuliano Montaldo: Against Intolerance] (1971). *Sovetskij ekran*. 21. [in Russian]
- Giuseppe..., 1980 – Giuseppe De Santis: Bol' moego serdca [Giuseppe De Santis: Pain of my heart] (1980). *Sovetskij ekran*. 3. [in Russian]
- Glavrepertkom, 1926 – Glavrepertkom (1926). Report. RGASPI, f. 17, 60, file 808: 57-64. [in Russian]
- Glazkov, 1983 – Glazkov, A. (1983). Eta nepokornaya Dzhessika [This recalcitrant Jessica]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 9. [in Russian]
- Glebov, 1928 – Glebov, S. (1928). Hollywood. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 7. [in Russian]
- Gledhill, Williams, 2000 – Gledhill, C., Williams, L. (eds.) (2000). Reinventing Film Studies. Oxford: Arnold & Oxford University Press.
- Golovnya, Shcherbakov, 1973 – Golovnya, V., Shcherbakov, E. (1973). Leipzig-73. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5. [in

- Russian]
- [Golovskoy, 1979](#) – *Golovskoy, V.* (1979). Adresovano vsem [Addressed to everyone]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Golovskoy, 2004](#) – *Golovskoy, V.* (2004). Mezhdru otpepel'yu i glasnost'yu. Kinematograf 70-h. [Between the Thaw and Glasnost. Cinema of the 70s.]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- [Golovskoy, 2011](#) – *Golovskoy, V.* (2011). Mezhdru otpepel'yu i glasnost'yu [Between Thaw and Glasnost]. Moscow. 412 p. [in Russian]
- [Golovskoy, Rimberg, 1986](#) – *Golovskoy, V., Rimberg, J.* (1986). Behind the Soviet screen: The Motion Picture Industry in the 1972-1982. Ann. Arbor: Ardis. 144 p.
- [Golubev, 1975](#) – *Golubev, A.* (1975). Ne ostavlyat' odnih [Do not leave alone]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Goncharova, 1962](#) – *Goncharova, A.* (1962). Biznes krovi i gryazi [The Business of blood and dirt]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16. [In Russian]
- [Goncharova, 1968](#) – *Goncharova, A.* (1968). Poslednyaya rol' Spensera Tresi [The Last Role of Spenser Tracy]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10. [In Russian]
- [Goncharova, 1968](#) – *Goncharova, A.* (1968). Vchera i zavtra Sofii Loren [Yesterday and Tomorrow of Sophia Loren]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 15. [In Russian]
- [Goryachev, 1991](#) – *Goryachev, O.* (1991). Ot pornuhi do programmy “Vremya” krutyat v moskovskih videosalonah [From porno to the program *Time* on Moscow video salons]. *Ekran*. 12: 26-27. [in Russian]
- [Govoryat..., 1959](#) – Govoryat uchastniki festivalya [The festival participants say] (1959). *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 2-8. [In Russian]
- [Grafov, 1988](#) – *Grafov, E.* (1988). “Gde seks? Ne vizhu seksa!” [“Where is sex? I don't see sex!”]. *Sovetskaya kul'tura*. 16.01.1988. [in Russian]
- [Gromov, 1972](#) – *Gromov, E.* (1972). Chto vpered? [What lies ahead?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Gromov, 1973](#) – *Gromov, E.* (1973). Pro Berlin [About Berlin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6. [in Russian]
- [Gromov, 1975](#) – *Gromov, E.* (1975). Stoit li smotret' “Tarzana”? [Is it worth watching *Tarzan*?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 19. [in Russian]
- [Gromov, 1985](#) – *Gromov, E.* (1985). Poisk istiny [The Search for Truth]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 20-22. [in Russian]
- [Grossman, 1925](#) – *Grossman, A.* (1925). Datskaya fil'ma [Danish film]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 11. [in Russian]
- [Gul, 1925](#) – *Gul, R.* (1925). “Klassicheskaya fil'ma” [“Classical Film”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 28: 13. [in Russian]
- [Gul, 1925](#) – *Gul, R.* (1925). Berlinskoe kino-letu [Berlin cinema summer]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 12. [in Russian]
- [Gul, 1925](#) – *Gul, R.* (1925). Po kino Berlina [On the cinema of Berlin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 15. [in Russian]
- [Gul, 1925](#) – *Gul, R.* (1925). V kino-rajonah Berlina [In the cinema districts of Berlin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 13. [in Russian]
- [Gul, 1926](#) – *Gul, R.* (1926). Fil'ma s vystrelami [Film with shots]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 6. [in Russian]
- [Gul, 1926](#) – *Gul, R.* (1926). Nemeckij ekran [German Screen]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 46: 10. [in Russian]
- [Gul, 1926](#) – *Gul, R.* (1926). O Kapitolii, “Tyshche metrov krinolina” i Charlie Chaplin [About the Capitol, “Thousand meters of crinoline” and Charlie Chaplin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 7. [in Russian]
- [Gul, 1927](#) – *Gul, R.* (1927). Amerikanske burlachki [American burlaks]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 4. [in Russian]
- [Gulchenko, 1978](#) – *Gulchenko, V.* (1978). Obychnye igry [Ordinary games]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Gulyanickaya, 1961](#) – *Gulyanickaya, G.* (1961). Gerard Philip. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24. [In Russian]
- [Gurkov, 1987](#) – *Gurkov, A.* (1987). Klaus-Maria Brandauer: do i posle *Mefisto* [Klaus-Maria Brandauer: before and after *Mephisto*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 23-24. [in Russian]
- [Herbert..., 1926](#) – Herbert Brenon (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 42: 13. [in Russian]
- [Hess, 1997](#) – *Hess, D.J.* (1997). Science Studies. New York: New York University Press.
- [Hibbin, 1968](#) – *Hibbin, N.* (1968). Fil'my, budorazhashchie mysl' [Films that excite the thought]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 13. [In Russian]
- [Hibbin, 1982](#) – *Hibbin, N.* (1982). Trevogi i nadezhdy [Anxiety and Hope]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 16-18. [in Russian]
- [Hibbin, 1983](#) – *Hibbin, N.* (1983). Volshebstvo Vivien Leigh [The Magic of Vivien Leigh]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 17-18. [in Russian]
- [Hill, Gibson, 1998](#) – Hill, J, Gibson, P.C. (eds.) (1998). The Oxford Guide to Film Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [Hollywood, 1925](#) – Hollywood (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 11. [in Russian]
- [Hollywood..., 1926](#) – Gollivud – serdce mirovogo kino [Hollywood is the heart of world cinema] (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 41: 14. [in Russian]
- [How..., 1929](#) – Kak vooruzhayut kinematografiyu protiv SSSR [How they arm the cinematography against the USSR] (1929). *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 14. [in Russian]
- [Hronika..., 1960](#) – Hronika zarubezhnogo kino [Chronicle of Foreign Cinema] (1960). *Sovetskij ekran*. 1960. 4: 20; 23: 20. [In Russian]
- [I vse..., 1968](#) – I vse-taki smeshno! [And Still funny!] (1968). *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [In Russian]
- [Ignatov, 1983](#) – *Ignatov, A.* (1983). Muza Rene Klemana [Muse of Rene Clement]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Ilinskaya, 1959](#) – *Ilinskaya, O.* (1959). Bez sem'i [Without a family]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [In Russian]
- [In..., 1928](#) – V ARK'e: Diskussiya o kinokritike [In ARC: A Discussion on film criticism] (1928). *Kino*. 9(233): 2. 28.02.1928. [in Russian]
- [Inber, 1926](#) – *Inber, V.* (1926). Tri vstrechi s Charli Chaplinym [Three meetings with Charlie Chaplin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 14. [in Russian]

- [Insurgent, 1925](#) – *Insurgentka* [Insurgent] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 12. [in Russian]
- [Irinin, 1925](#) – *Irinin* (1925). “Poslednij chelovek” [*The Last Man*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 10. [in Russian]
- [Isabelle..., 1988](#) – Isabelle Huppert – novaya Greta Garbo? [Isabelle Huppert – a new Greta Garbo?] (1988). *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 22, 24. [in Russian]
- [It..., 1927](#) – Nado rasshirit' front bor'by [It is necessary to expand the front of the struggle] (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 35: 3. [in Russian]
- [Italian..., 1925](#) – Ital'yanskaya fil'ma [Italian film] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 8. [in Russian]
- [Ivanov, 1981](#) – *Ivanov, V.* (1981). Razvenchivaya mify [Debunking myths]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 18. [in Russian]
- [Ivanov, 1984](#) – *Ivanov, V.* (1984). Ohotnik ili zhertva? [Hunter or prey?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 9. [in Russian]
- [Ivanov, 1985](#) – *Ivanov, V.* (1985). Professiya: telerepoter [Profession: TV reporter]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 10. [in Russian]
- [Ivanov, 1985](#) – *Ivanov, V.* (1985). Proiski “vechno vcherashnih” [The intrigues of “eternally yesterday”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Ivanova, 1967](#) – *Ivanova, V.* (1967). Stefania Sandrelli. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 14. [In Russian]
- [Ivanova, 1972](#) – *Ivanova, V.* (1972). Iskusstvo ili poker? [Art or poker?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Ivanova, 1975](#) – *Ivanova, V.* (1975). Bezdny komfortnogo mira [The Abyss of a Comfortable World]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Ivanova, 1976](#) – *Ivanova, T.* (1976). Optimist Pet Conroy [Optimist Pat Conroy]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Ivanova, 1983](#) – *Ivanova, V.* (1983). Vozdushnye shary nad Toskanoj [Balloons over Tuscany]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 9. [in Russian]
- [Ivanova, 1985](#) – *Ivanova, V.* (1985). Eto bespokojnoe “tihoe pokolenie” [This restless “quiet generation”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 22. [in Russian]
- [Ivanova, 1989](#) – *Ivanova, Y.* (1989). My lyubim detektiv [We love detective]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 29. [in Russian]
- [Jean..., 1975](#) – Renoir Jean Renoir: “Moya zhizn' i moi fil'my” [Jean Renoir: “My life and my films”] (1975). *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 19. [in Russian]
- [Jean..., 1976](#) – Jean Rochefort (1976). *Sovetskij ekran*. 20. [in Russian]
- [Joris..., 1930](#) – Joris Ivens // Kino i zhizn. 5: 21. [in Russian]
- [K sporu..., 1966](#) – K sporu o fil'me... [To the argument about film...] (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 5. [In Russian]
- [K..., 1986](#) – K nashim chitatel'nyam [To our readers] (1986). *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 3. [in Russian]
- [Kak..., 1930](#) – Kak delayutsya fil'my v Germanii [How films are made in Germany]. *Kino i zhizn*. 2: 19. [in Russian]
- [Kalgatina, 1990](#) – *Kalgatina, L.* (1990). Sem' dnei v starinnom gorode novoj Germanii [Seven days in the old town of New Germany]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 26-27. [in Russian]
- [Kapralov, 1962](#) – *Kapralov, G.* (1962). Gory i fil'my. Zametki o XV Lokarnskom kinofestivale [Mountains and Films. Notes on the XV Locarno Film Festival]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 15, 20. [In Russian]
- [Kapralov, 1972](#) – *Kapralov, G.* (1972). Veneciya-72 [Venice-72]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 15-16. [in Russian]
- [Kapralov, 1990](#) – *Kapralov, G.* (1990). Otkuda u kota sapogi? [Where did the cat get the boots?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 26. [in Russian]
- [Karaganov, 1964](#) – *Karaganov, A.* (1964). Na XVII Kannskom [At the XVII Cannes Film Festival]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 18-19. [In Russian]
- [Karaganov, 1968](#) – *Karaganov, A.* (1968). Vmeste s partiej, vmeste s narodom [Together with the party, together with the people]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 2-3. [In Russian]
- [Karaganov, 1982](#) – *Karaganov, A.* (1982). Zadacha samaya vazhnaya [The most important task]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 1. [in Russian]
- [Karaganov, 1983](#) – *Karaganov, A.* (1983). Ekran – pole i oruzhie bor'by [Screen is a field and a weapon of struggle]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 1. [in Russian]
- [Karakoleva, 1991](#) – *Karakoleva, E.* (1991). Madonna ot Lancôme [Madonna from Lancôme]. *Ekran*. 17: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Karaseva, 1984](#) – *Karaseva, E.* (1984). Ozhidanie novyh vstrech [Waiting for new meetings]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Karinskaya, 1966](#) – *Karinskaya, L.* (1966). Vblizi ot iskusstva [Close to Art]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 19. [In Russian]
- [Karinskaya, 1967](#) – *Karinskaya, L.* (1967). Lyubov' i smert' [Love and Death]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 13. [In Russian]
- [Karinskaya, 1968](#) – *Karinskaya, L.* (1968). Rassvet v dushnoj nochi [Dawn in the stuffy night]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 12. [In Russian]
- [Karlov, 1975](#) – *Karlov, A.* (1975). Cel'nost' i prostota [Integrity and simplicity]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1961](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1961). Henry Fonda. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 16-17. [In Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1962](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1962). Kogda zvezdy gasnut [When the stars go out]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6. [In Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1962](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1962). Mushketery s kol'tami za poyasom [Musketeers with colts behind their belts]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15. [In Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1966](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1966). Anthony Perkins. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 19. [In Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1966](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1966). Chelovek, kotoromu snyatsya l'vy [The Man who dreams of lions]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 18-19. [In Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1966](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1966). Po sosedstvu s Al'favilem [In the neighborhood with Alphaville].

- Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 19. [In Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1968](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1968). Gojya bez Goji [Goya without Goya]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 16-17. [In Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1969](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1969). Luchshie gody ego zhizni [The best years of his life]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 13, 15. [In Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1969](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1969). Luchshie gody ego zhizni [The best years of his life]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 13, 15. [in Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1970](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1970). Chelovek, kotoryj sohranil sebya [The Man who saved himself]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Kartseva, 1972](#) – *Kartseva, E.* (1972). Kinofantastika oblichayet [Film fiction exposes]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Kasatkina, 1962](#) – *Kasatkina, L.* (1962). Vstrecha v Suomi [The Meeting in Suomi]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 20. [In Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1927](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1927). Lillian Gish. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 10. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1927](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1927). Metro Majer Golduin [Metro Goldwin Mayer]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1927](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1927). Rene Clair. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 13. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1927](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1927). Ulica na ekrane [Street on the screen]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 34: 14. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1928](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1928). Chto mozhno i chto nuzhno brat' na zagranichnoj produkcii [What can and should be taken on foreign productions]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 26: 4. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1928](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1928). Nanook, Moana, Chang. *Sovetskij ekran*. 40: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1928](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1928). Zvukovoe kino [Sound cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 42: 12. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1929](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1929). André Gide and Novak. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 4. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1929](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1929). Burzhuaznaya kinocenzura [Bourgeois film censorship]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 40: 14. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1929](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1929). Foto-kinovystavka v Shtutgardte [Photo-cinema exhibition in Stuttgart]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 10. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1929](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1929). Kinointernacional katolikov [Cinema International of Catholics]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 38: 10. [in Russian]
- [Kaufman, 1929](#) – *Kaufman, N.* (1929). Kul'turfil'ma na Zapade [Culture film in the West]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 12. [in Russian]
- [Kaun, 1930](#) – *Kaun.* Bourgeois Film Propaganda // *Kino i zhizn*. 18: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Keimakh, 1974](#) – *Keimakh, T.* (1974). Dolgaya zhizni Askeli Koskela [Long life of Askeli Koskel]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 7. [in Russian]
- [Kelly, 1960](#) – *Kelly, J.* (1960). Bette Davis. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 16-17. [In Russian]
- [Ken..., 1971](#) – Ken Hughes: sovremennost' istorii [Ken Hughes: Modern History]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [in Russian]
- [KGB..., 1990](#) – KGB vs. James Bond (1990). *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 22-23. [in Russian]
- [Khanyutin, 1961](#) – *Khanyutin, Y.* (1961). Fil'my, zovushchie k bor'be [Films Calling to Struggle]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18. [In Russian]
- [Khanyutin, 1961](#) – *Khanyutin, Y.* (1961). Francuzskie vpechatleniya [French impression]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15. [In Russian]
- [Khanyutin, 1965](#) – *Khanyutin, Y.* (1965). "Planeta lyudej" ["The Planet of People"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 14-15. [In Russian]
- [Khanyutin, 1966](#) – *Khanyutin, Y.* (1966). Karlovy Vary – 1966. V poiskah sinteza [Karlovy Vary – 1966. In Search of Synthesis.]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 14-15. [In Russian]
- [Khanyutin, 1967](#) – *Khanyutin, Y.* (1967). Dva poedinka Spartaka [Two duels of Spartacus]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 16-17. [In Russian]
- [Khanyutin, 1973](#) – *Khanyutin, Y.* (1973). Vtoroe prishestvie iz kosmosa [The Second Coming from Space]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7. [in Russian]
- [Khanyutin, 1975](#) – *Khanyutin, Y.* (1975). Moment istiny [Moment of Truth]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Khersonsky, 1929](#) – *Khersonsky, H.* (1929). O chem govorit Chicago [What Chicago says]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 8. [in Russian]
- [Khloplyankina, 1972](#) – *Khloplyankina, T.* (1972). Chut'-chut' nervnyj smekh [Slightly nervous laughter]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 15. [in Russian]
- [Khloplyankina, 1973](#) – *Khloplyankina, T.* (1973). Khloplyankina, T. Pri svete osennego dnya [In the light of an autumn day]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Khloplyankina, 1975](#) – *Khloplyankina, T.* (1975). Khloplyankina, T. Priklyucheniya skripacha [The Adventures of a Violinist]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 9. [in Russian]
- [Khloplyankina, 1977](#) – *Khloplyankina, T.* (1977). Khloplyankina, T. Kak vazhno byt' ser'eznym [How important it is to be serious]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Khloplyankina, 1977](#) – *Khloplyankina, T.* (1977). Khloplyankina, T. Vmesto prologa [Instead of a prologue]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 1-2. [in Russian]
- [Khloplyankina, 1987](#) – *Khloplyankina, T.* (1987). I eshche raz pro lyubov' [And again about love]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 21. [in Russian]
- [Khloplyankina, 1991](#) – *Khloplyankina, T.* (1991). Lyubov' v epohu seksa [Love in the age of sex]. *Ekran*. 14: 6-7. [in Russian]
- [Khloplyankina, 1991](#) – *Khloplyankina, T.* (1991). Proshloj osen'yu v Mangejme [Last Fall in Mannheim].

- Ekran*. 3: 30-31. [in Russian]
[Khlopyankina, 1991](#) – *Khlopyankina, T.* (1991). V poiskah schastlivogo finala [In Search of a Happy End]. *Ekran*. 17: 24-25. [in Russian]
[Khodzhaev, 1969](#) – *Khodzhaev, Y.* (1969). Nochnye ogni Lejster-skvera [Night lights of Leicester Square]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 14-15. [in Russian]
[Khodzhaev, 1979](#) – *Khodzhaev, Y.* (1979). Prosmotry v Los-Andzhelese [Views in Los Angeles]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 7. [in Russian]
[Khovrin, 1974](#) – Florestano Vancini: poka fashizm ne umret [Florestano Vancini: until fascism dies] (1974). *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 16. [in Russian]
[Khrenov, 2006](#) – *Khrenov, N.* (2006). Zrelishcha v epohu vosstaniya massyu [Spectacles in the era of mass uprising]. Moscow. [in Russian]
[Khrenov, 2011](#) – *Khrenov, N.* (2011). Civilizacionnaya identichnost' v perekhodnuyu epohu: kul'turologicheskij, sociologicheskij i iskusstvovedcheskij aspekty [Civilizational Identity in the transitional era: cultural, sociological and art history aspects]. Moscow. [in Russian]
[Khutsiev, 1976](#) – *Khutsiev, M.* (1976). Charlie Chaplin. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 20-21. [in Russian]
[Kichin, 1977](#) – *Kichin, V.* (1977). Obyknovennoe chudo [Ordinary miracle]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 12-13. [in Russian]
[Kichin, 1991](#) – *Kichin, V.* (1991). Kino sredi vulkanov [Cinema among the Volcanoes]. *Ekran*. 9: 28. [in Russian]
[Kichin, 1991](#) – *Kichin, V.* (1991). Kino v mire golodnom i sytom [Cinema in the world of hungry and well-fed]. *Ekran*. 1: 24-25. [in Russian]
[Kichin, 1991](#) – *Kichin, V.* (1991). Likbez dlya mastera [Eliminating illiteracy for the master]. *Ekran*. 10: 13. [in Russian]
[Kichin, 1991](#) – *Kichin, V.* (1991). Medvezhij bal vozle berlinskogo zooparka [A Bear ball near the Berlin Zoo]. *Ekran*. 8: 25-28. [in Russian]
[Kichin, 1991](#) – *Kichin, V.* (1991). MKF: Agoniya? Norma? [Moscow International Film Festival: Agony? Norm?]. *Ekran*. 14: 4. [in Russian]
[Kino..., 1975](#) – Kinoekran i ideologicheskaya bor'ba [Cinema Screen and Ideological Struggle] (1975). *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 2. [in Russian]
[Kirshon, 1928](#) – *Kirshon, V.* (1928). O kinokritike. Iz stenogrammy doklada na zasedanii Associacii revolyucionnoj kinematografii. Fevral' 1928 [On film criticism. From the transcript of a report at a meeting of the Association of Revolutionary Cinematography. February 1928]. *Na kino-postu*. Moscow-Leningrad: 144-150. [in Russian]
[Klubok..., 1969](#) – Klubok strastej chelovecheskih [A Tangle of human passions] (1969). *Sovetskij ekran*. 20. [in Russian]
[Kochetov, 1979](#) – *Kochetov, A.* (1979). Golos Dina Rida [Voice of Dean Reed]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 14-17. [in Russian]
[Kokarev, 1983](#) – *Kokarev, I.* (1983). Mify i real'nost' [Myths and reality]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 17. [in Russian]
[Kokarev, 1988](#) – *Kokarev, A.* (1988). Iz Rossii s lyubov'yu [From Russia with Love]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 12-13. [in Russian]
[Kokarev, 1991](#) – *Kokarev, A.* (1991). Vesti iz Gollivuda [News from Hollywood]. *Ekran*. 9: 20-21. 16: 20-21. [in Russian]
[Kokorevich, 1978](#) – *Kokorevich, B.* (1978). Tajnoe stanovitsya yavnym [The secret becomes clear]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1978. 4: 12. [in Russian]
[Kolbovsky, 1990](#) – *Kolbovsky, A.* (1990). Careubijca [The killer of Tsare]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 14. [in Russian]
[Kolodyazhnaya, 1958](#) – *Kolodyazhnaya, V.* (1958). Zarubezhnye komedii v Sovetskom Soyuze [Foreign comedies in the Soviet Union]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 12-13. [in Russian]
[Kolodyazhnaya, 1959](#) – *Kolodyazhnaya, V.* (1959). Parizhanka [Parisienne]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 13. [in Russian]
[Koltsova, 1925](#) – *Koltsova, L.* (1925). Zarisovki. Pochemu Valentino? [Sketches. Why Valentine?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 39: 14-15. [in Russian]
[Koltsova, 1926](#) – *Koltsova, L.* (1926). Angliya na kinopajke [England on film soldering]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 4-5. [in Russian]
[Koltsova, 1926](#) – *Koltsova, L.* (1926). Zolotoj fond taet [The gold fund is melting]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 48: 4-5. [in Russian]
[Koltsova, 1927](#) – *Koltsova, L.* (1927). Kino v Pol'she [Cinema in Poland]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 41: 4-5. [in Russian]
[Koltsova, 1928](#) – *Koltsova, E.* (1928). Prodavcy proshlogo [Sellers of the Past]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 10. [in Russian]
[Koltsova, 1928](#) – *Koltsova, E.* (1928). Tam i zdes' [There and there]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 10-11. [in Russian]
[Komarov, 1959](#) – *Komarov, S.* (1959). Nedelya francuzskih fil'mov. Fil'my, o kotoryh hochetsya govorit' [Week of French Films. Films that one wants to talk about]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 12-13. [in Russian]
[Komarov, 1960](#) – *Komarov, S.* (1960). 12 dnej vo Francii [12 days in France]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 16-17. [in Russian]
[Komov, 1977](#) – *Komov, Y.* (1977). Obez'yanij marafon [Monkey Marathon]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 20-21. [in Russian]
[Komov, 1978](#) – *Komov, Y.* (1978). Begstvo otreal'nosti [Escape from reality]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 7. [in Russian]
[Komov, 1978](#) – *Komov, Y.* (1978). Zapreshchennye igry [Forbidden games]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 18. [in Russian]
[Komov, 1979](#) – *Komov, Y.* (1979). Deti-ubijcy, ubijcy detej [Child killers, killers of children]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 18. [in Russian]

- [Komov, 1979](#) – Komov, Y. (1979). Komu sluzhit *Paramaunt*? [Who does *Paramount* serve?] *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 17. [in Russian]
- [Komov, 1980](#) – Komov, Y. (1980). Mir prizrachnyj i kovarnyj [The world is ghostly and insidious]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 17. [in Russian]
- [Komov, 1982](#) – Komov, Y. (1982). Epidemiya uzhasov [Epidemic of Horrors]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 18. [in Russian]
- [Komov, 1985](#) – Komov, Y. (1985). Gonki s ten'yu [Races with the shadow]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- [Kompanichenko, 1987](#) – Kompanichenko, G. (1987). "Horoshij chelovek nuzhen vsegda". Beseda s Miloshem Formanom ["A good man is always needed". Conversation with Milos Forman]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 21-22. [in Russian]
- [Kompanichenko, 1991](#) – Kompanichenko, G. (1991). Samyj krasivyy profil' Gollivuda [The most beautiful profile of Hollywood]. *Ekran*. 18: 12-13. [in Russian]
- [Kopelev, 1962](#) – Kopelev, L. (1962). Prosto o ser'eznom [Just about the serious]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7. [In Russian]
- [Kopylova, 1972](#) – Kopylova, R. (1972). "Pervaya" i "vtoraya" Lucia Bosè ["First" and "second" Lucia Bosè]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 16. [in Russian]
- [Korolevich, 1926](#) – Korolevich, V. (1926). Dovol'no Enough Mary Pickford! [Enough Mary Pickford!]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 32: 13. [in Russian]
- [Korolevich, 1926](#) – Korolevich, V. (1926). Ispankaya tancovshchica [Spanish dancer]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 45: 14. [in Russian]
- [Korolevich, 1926](#) – Korolevich, V. (1926). Pat i Patashon [Pat and Patashon]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 31: 14. [in Russian]
- [Korolevich, 1926](#) – Korolevich, V. (1926). Skandal v obshchestve [Scandal in society]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 39: 13. [in Russian]
- [Korolevich, 1926](#) – Korolevich, V. (1926). Zhenshchina germanskoj fil'my [Woman of the German film]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 35: 7. [in Russian]
- [Korotkaya..., 1968](#) – Korotkaya radost' svobody [A Short joy of freedom] (1968). *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [In Russian]
- [Kovarsky, 1963](#) – Kovarsky, N. (1963). Kamen' vmesto hleba [Stone instead of bread]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4. [In Russian]
- [Kovshov, 1981](#) – Kovshov, V. (1981). Igra bez pravil [Game without rules]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Kozintsev, 1959](#) – Kozintsev, G. (1959). Vstrechi na festivale [Meetings at the Festival]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 4-5. [In Russian]
- [Krah..., 1983](#) – Krah "Tarzana" [The collapse of *Tarzan*] (1983). *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 17-18. [in Russian]
- [Krasnov, 1926](#) – Krasnov, P. (1926). Buster Keaton v trekh sosnah [Buster Keaton in Three Pines]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7. [in Russian]
- [Krasnov, 1926](#) – Krasnov, P. (1926). Dva polyusa Venery [Two poles of Venus]. *Sovetskij ekran*. [in Russian]
- [Krasnova, 1981](#) – Krasnova, G. (1981). Mariya, Krista, Margaret, Bebi i drugie... [Maria, Krista, Margaret, Baby and others ...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 16. [in Russian]
- [Krasnova, 1984](#) – Krasnova, G. (1984). Peter Fleishman: "My dolzhny byt' na postu, nacheku!" [Peter Fleishman: "We must be on guard, alert!"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Krasnova, 1988](#) – Krasnova, G. (1988). Hanna Schygulla: ot Suzdalya do Budapeshta [Hanna Schygulla: from Suzdal to Budapest]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1988. 20: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Krasnova, 1988](#) – Krasnova, G. (1988). Shans, kotorym prenebregli [Chance that was neglected]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 21. [in Russian]
- [Krechetova, 1975](#) – Krechetova, R. (1975). Posledstviya vybora [Consequences of choice]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 6. [in Russian]
- [Kremlev, 1962](#) – Kremlev, G. (1962). Trinadcatyj, schastlivyj [The Thirteenth, happy]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15. [In Russian]
- [Krotky, 1925](#) – Krotky, E. (1925). O velikom gluhonemom [About the great deaf-mute]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 31: 12-13. [in Russian]
- [Krylova, 1960](#) – Krylova, N. (1960). Sidney Poitier. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 18-19. [In Russian]
- [Krymova, 1959](#) – Krymova, N. (1959). Zhenshchina Niskavuori [Woman Niskavuori]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 12. [In Russian]
- [Krysha, 1958](#) – Krysha [The Roof] (1958). *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 5. [In Russian]
- [Krysy, 1957](#) – Krysy [Rats] (1957). *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 5. [In Russian]
- [Kryuchkov, 1968](#) – Kryuchkov, N. (1968). Spravedlivaya kritika [Fair criticism]. *Ogonek*. 48: 17. [In Russian]
- [Kryuchkov, 1968](#) – Kryuchkov, N. (1968). Spravedlivaya kritika [Fair criticism]. *Ogonek*. 48: 17. [in Russian]
- [Kto..., 1968](#) – Kto ubil Marilyn Monroe? [Who killed Marilyn Monroe?] (1968). *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [In Russian]
- [Kudrin, 1981](#) – Kudrin, I. (1981). Po odnomu scenariyu [According to one scenario]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 18. [in Russian]
- [Kudrin, 1983](#) – Kudrin, I. (1983). Chto idet na Gran Via [What goes to the Gran Via] *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 18. [in Russian]
- [Kudrin, 1984](#) – Kudrin, I. (1984). Vstrecha s "Korolevoj shanteklera" [Meeting with the "Queen of Chanticleer"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 19-20. [in Russian]
- [Kudryavtsev, 1988](#) – Kudryavtsev, S. (1988). Chernyj, chastnyj, parallel'nyj [Black, Private, Parallel]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 22; 22: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Kudryavtsev, 1988](#) – Kudryavtsev, S. (1988). Tak skol'ko zhe budet 2 x 2? [So how much will be 2 x 2?].

- Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 20-21. [in Russian]
 Kudryavtsev, 1989 – Kudryavtsev, S. (1989). Videokompas [Video Compass]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 29; 5: 30; 6: 30; 7: 29; 8: 30; 9: 30; 11: 29; 13: 29; 14: 30; 15: 30; 16: 31; 17: 29. [in Russian]
 Kudryavtsev, 1989 – Kudryavtsev, S. (1989). Zachem verit' kinokritikam [Why believe the film critics]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 31. [in Russian]
 Kukarkin, 1959 – Kukarkin, A. (1959). Charlie Chaplin. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 12-13. [In Russian]
 Kukarkin, 1963 – Kukarkin, A. (1963). Mify zapadnogo kino [Myths of Western cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 15; 19. [In Russian]
 Kukarkin, 1964 – Kukarkin, A. (1964). V pogone za zolotym tel'com [In Pursuit of the golden calf]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 18-19. [In Russian]
 Kukarkin, 1985 – Kukarkin, A. (1985). Burzhuznaya massovaya kul'tura. Teorii. Idei. Raznovidnosti. Obrazcy. Tekhnika. Biznes [Bourgeois Mass Culture. Theories. Ideas. Varieties. Patterns. Technique. Business]. Moscow. [in Russian]
 Kuleshov, 1928 – Kuleshov, L. (1928). Ocherki kinoiskusstva [Essays on Cinema Art]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 5. [in Russian]
 Kuleshov, 1929 – Kuleshov, L. (1929). My i zagranica [We and the Foreign Country]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 3. [in Russian]
 Kuleshov, 1960 – Kuleshov, A. (1960). Pestrnye kadry [Motley images]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 20: 16-17. [In Russian]
 Kuleshov, 1976 – Kuleshov, A. (1976). Neistovstvo porno [Fury of porn]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 18-19. [in Russian]
 Kuleshov, 1987 – Kuleshov, L. (1987). Sobranie sochinenij [Collected works]. Moscow. [in Russian]
 Kumiry..., 1967 – Kumiry proshlogo segodnya [Idols of the past today] (1967). *Sovetskij ekran*. 16. [In Russian]
 Kushnirov, 1973 – Kushnirov, M. (1973). Skandal? *Sovetskij ekran*. 6. [in Russian]
 Kuznetsov, 1962 – Kuznetsov, M. (1962). Kak byt', kogda smeshno? [How to be when it is funny?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1. [In Russian]
 Kuznetsov, 1963 – Kuznetsov, M. (1963). Smotrivo [What's good to watch]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19. [In Russian]
 Kuznetsov, 1965 – Kuznetsov, M. (1965). O vojne i o mire [About the War and Peace]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 2-3. [In Russian]
 Kuznetsov, 1965 – Kuznetsov, M. (1965). Yagoda skhodit. Nedelya francuzskogo kino [Berry is coming. A Week of French Cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 16-17. [In Russian]
 Kuznetsov, 1991 – Kuznetsov, V. (1991). Rekviev neob'yavlennoj vojny [Requiem for an undeclared war]. *Ekran*. 10: 11. [in Russian]
 Lagina, 1972 – Lagina, N. (1972). Pevac i kinoakter [Singer and film actor]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 14. [in Russian]
 Lagina, 1972 – Lagina, N. (1972). Posleslovie k "Zvukam muzyki" [Afterword to *The Sound of Music*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 14-15. [in Russian]
 Lagorio, 1926 – Lagorio, A. (1926). Mary Pickford i Douglas Fairbanks o "Potemkine" [Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks on *Potemkin*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 7. [in Russian]
 Lavrentiev, 1987 – Lavrentiev, S. (1987). Beskonechnaya istoriya [Endless Story]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 21. [in Russian]
 Lavrentiev, 1987 – Lavrentiev, S. (1987). Grozd'ya gneva [Grapes of Wrath]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 19. [in Russian]
 Lavrentiev, 1988 – Lavrentiev, S. (1988). Bereg pravyy, bereg levyy [The shore right, the shore left]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 20. [in Russian]
 Lavrentiev, 1988 – Lavrentiev, S. (1988). Prodelki v starinnom duhe [Pranks in the Old Fashioned Spirit]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 18-19. [in Russian]
 Lavrentiev, 1989 – Lavrentiev, S. (1989). Debyut. Zhizn'. Eshche debyut [Debut. Life. Still a debut]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 9-10. [in Russian]
 Lavrentiev, 1989 – Lavrentiev, S. (1989). Proigravshij pobeditel' [The Loser Winner]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 8, 10. [in Russian]
 Lavrentiev, 1990 – Lavrentiev, S. (1990). Oazis v krasnoj pustyne [Oasis in the Red Desert]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 27-28. [in Russian]
 Lea..., 1966 – Lea Massari (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 21. [In Russian]
 Lemberg, 1925 – Lemberg, E. (1925). Ekran Parizha [Screen of Paris]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1925. 17: 12. [in Russian]
 Leonidov, 1926 – Leonidov, L. (1926). Nikakih sluchajnostej [No accidents]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6-7. [in Russian]
 Leonidov, 1984 – Leonidov, I. (1984). Tragediya na s"emochnoj ploshchadke [Tragedy on the set]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 20. [in Russian]
 Lesovoy, 1966 – Lesovoy, M. (1966). Trilogiya Wolfgang Staudte [The Trilogy of Wolfgang Staudte]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 16-17. [In Russian]
 Lesovoy, 1968 – Lesovoy, M. (1968). Kto vyigral bitvu za Britaniyu? [Who won the battle for Britain?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 12. [In Russian]
 Lesovoy, 1969 – Lesovoy, M. (1969). Ital'yanskij "chelovek vozduha" [Italian "man of air"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [In Russian]
 Lesovoy, 1969 – Lesovoy, M. (1969). Ital'yanskij "chelovek vozduha" [Italian "man of air"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [in Russian]
 Levashova, 1975 – Levashova, Y. (1975). Mireille Darc. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 18-19. [in Russian]
 Levidov, 1928 – Levidov, M. (1928). Naschet geroev: v kino i v literature [About heroes: in cinema and in literature]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 47: 8-9. [in Russian]
 Levitskaya, 2022 – Levitskaya, A. (2022). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in Cinema Art Journal: 1956-

1968. *Media Education*. 18(3): 390-438.
- [Levitskaya, Fedorov, 2023](#) – *Levitskaya, A., Fedorov, A.* (2023). Western Cinematography on the Pages of the *Soviet Screen Magazine of 1925–1927*. *Media Education*. 19(1): 71-96.
- [Lipkov, 1971](#) – *Lipkov, A.* (1971). Obvinenie [Prosecution]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 15. [in Russian]
- [Lipkov, 1972](#) – *Lipkov, A.* (1972). Michèle Morgan: “O chem ya mechtayu” [Michèle Morgan: “What I Dream About”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 17. [in Russian]
- [Lipkov, 1986](#) – *Lipkov, A.* (1986). Vetv' Edisona [Edison's branch]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 22. [in Russian]
- [Lishchinsky, 1960](#) – *Leshchinsky, I.* (1960). Jean-Paul Le Chanois. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 14-15. [In Russian]
- [Lishchinsky, 1965](#) – *Leshchinsky, I.* (1965). Kto vinovat? [Who is to blame?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20. [In Russian]
- [Lishchinsky, 1967](#) – *Leshchinsky, I.* (1967). Alain Delon. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7. [In Russian]
- [Lishchinsky, 1968](#) – *Leshchinsky, I.* (1968). Samaya francuzskaya... [The Most French...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 18-19. [In Russian]
- [Lishchinsky, 1971](#) – *Lishchinsky, I.* (1971). Poslednyaya progulka Burvilya [Bourvil's last walk]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Lishchinsky, 1972](#) – *Lishchinsky, I.* (1972). Put' nahodok, put' poter' [The way of finds, the way of losses]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Lityakova, 1990](#) – *Litvyakova, T.* (1990). Liza Minelli. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 15. [in Russian]
- [Loktev, 1960](#) – *Loktev, A.* (1960). Adskie voditeli [Hell Drivers]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16. [In Russian]
- [Loktev, 1965](#) – *Loktev, A.* (1965). Giovanni Alberti, ego druz'ya i vragi [Giovanni Alberti, his friends and foes]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [In Russian]
- [Lordkipanidze, 1967](#) – *Lordkipanidze, N.* (1967). Byt' soboj do konca [To be myself to the end]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 13. [In Russian]
- [Lotman, 1973](#) – *Lotman, Y.* (1973). Semiotika kino i problemy kinoestetiki [Semiotics of cinema and problems of cinema aesthetics]. Tallin. [in Russian]
- [Lotman, 1992](#) – *Lotman, Y.* (1992). Stat'i po memiotike i tipologii kul'tury. Izbrannye stat'i [Articles on memotics and typology of culture. Selected Articles]. Tallin. [in Russian]
- [Lotman, Tsvivan, 1994](#) – *Lotman, Y., Tsvivan, Y.* (1994). Dilog s ekranom [Dialogue with a screen]. Tallin, 1994. [in Russian]
- [Lotyanu, 1980](#) – *Lotyanu, E.* (1980). Trieste-80. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23. [in Russian]
- [Lunacharsky, 1928](#) – *Lunacharsky, A.* (1928). Novyj shedevr meshchanskogo kino [The New masterpiece of burger cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 4. [in Russian]
- [Lunacharsky, 1929](#) – *Lunacharsky, A.* (1929). Pis'mo ot 30 marta 1929 goda [Letter of March 30, 1929]. [in Russian]
- [Lungina, 1989](#) – *Lungina, L.* (1989). Preduprezhdenie [Warning]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 26-27. [in Russian]
- [Lunyakova, 1966](#) – *Lunyakova, N.* (1966). Doroga dlinoj v gody [The Road of Years]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 16. [In Russian]
- [Lvov, 1959](#) – *Lvov, G.* (1959). Ben Gur i tragediya “Sinechitty” [Ben Gur and the tragedy of “Cinecitta”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 19. [In Russian]
- [Lvov, 1960](#) – *Lvov, G.* (1960). Neve i ego sem'ya [Neve and his family]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 16. [In Russian]
- [Lvov, 1971](#) – *Lvov, S.* (1971). Slovo o chistote i muzhestve [A word about purity and courage]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Lyndina, 1971](#) – *Lyndina, E.* (1971). Zrelost' talanta i kanony Gollivuda [The maturity of talent and the canons of Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Lyndina, 1972](#) – *Lyndina, E.* (1972). Pytayas' razorvat' seti... [Trying to break the networks...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Moor, 1927](#) – *Moor, L.* (1927). Amerikanskije kinoteatry [American cinemas]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 35: 10. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1970](#) – *Makarov, G.* (1970). Portret “yastreba” [Portrait of a “hawk”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1976](#) – *Makarov, A.* (1976). Prishedshij s ulicy [Who came from the street]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1981](#) – *Makarov, A.* (1981). Igra i real'nost' [Game and reality]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1982](#) – *Makarov, A.* (1982). Kraj sveta po-ital'yanski [The end of the world in Italian]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 8. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1983](#) – *Makarov, A.* (1983). Intelligent s zontikom v chernom botinke [An intellectual with an umbrella in a black boot]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 18. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1985](#) – *Makarov, A.* (1985). Skuchnaya istoriya [Boring history]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 10. [in Russian]
- [Makarov, 1986](#) – *Makarov, A.* (1986). Muzhchina srednih let intelligentnoj naruzhnosti [A middle-aged man with an intelligent appearance]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Malen'kij..., 1965](#) – *Malen'kij chelovek: chto dal'she?* [A Little man: what's next?] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 19. [In Russian]
- [Malyshev, 1986](#) – *Malyshev, V.* (1986). Anatomiya terrora [Anatomy of Terror]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 19. [in Russian]
- [Manevich, 1960](#) – *Manevich, I.* (1960). Marie-October. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [In Russian]
- [Manevich, 1991](#) – *Manevich, I.* (1991). Chuzhie trofei [Alien Trophies]. *Ekran*. 18: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Marc..., 1966](#) – *Marc Michel* (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 13. [In Russian]
- [Marcel..., 1926](#) – *Marcel L'Herbier* (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 45: 13. [in Russian]
- [Maria..., 1966](#) – *Maria Grazia Buccella* (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 20. [In Russian]
- [Mariamov, 1962](#) – *Mariamov, G.* (1962). “Vtoraya liniya ataki russkih” (zametki ob Edinburgskom

- kinofestivale) ["The second line of attack of the Russians" (notes on the Edinburgh Film Festival)]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23. [In Russian]
- Mario..., 1966 – Mario Adorf (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 21. [In Russian]
- Markov, 1972 – Markov, S. (1972). Kevin Brownlow: "Eto sluchilos' zdes'" [Kevin Brownlow: "It Happened Here"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 15. [in Russian]
- Markov, 1974 – Markov, S. (1974). Fotoal'bom aktrisy [Photo album of the actress]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 19-20. [in Russian]
- Markov, 1975 – Markova, E. (1975). "Pirosmani" v Amerike [Pirosmani in America]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 17. [in Russian]
- Markova, 1971 – Markova, F. (1971). Ivo Garani: Razoblachat' fashizm [Ivo Garani: Exposing fascism]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [in Russian]
- Martin, 1961 – Martin, M. (1961). Sud'ba "Novoj volny" [The Fate of the "New Wave"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6. [In Russian]
- Maskina, 1991 – Maskina, N. (1991). Omar Sharif. *Ekran*. 10: 12. [in Russian]
- Maslovsky, 1987 – Maslovsky, G. (1987). Stico. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 21. [in Russian]
- Mast, Cohen, 1985 – Mast, G., Cohen, M. (eds.) (1985). *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mastera..., 1957 – Mastera dokumental'nogo kino [Masters of documentary film] (1957). *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 16-17. [In Russian]
- Masters..., 1927 – Mastera maski [Masters of the mask]. (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 36: 15. [in Russian]
- Matusevich, 1960 – Matusevich, V. (1960). Legenda o beglece [A legend about a fugitive]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 14. [In Russian]
- Matusevich, 1966 – Matusevich, V. (1966). Matusevich, V. Shvedskij kinobum [Swedish Cinema Boom]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 14-15. [In Russian]
- Matusevich, 1968 – Matusevich, V. (1968). Zdorov'e, kak chernyj hleb... [Health as black bread...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [In Russian]
- Matveev, 1964 – Matveev, E. (1964). Pod znojnym nebom Argentiny [Under the sultry skies of Argentina]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 18. [In Russian]
- Maximov, 1990 – Maximov, A. (1990). Myuzikl: operaciya na serdce zhanra [Musical: Operation on the heart of the genre]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 28-29. [in Russian]
- Medvedeva, 1961 – Medvedeva, G. (1961). Moj deviz – bor'ba [My Motto is Struggle]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18. [In Russian]
- Melville, 1985 – Melville, L. (1985). V krivom zerkale [In a crooked mirror]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 20. [in Russian]
- Metz, 1974 – Metz, C. (1974). *Language and cinema*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Meyerhold, 1928 – Meyerhold, V. (1928). O zapadnom kino [On western cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 52: 14. [in Russian]
- Michel..., 1976 – Michel Bouquet (1976). *Sovetskij ekran*. 24. [in Russian]
- Microphone..., 1965 – Microphone... v posteli [Microphone... in bed] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 18. [In Russian]
- Mikhailov, 1959 – Mikhailov, B. (1959). Fil'my uzhasov [Horror Films]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11. [In Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1974 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1974). Obrashchayas' k chitatel'skoj pamyati [Addressing the reader's memory]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 4-5. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1977 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1977). "Ty techesh', kak reka..." ["You flow like a river ..."]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 4-5. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1978 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1978). Udar! Eshche udar! [Hit! Another hit!]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 3-4. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1981 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1981). Vinnetu i ego druz'ya [Vinnetu and his friends]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 17. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1983 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1983). Max von Sydow: kontrasty [Max von Sydow: contrasts]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 17. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1985 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1985). Prishli strasti-mordasti [Passion-faces have come]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 11. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1988 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1988). Eti velikolepnye geroi na Bezhinom lugu [These magnificent heroes on Bezhin Meadow]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 17-18. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1989 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1989). Prelest' nevoobrazimogo [The Beauty of the Unimaginable]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 26-27. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1989 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1989). Vpered k proshlomu... [Forward to the Past...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 28. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1990 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1990). Poiski v znakovyh debryah [Searches in the sign jungle]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1991 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1991). Kak ustroit' Rimskie kanikuly [How to arrange Roman Holiday]. *Ekran*. 18: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Mikhalkovich, 1991 – Mikhalkovich, V. (1991). Urok baryshni s proshlym [The lesson of a young lady with a past]. *Ekran*. 13: 26-27. [in Russian]
- Mikhan, 1967 – Mikhan, T. (1967). V masterskoj Fellini [In Fellini's workshop]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 14-15. [In Russian]
- Milman, 1925 – Milman, V. (1925). Prem'era v Londone. *Don Q – Syn Zorro* [Premiere in London. *Don Q – Son of Zorro*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 27: 9. [in Russian]
- Minkin, 1929 – Minkin, A. (1929). Pod svoej tyazhest'yu: k smerti Vyacheslava Pavlovicha Uspenskogo [Under

its own weight: To the death of Vyacheslav Pavlovich Uspensky]. *Kino*. 15(291): 3. 9.04.1929. [in Russian]

Mishchenko, 2012 – Mishchenko, T. (2012). Zhenshchiny iz sovetskikh fil'mov (po materialam zhurnala *Sovetskij ekran* 1960–1968 gg.) [Women from Soviet films (based on the materials of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1960–1968)). *Vestnik Bryanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. 2-1: 132–136. [in Russian]

Mogilevsky, 1929 – Mogilevsky, L. (1929). Joris Ivens. *Sovetskij ekran*. 29: 6. [in Russian]

Moikin, 1973 – Moikin, N. (1973) Ego professiya – ubijstvo [His profession is murder]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1973. 7. [in Russian]

Moikin, 1974 – Moikin, N. (1974). Bogatstvo i nishcheta Ameriki [Wealth and poverty of America]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1974. 13: 18. [in Russian]

Moikin, 1974 – Moikin, N. (1974). Elektronika “obyknovennykh ubijstv” [Electronics of “ordinary murders”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1974. 18: 19. [in Russian]

Moikin, 1974 – Moikin, N. (1974). Sidney Pollack: Byt' s temi, kto boretsya za spravedlivost' [Sydney Pollack: To be with those who fight for justice]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 20. [in Russian]

Morozov, 1969 – Morozov, A. (1969). Moroz po kozhe [Frost on the Skin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22. [in Russian]

Morozov, 1989 – Morozov, A. (1989). Kasseta na tamozhne [Cassette at the Custom House]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 19. [in Russian]

Morozov, 1990 – Morozov, A. (1990). Katastrofa – i nikakogo riska [Catastrophe – and no risk]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 30–31. [in Russian]

Morozov, 1990 – Morozov, A. (1990). Populyarnye koshmary [Popular Nightmares]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 23. [in Russian]

Mosin, 1978 – Mosin, L. (1978). Poliekran planet [Polyscreen of the planet]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 1. [in Russian]

Mosina, 1991 – Mosina, E. (1991). Jean Marais. Dve ipostasi [Jean Marais. Two hypostasis]. *Ekran*. 18: 18. [in Russian]

Mosina, 1991 – Mosina, E. (1991). Tancyuyushchaya Marika [Dancing Marika]. *Ekran*. 18: 6. [in Russian]

Movies..., 1925 – Kino-pornografiya [Movies-pornography] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 10. [in Russian]

Mudrov, 1984 – Mudrov, A. (1984). Paren' s ulicy Glyuka [The guy from Gluck street]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 22. [in Russian]

Myasnikova, 1980 – Myasnikova, E. (1980). Norvezhskie fil'my v SSSR [Norwegian films in the USSR]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3. [in Russian]

Na..., 1966 – Na ekrane i v zhizni [On the screen and in life] (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 19. [in Russian]

Na..., 1987 – Na perelome [At the turning point] (1987). *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 2. [in Russian]

Nadezhdy..., 1973 – Nadezhdy Volker Schlöndorff [Volker Schlöndorff's Hopes]. (1973). *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 17. [in Russian]

Nagibin, 1985 – Nagibin, Y. (1985). Posle “Bala” [After *Le Bal*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 18–19. [in Russian]

Naloev, 1984 – Naloev, A. (1984). Puteshestvie na planetu Pepperlend [Journey to the planet Pepperland]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 22. [in Russian]

Narymova, 1990 – Narymova, V. (1990). Lunatiki Fellini [Fellini's Lunatics]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 29. [in Russian]

Navstrechu..., 1965 – Navstrechu IV Moskovskomu kinofestivalyu [Towards the IV Moscow Film Festival] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 16–17. [in Russian]

Nedelin, 1977 – Nedelin, V. (1977). “Izuminna na solnce” [*Raisins in the sun*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23. [in Russian]

Nedelin, 1977 – Nedelin, V. (1977). “Professiya: reporter” [*Profession: reporter*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1. [in Russian]

Nedelya..., 1959 – Nedelya anglijskikh fil'mov v SSSR [A Week of English Films in the USSR] (1959). *Sovetskij ekran*. 20. [in Russian]

Neldichen, 1926 – Neldichen, S. (1926). Tragediya so schastlivoj razvyazkoj [Tragedy with a happy ending]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 34: 14. [in Russian]

Nemirovich-Danchenko, 1928 – Nemirovich-Danchenko, V. (1928). Kino-Amerika [Cinema-America]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 10. [in Russian]

Nenasheva, 1987 – Nenasheva, O. (1987). Pomogite, rezhut! [Help, cut!]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 21–22. [in Russian]

Nenasheva, 1987 – Nenasheva, O. (1987). TV Gold garantiruet [TV Gold guarantees]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 16–17. [in Russian]

Nenasheva, 1989 – Nenasheva, O. (1989). Mafiya po receptu [Mafia by prescription]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 29. [in Russian]

Nenasheva, 1989 – Nenasheva, O. (1989). Tampere-89. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 28. [in Russian]

Nenasheva, 1990 – Nenasheva, O. (1990). Michael Douglas. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 16. [in Russian]

Neradov, 1929 – Neradov, A. (1929). Novye techeniya v germanskom kino [New currents in German Cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 12. [in Russian]

Nerves..., 1926 – Nery tryukovogo aktera [Nerves of a stunt actor] (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 15. [in Russian]

News..., 1925 – News of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. 1925. 25–26: 8–9. [in Russian]

Nibelungs, 1925 – Nibelungi [Nibelungs] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 9–10. [in Russian]

Nikolaeva, 1962 – Nikolaeva, E. (1962). A gde zhe Mark Twain? [And where is Mark Twain?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 18–19. [in Russian]

Nikulin, 1926 – Nikulin, L. (1926). Tovarishchu s nozhnicami [For the comrade with scissors]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 5. [in Russian]

Nikulin, 1928 – Nikulin, L. (1928). Pis'ma o sinema [Letters on Cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 28: 12–13. [in Russian]

- Nino..., 1966 – Nino Castelnuovo (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 13. [In Russian]
- Nochnoj..., 1991 – Nochnoj otel' na odin vecher [A Night hotel for one evening] (1991). *Ekran*. 9: 23. [in Russian]
- Novogrudsky, 1958 – Novogrudsky, A. (1958). Machinist. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 4. [In Russian]
- Novogrudsky, 1983 – Novogrudsky, A. (1983). Oberhausen-83. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Nusinova, 1987 – Nusinova, N. (1987). "Serdityj kritik" François Truffaut ["The Angry Critic": François Truffaut]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 20. [in Russian]
- Obminskaya, 1982 – Obminskaya, M. (1982). Novichok i veteran [Newcomer and Veteran]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 19. [in Russian]
- Obraztsova, 1960 – Obraztsova, A. (1960). Ulybka Fanfana [Fanfan Smile]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 17-18. [In Russian]
- On..., 1928 – O kinomanii [On movie mania] (1928). *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 3. [in Russian]
- On..., 1929 – O sovetskom kinoimporte [On Soviet film imports] (1929). *Sovetskij ekran*. 40: 3. [in Russian]
- One..., 1925 – Tot, kto poluchaet poshchechiny [One who receives slaps] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 33: 15. [in Russian]
- Oni..., 1967 – Oni shli za soldatami [They followed the soldiers] (1967). *Sovetskij ekran*. 2. [In Russian]
- Orlenko, 1979 – Orlenko, A. (1979). Supermen Genri v lichine prostaka Frica [Superman Henry in the guise of a simpleton Fritz]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 13. [in Russian]
- Orlov, 1959 – Orlov, V. (1959). Doroga dlinoyu v god [The Road of a Year]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16. [In Russian]
- Orlov, 1960 – Orlov, V. (1960). My – vunderkindy [We are child prodigies]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 14-15. [In Russian]
- Orlov, 1966 – Orlov, V. (1966). ...Chto emu Gekuba? [...What is Hecuba to him?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 14-15. [In Russian]
- Orlov, 1966 – Orlov, V. (1966). Iskusstvo nuzhno raznoe! [Art needs different!]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 19. [In Russian]
- Orlov, 1968 – Orlov, V. (1968). Edinstvennyj vystrel [The Only Shot]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 17. [In Russian]
- Orlov, 1981a – Orlov, D. (1981). Dni Deli [Days of Delhi]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 16-18. [in Russian]
- Orlov, 1981b – Orlov, D. (1981). Razmyshleniya na ploshchadi [Reflections on the square]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Orlov, 1984 – Orlov, D. (1984) U Luisa Bunyuelya [At Luis Bunuel]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 20. [in Russian]
- Orlov, 2011 – Orlov, D. (2011). Replika v zal. Zapiski "deystvuyushchego lica" [Replica in the hall. Notes of the "actor"]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- Orlova, 1982 – Orlova, V. (1982) Zagadka Kaya Skauga [The Riddle of Kai Skaug] *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 9. [in Russian]
- Osipov, 1987 – Osipov, A. (1987). Policiya bessil'na [Police is powerless]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 10-11. [in Russian]
- Osipov, 1988 – Osipov, A. (1988). Jane Birkin. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 24. [in Russian]
- Osipov, 1988 – Osipov, A. (1988). Jeanne Moreau: "Za uspekhn artist dolzhen platit'" [Jeanne Moreau: "The actor must pay for success"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 22. [in Russian]
- Osipov, 1989 – Osipov, A. (1989). Dominique Sanda. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 16-18. [in Russian]
- Osipov, 1989 – Osipov, A. (1989). Jean-Paul Belmondo. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Osipov, 1989 – Osipov, A. (1989). Obyanie neobnazhennoj natury [The Charm of a non-naked nature]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 26. [in Russian]
- Osipov, 1991 – Osipov, A. (1991). Michelle Pfeiffer: vice and virtue Mishel' Pfajffer: porok i dobrodetel' [Michelle Pfeiffer: vice and virtue]. *Ekran*. 9: 18. [in Russian]
- Otverzhennye, 1960 – Otverzhennye [Les Misérables] (1960). *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 15. [In Russian]
- Our..., 1929 – Nashe i zapadnoe kino [Our and Western cinema] (1929). *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 7. [in Russian]
- Ozerov, 1978 – Ozerov, M. (1978). Ulybka skhodit s lica [The smile disappears from the face]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 18. [in Russian]
- Ozerov, 1986 – Ozerov, M. (1986). Fabrika nasiliya [Factory of Violence]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Palladin, 1978 – Palladin, A. (1978). Bar'ery antisov'etizma [Barriers of anti-Sovietism]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 17. [in Russian]
- Pankratova, 1977 – Pankratova, N. (1977). Jacques Demy. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6. [in Russian]
- Panov, 1929 – Panov, E. (1929). Rabochee dvizhenie v zarubezhnom kino [The Working movement in foreign cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 39: 7. [in Russian]
- Parnov, 1982 – Parnov, E. (1982). Slagaemye fenomena [Terms of the phenomenon]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Pered..., 1958 – Pered licom vojny v Alzhire [Before the War in Algeria] (1958). *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 17. [In Russian]
- Pered..., 1958 – Pered zahodom solnca [Before the Sunset] (1958). *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 7. [In Russian]
- Pertsov, 1926 – Pertsov, V. (1926). Geroi kino – lovkost' i skorost' [Movie Heroes – Agility and Speed]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 14. [in Russian]
- Peskova, 1959 – Peskova, V. (1959). Nicole Courcelles. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2. [In Russian]
- Petrov, 1967 – Petrov, B. (1967). Chelovechnost' pobezhdaet [Humanity wins]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 13. [In Russian]
- Petrov, 1975 – Petrov, B. (1975). John Mornarty: nachalo puti [John Mornarty: the beginning of the journey]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Petrova, 1989 – Petrova, N. (1989). Eto i est' Amerika [This is America]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 29. [in Russian]
- Pinsky, 1990 – Pinsky, B. (1990). Igra v detektiv po-yaroslavski [The detective game in Yaroslavl]. *Sovetskij*

- ekran. 8: 24-25. [in Russian]
- [Pinsky, 1991](#) – *Pinsky, B.* (1991). Unizhenie pache gordosti [Humiliation over pride]. *Ekran.* 4: 30-31. [in Russian]
- [Pisarevsky, 1965](#) – *Pisarevsky, D.* (1965). Sud'by kino i zritel'. Zametki s Kannskogo festivalya [The fate of cinema and the spectator. Notes from the Cannes Film Festival]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 15: 16-19. [In Russian]
- [Pisarevsky, 1967](#) – *Pisarevsky, D.* (1967). Segodnya v Danii [Today in Denmark]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6. [In Russian]
- [Pisarevsky, 1972](#) – *Pisarevsky, D.* (1972). Pula-72: temy sovremenosti [Pula-72: contemporary themes]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 16-18. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1983](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1983). Chto takoe "belmondizm" [What is Belmondism]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 17. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1983](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1983). Strah, poshchadivshij dushu [Fear that spared the soul]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 5-6. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1983](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1983). Zamknutyj krug. V mire duhovnogo krizisa [Vicious circle. In the world of spiritual crisis]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 17. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1985](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1985). Gordye provincialki Natalie Bay [Proud provincial women Natalie Bay]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1985](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1985). Trevoga i nadezhda [Anxiety and Hope]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1985](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1985). V masshtabe melodramy [On the scale of melodrama]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 10. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1986](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1986). Grust' "uhodyashchej natyry" [The Sadness of "Departing Nature"]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 10-11. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1987](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1987). Chudo ne povtoryaetsya [The miracle is not repeated]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 22: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1987](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1987). Paradoksal'naya professiya [Paradoxical profession]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 21. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1989](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1989). Zemlya Bergmana [Bergman's Land]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 3: 30. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1990](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1990). Nostal'giya po-francuzski [Nostalgia in French]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 15: 11. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1991](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1991). Infernal'naya lyubov' Maksa i Lyuchii [Infernal Love of Max and Lucia]. *Ekran.* 11: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1991](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1991). Jean-Louis Trintignant, chelovek-fantom [Jean-Louis Trintignant, the phantom man]. *Ekran.* 12: 28-29. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1991](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1991). Roman Polanski: begstvo ot ideologii [Roman Polanski: Escape from Ideology]. *Ekran.* 14: 12-14. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1991](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1991). Russkij les i nash Gonkong [The Russian Forest and Our Hong Kong]. *Ekran.* 3: 25-26. [in Russian]
- [Plakhov, 1991](#) – *Plakhov, A.* (1991). Strana sovetov [The Country of Soviets]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1: 15. [in Russian]
- [Plakhova, 1991](#) – *Plakhova, E.* (1991). Prichudy iskrennosti [The quirks of sincerity]. *Ekran.* 1: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Podsolnuhi..., 1969](#) – *Podsolnuhi.* Idut s'emki [There are shooting] (1969). *Sovetskij ekran.* 19: 10-12. [In Russian]
- [Podsudimyj..., 1989](#) – *Podsudimyj Erot, vstan'te!* [The Defendant Eros, Rise up!] (1989). *Sovetskij ekran.* 10: 15, 29. [in Russian]
- [Pogozheva, 1973](#) – *Pogozheva, L.* (1973). Bez prazdnika [Without a holiday]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 15-17. [in Russian]
- [Poklonov, 1976](#) – *Poklonov, Y.* (1976). Pod komedijnoj maskoj [Under a Comedy Mask]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Polskih, 1977](#) – *Polskih, L.* (1977). Philip Noiret. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9. [in Russian]
- [Polyak, 1927](#) – *Polyak, M.* (1927). O francuzkom kino [About French Cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 3: 13. [in Russian]
- [Polyak, 1927](#) – *Polyak, M.* (1927). Shahmatnyj igrok [Chess player]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 10: 5. [in Russian]
- [Postanovlenie..., 1969](#) – Postanovlenie sekretariata CK KPSS "O povyshenii otvetstvennosti rukovoditelej organov pechati, radio, televideniya, kinematografii, uchrezhdenij kul'tury i iskusstva za idejno-politicheskij uroven' publikuemyh materialov i repertuara" ot 7.01.1969 [Resolution of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio, television, cinematography, cultural institutions and art for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire". 7.01.1969]. [in Russian]
- [Postanovlenie..., 1972](#) – Postanovlenie CK KPSS "O literaturno-hudozhestvennoj kritike" [Decree of Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On Literary and Artistic Criticism"]. 21.01.1972. [in Russian]
- [Postanovlenie..., 1972](#) – Postanovlenie CK KPSS "O merah po dal'nejshemu razvitiyu sovetsoj kinematografii" [Decree of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "On measures for the further development of Soviet cinematography"]. *Pravda.* 22.08.1972. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1972. 19. [in Russian]
- [Pozdnyakov, 1989](#) – *Pozdnyakov, A.* (1989). Michael Douglas. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Poznakom'tes'..., 1962](#) – *Poznakom'tes': Alain Delon* [Get acquainted: Alain Delon] (1962). *Sovetskij ekran.* 13. [In Russian]
- [Pravda, 1925](#) – *Pravda.* 1.07.1925. [in Russian]
- [Pravda..., 1962](#) – *Pravda ob odnoj kinozvezde* [The truth about a movie star] (1962). *Sovetskij ekran.* 1. [In

Russian]

[Pravednik..., 1967](#) – Pravednik v Sodome [The Righteous One in Sodom] (1967). *Sovetskij ekran*. 6. [In Russian]

[Primitivy..., 1965](#) – Primitivy i yarmarochnoe kino (1895-1908) [The Primitives and the Fairgrounds Cinema (1895-1908)] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [In Russian]

[Pritulenko, 1989](#) – *Pritulenko, V.* (1989). Dobro pozhalovat', Woody! [Welcome, Woody!]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 26-27. [in Russian]

[Prohorov, 1990](#) – *Prohorov, A.* (1990). Otchayannyj voplj' Shtutgarta [Desperate cry of Stuttgart]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 22. [in Russian]

[Prozhogin, 1972](#) – *Prozhogin, N.* (1972). Po tu storonu raya [On the other side of paradise]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 16-17, 20. [in Russian]

[Prozhogin, 1975](#) – *Prozhogin, N.* (1975). Ital'yanskaya panorama [Italian panorama]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 14-15. [in Russian]

[Psychology..., 1925](#) – Psihologiya reklamy [Psychology of advertising] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 10. [in Russian]

[Radi..., 1972](#) – Radi slavy [For the sake of glory] (1972). *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 16. [in Russian]

[Rakhlin, 1991](#) – *Rakhlin, S.* (1991). *The Russian House*. Iz Rossii s lyubov'yu i s fil'mom [The Russian House. From Russia with Love and with a Film]. *Ekran*. 7: 26-27. [in Russian]

[Rakhlin, 1991](#) – *Rakhlin, S.* (1991). Za chto obidelim Scorsese? [What's the point of offending Scorsese?]. *Ekran*. 11: 24-25. [in Russian]

[Rakhlin, 1991a](#) – *Rakhlin, S.* (1991a). Pustota pustyni [The emptiness of the desert]. *Ekran*. 15: 22-23. [in Russian]

[Rakoviny..., 1970](#) – Rakoviny San-Sebast'yana [Sinks of San Sebastian] (1970). *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 14. [in Russian]

[Ramon..., 1927](#) – Ramon Novarro (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 32: 14. [in Russian]

[Rassadin, 1963](#) – *Rassadin, S.* (1963). Chelovek, kotoromu povezlo [The Man who was lucky]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2. [In Russian]

[Rassadin, 1966](#) – *Rassadin, S.* (1966). ...I Simone Signoret [And Simone Signoret]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 16-17. [In Russian]

[Rasskazyvaet..., 1965](#) – Rasskazyvaet Jean Gabin [Narrated by Jean Gabin] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran*. 1. [In Russian]

[Ravich, 1929](#) – *Ravich, N.* (1929). *Chicago, Chang, Moulin Rouge*. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 14. [in Russian]

[Razbitye..., 1958](#) – Razbitye mechty [Shattered Dreams] (1958). *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 4. [In Russian]

[Razlogov, 1981](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1981). Mnogolikij ekran Parizha [The many-sided screen of Paris]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 17-18. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1982](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1982). Pervyj Manil'skij [First Manila Fest]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 16-17. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1983](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1983). Pristrastnoe zerkalo [Biased Mirror]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 14-15. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1983](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1983). Vopreki stereotipam [Contrary to stereotypes]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 18-19. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1984](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1984). Bombej: Fil'motsav-84 [Bombay: Filmotsav-84]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 20-21. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1984](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1984). Stroenie fil'ma. Nekotorye problemy analiza proizvedenij ekrana [Structure of the film. Some problems of analyzing the screen works. Moscow. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1988](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1988). Korotkoe zamykanie lyubvi [Short Circuit of Love]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 21-22. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1989](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1989). Nakonec-to Pasolini... [Finally Pasolini...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 26-27. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1989](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1989). Preodolet' svoj strah [Overcome own fear]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 7. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1990](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1990). Na kakom svete my zhivem? [What world do we live on?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 24-25. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1990](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1990). Stoit li vypryamlyat' krivoje zerkalo [Is it worth straightening the crooked mirror]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 25. [in Russian]

[Razlogov, 1991](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1991). Da net tam nikakoj pornuhi! [There's no porn there!]. *Ekran*. 12: 27. [in Russian]

[Razumny, 1968](#) – *Razumny, V.* (1968). Poziciya... no kakaya? [Position. But what?]. *Ogonek*. 43: 26-27. [In Russian]

[René..., 1973](#) – René Clair razmyshlyayet o sud'bah kino [René Clair reflects on the fate of cinema] (1973). *Sovetskij ekran*. 10. [in Russian]

[Renz, 1925](#) – *Renz, I.* (1925). Samyj veselyj chelovek na Zemle [The most cheerful person on Earth]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 34: 6-7. [in Russian]

[Revanshizm..., 1965](#) – Revanshizm i ego iskusstvo [Revanchism and its art] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran*. 6. [In Russian]

[Revich, 1969](#) – *Revich, V.* (1969). "Bikini" i dinozavry ["Bikini" and dinosaurs]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9. [in Russian]

[Revich, 1970](#) – *Revich, V.* (1970). Tom Liven – agent 000 [Tom Lieven – agent 000]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 14-15. [in Russian]

[Revich, 1971](#) – *Revich, V.* (1971). Ot uzhasnogo do smeshnogo [From terrible to funny]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17. [in Russian]

- Revich, 1976 – Revich, V. (1976). Zagadka detektiva [The riddle of the detective]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 13. [in Russian]
- Rex..., 1926 – Rex Ingram (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 35: 13. [in Russian]
- Rezinkov, 1973 – Rezinkov, V. (1973). Jane Fonda. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4. [in Russian]
- Reznichenko, 1976 – Reznichenko, V. (1976). Prodiktovano biznesom [Dictated by business]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Richard..., 1927 – Richard Talmadge (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 30: 13. [in Russian]
- Rokotov et al., 1929 – Rokotov, T. et al. (1929). V.P. Uspenskij [nekrolog] [V.P. Uspensky [obituary]. *Novy zritel*. 15(274): 3. 7.04.1929. [in Russian]
- Romanov, 1968 – Romanov, A. (1968). Vmeste s partiej, vmeste s narodom [Together with the Party, Together with the People]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 2-3. [In Russian]
- Romanov, 1971 – Romanov, Y. (1971). Kontinent – kinokoloniya [Continent is film colony]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 12-13. [in Russian]
- Romanov, 1979 – Romanov, Y. (1979). Agressivnyj Gollivud [Aggressive Hollywood]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 18. [in Russian]
- Romanov, 1982 – Romanov, Y. (1982). Vse li mozhet supermen? [Can Superman do everything?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 18. [in Russian]
- Romashka, 1929 – Romashka, R. (1929). Za rubezhom [Abroad]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 14. [in Russian]
- Romov, 1990 – Romov, A. (1990). Gor'kie slazy Missisipi [Bitter Tears of Mississippi]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 4-5. [in Russian]
- Roshal, 1926 – Roshal, G. (1926). Nuzhny li nam istoricheskie kartiny? [Do we need historical movies?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 34: 5. [in Russian]
- Rozhdestvensky, 1979 – Rozhdestvensky, R. (1979). "Da" i "net" ["Yes" and "no"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Rtishcheva, 1990 – Rtishcheva, N. (1990). Proshchaj, komissar! Ciao, Michele! [Farewell, Commissar! Ciao, Michele!]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 31. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1964 – Rubanova, I. (1964). Sozvezdie [Constellation]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 12-13. [In Russian]
- Rubanova, 1965 – Rubanova, I. (1965). Christian-Jacques. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 16-17. [In Russian]
- Rubanova, 1965 – Rubanova, I. (1965). Rimlyanka [The Maid of Rome]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 23. [In Russian]
- Rubanova, 1966 – Rubanova, I. (1966). Vsyo o Visconti [All about Visconti]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 19. [In Russian]
- Rubanova, 1968 – Rubanova, I. (1968). Melodiya chuvstva [Melody of feeling]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5. [In Russian]
- Rubanova, 1972 – Rubanova, I. (1972). Talant skromnosti [Talent of modesty]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1973 – Rubanova, I. (1973). Annie Girardot. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1975 – Rubanova, I. (1975). Aktrisa na vse vremena [Actress for all times]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1982 – Rubanova, I. (1982). "...A nado bylo nezhnost'yu" ["...But it was necessary with tenderness"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 9. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1982 – Rubanova, I. (1982). "...Iz snega i odinochestva" ["...From snow and loneliness"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1982 – Rubanova, I. (1982). "Eshche ne zamer smekh..." ["The laughter has not yet stopped ..."] *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 17-18. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1985 – Rubanova, I. (1985). "Pro shchegla v zapiske pervoj..." ["About the goldfinch in the first note..."]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 10-11. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1986 – Rubanova, I. (1986). Catherine Deneuve: grezy i pravda [Catherine Deneuve: Dreams and Truth]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Rubanova, 1991 – Rubanova, I. (1991). Poklonnikov kinofejerverkov prosyat ne bespokoit'sya [Fans of cinema fireworks are asked not to worry]. *Ekran*. 10: 7. [in Russian]
- Rumiantsev, 1965 – Rumiantsev, F. (1965). Tajnoe stanovitsya yavnym [Secret becomes visible]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 18. [In Russian]
- Ryazanov, 1989 – Ryazanov, E. (1989). Vek Charlie Chaplin [The Age of Charlie Chaplin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 25-27. [in Russian]
- Sadoul, 1959 – Sadoul, G. (1959). Francuzskoe kino [French cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10. [In Russian]
- Sadoul, 1959 – Sadoul, G. (1959). Realizm i mirovoe kinoiskusstvo [Realism and World Cinema Art]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 12-13. [In Russian]
- Sadoul, 1961 – Sadoul, G. (1961). Georges Méliès. Jules Verne. Cinema. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22. [In Russian]
- Sadul, 1972 – Sadul, G. (1972). Istoriya mirovogo kino vplot' do 2005 goda [History of world cinema until 2005]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Salner, 1985 – Salner, P. (1985). Jessica Lange: zvezda zazhglas' v Moskve [Jessica Lange: a star lit up in Moscow]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Samoilov, 1959 – Samoilov, S. (1959). Frankfurtskij skandal na ekrane [The Frankfurt Scandal on the Screen]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5. [In Russian]
- Samoilova..., 1961 – Samoilova – Lollobrigida. Razgovor po dusham [Samoilova – Lollobrigida. A Conversation on the Heart] (1961). *Sovetskij ekran*. 16. [In Russian]
- Sanaev, 1966 – Sanaev, V. (1966). XXVII Venecijskij [XXVII Venice film Festival]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 17-18. [In Russian]
- Savitsky, 1974 – Savitsky, N. (1974). Alekos Stasakis vo vrazhdebnom mire [Alekos Stasakis in a hostile world]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 6. [in Russian]

- Savitsky, 1982** – Savitsky, N. (1982). Pustye hlopoty advokata Giovine [The empty chores of the lawyer Giovine]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 6. [in Russian]
- Savitsky, 1985** – Savitsky, N. (1985). Svidetel' obvineniya [Witness for the Prosecution]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Savitsky, 1986** – Savitsky, N. (1986). "Bol'shoj ekran" Karlovyh Var ["Big screen" of Karlovy Vary]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Savitsky, 1986** – Savitsky, N. (1986). Svidanie s proshlym [A Date with the Past]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 9-10. [in Russian]
- Savitsky, 1989** – Savitsky, N. (1989). Peresmatrivaya Antonioni [Revising Antonioni]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 26-27. [in Russian]
- Scripts..., 1927** – Scenarii Louis Delluca [Scripts by Louis Delluc] (1927). *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 5. [in Russian]
- Season..., 1925** – Sezon v Berline [Season in Berlin] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 30: 6-7. [in Russian]
- Segura, 1989** – Segura, C. (1989). V volshebnoy dvorce Miramar [In a magic palace Miramar]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 26, 29. [in Russian]
- Sem'..., 1957** – Sem' greshnikov [Seven Sinners] (1957). *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 7. [In Russian]
- Semenov, 1967** – Semenov, M. (1967). Pesni i roli Iva Montana [Songs and roles of Yves Montand]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4. [In Russian]
- Senin, 1966** – Senin, M. (1966). Nad nami odno nebo [One sky above us]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 18-19. [In Russian]
- Senin, 1971** – Senin, S. (1971). Sophia Loren: "Zhit' – znachit rabotat'". K vypusku na ekran fil'ma "Podsolnuhi" [Sophia Loren: "To live means to work." To the release of the film *Sunflowers*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 18. [in Russian]
- Serebrennikov, 1973** – Serebrennikov, R. (1973). Za ognymi reklamy [Behind the lights of advertising]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Serebrennikov, 1977** – Serebrennikov, R. (1977). Skazki i real'nost' Zhana Mare [Tales and reality of Jean Marais]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1. [in Russian]
- Sergeev, 1975** – Sergeev, Y. (1975). Neistovstvo dobroty [Fury of kindness]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 2-3. [in Russian]
- Shabanov, 1960** – Shabanov, A. (1960). Moryak skhodit na bereg [A Sailor Goes ashore]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 15. [In Russian]
- Shagena, 1925** – Shagena (1925). Slon na provoloke [Elephant on a wire]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 26: 10. [in Russian]
- Shagi..., 1965** – Shagi festivalya [Steps of the Festival] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 2-5. [In Russian]
- Shaternikova, 1982** – Shaternikova, N. (1982). Kogda prorochestva sbyvayutsya [When prophecies come true]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 17-18. [in Russian]
- Shaternikova, 1984** – Shaternikova, N. (1984). Goresti i nadezhdy "malen'kogo cheloveka" [Sorrows and hopes of the "little man"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Shaternikova, 1987** – Shaternikova, M. (1987). Tysyacha pesen Woody Guthrie [A Thousand Songs of Woody Guthrie]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 9. [in Russian]
- Shcherbakov, 1969** – Shcherbakov, K. (1969). Ispytanie dostoinstva [Test of dignity]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20. [in Russian]
- Shcherbakov, 1971** – Shcherbakov, K. (1971). Luchshie fil'my na ekranah Moskvyy [Best films on the screens of Moscow]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18. [in Russian]
- Shemyakin, 1985** – Shemyakin, A. (1985). "Roman klassicheskij, starinnyj..." ["A classic, old-fashioned novel ..."]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 10. [in Russian]
- Sher, 1958** – Sher, Y. (1958). Kartina, o kotoroy govoryat [The picture they talk about]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21. [In Russian]
- Sher, 1960** – Sher, Y. (1960). Frank Sinatra i duh senatora [Frank Sinatra and the Spirit of the Senator]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1960. 24: 18. [In Russian]
- Sher, 1960** – Sher, Y. (1960). Tamango. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 17. [In Russian]
- Sher, 1960** – Sher, Y. (1960). Zakon est' zakon [The law is the law]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 15. [In Russian]
- Sher, 1961** – Sher, Y. (1961). Kino "svobodnogo mira" [Movie from "free world"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1. [In Russian]
- Sher, 1961** – Sher, Y. (1961). Ten' svastiki [The Shadow of the Swastika]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12. [In Russian]
- Sher, 1962** – Sher, Y. (1962). Marina Vlady. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 18-19. [In Russian]
- Shirokov, 1965** – Shirokov, O. (1965). Plennik Dzhejmsa Bonda [Prisoner of James Bond]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23. [In Russian]
- Shishkin, 2020** – Shishkin, N. (2020). Osveshchenie zarubezhnogo kinematografa na stranicah zhurnala *Sovetskij ekran* v period perestrojki [Coverage of foreign cinema on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine during perestroika]. *Missiya Konfessij*. 9(6): 700-708. [in Russian]
- Shishkin, 2020** – Shishkin, N. (2020). Problematika videobuma v zhurnale *Sovetskij ekran* [Problems of the video boom in the *Soviet Screen* magazine]. *Missiya Konfessij*. 9(8): 925-931. [in Russian]
- Shishov, 1989** – Shishov, O. (1989). Mario velikolepnyj [Mario the Magnificent]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 27. [in Russian]
- Shitova, 1962** – Shitova, V. (1962). Dva raza Anthony Quinn [Twice Anthony Quinn]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 14-15. [In Russian]
- Shitova, 1962** – Shitova, V. (1962). Luchino Visconti i ego fil'my [Luchino Visconti and his films]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [In Russian]
- Shitova, 1962** – Shitova, V. (1962). Luchino Visconti i ego fil'my [Luchino Visconti and his films]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [in Russian]
- Shitova, 1977** – Shitova, V. (1977). Dalekoe blizkoe [Far near]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 8-9. [in Russian]
- Shitova, 1977** – Shitova, V. (1977). Vlast' masterstva [The Power of Mastery]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 18-19. [in Russian]

- Russian]
- [Shitova, 1979](#) – [Shitova, V.](#) (1979). Sil'nye sily [Strong Forces]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Shitova, 1984](#) – [Shitova, V.](#) (1984). Pobeditel' ne poluchaet nichego [Victoriously gets nothing]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 10-11. [in Russian]
- [Shneiderov, 1962](#) – [Shneiderov, V.](#) (1962). Joseph Martin. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19. [In Russian]
- [Shulyukin, 1983](#) – [Shulyukin, E.](#) (1983). Vsadnik Kurosavy na naberezhnoj Kruazet [Kurosawa's rider on the Croisette]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Shumyatskaya, 1991](#) – [Shumyatskaya, O.](#) (1991). "Angélique s poteryannym serdцем" ["Angélique with a lost heart"]. *Ekran*. 14: 10. [in Russian]
- [Shutko, 1927](#) – [Shutko, K.](#) (1927). Kak nuzhno delat' horoshie kartiny [How to make good movies]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 39: 6-7. [in Russian]
- [Shutko, 1928](#) – [Shutko, K.](#) (1928). Privarok ili revolyuciya? [Appendix or revolution?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 28: 6. [in Russian]
- [Shutko, 1928](#) – [Shutko, K.](#) (1928). Za chto gotovyat umirat'? [What are they preparing to die for?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 30: 4. [in Russian]
- [Simanovich, 1989](#) – [Simanovich, G.](#) (1989). Odin na odin s "Odnokoj" [One on one with *Le Solitaire*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 28. [in Russian]
- [Skalova, 1959](#) – [Skalova, Z.](#) (1959). Doroga bez konca [Road without end]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 13. [In Russian]
- [Skandaly..., 1991](#) – Skandaly pri postoronnih [Scandals in the presence of strangers] (1991). *Ekran*. 14: 15. [in Russian]
- [Skazki..., 1960](#) – Skazki venskogo lesa [Tales of the Vienna Woods] (1960). *Sovetskij ekran*. 11. [In Russian]
- [Skobtseva, 1965](#) – [Skobtseva, I.](#) (1965). Nedelya v Venecii [A Week in Venice]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 16-17. [In Russian]
- [Slavin, 1926](#) – [Slavin, L.](#) (1926). Pearl White. *Sovetskij ekran*. 33: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Slavkin, 1966](#) – [Slavkin, V.](#) (1966). Trati' li pyat'desyat kopeek? [Do I spend fifty kopecks?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 19. [In Russian]
- [Slavkin, 1991](#) – [Slavkin, V.](#) (1991). V storonu Solnechnoj doliny [In the direction of the Sun Valley]. *Ekran*. 18: 26. [in Russian]
- [Slova..., 1969](#) – Slova dlya bitvy [Words for battle] (1969). *Sovetskij ekran*. 1. [in Russian]
- [Smelkov, 1975](#) – [Smelkov, Y.](#) (1975). Imeet uspekht?.. [Is it a success?..]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Smert'..., 1962](#) – Smert' Merilyn Monroe [The Death of Marilyn Monroe] (1962). *Sovetskij ekran*. 19. [In Russian]
- [Smirnova, 1988](#) – [Smirnova, E.](#) (1988). Dalekaya yunost' "Sovetskogo ekrana" [The distant youth of *Soviet Screen*]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 5. [in Russian]
- [Smirnova, 1991](#) – [Smirnova, D.](#) (1991). Jeanne Moreau ostaetsya superzvezdoj [Jeanne Moreau remains a superstar]. *Ekran*. 16: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Smotr..., 1959](#) – Smotr mirovogo kinoiskusstva [Watching the World Cinema Art] (1959). *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 1. [In Russian]
- [Sobolev, 1972](#) – [Sobolev, R.](#) (1972). Dikari na dorogah Ameriki [Savages on the roads of America]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Sobolev, 1974](#) – [Sobolev, R.](#) (1974). Menyayushchisya i neizmennyj [Changing and unchanged]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Sobolev, 1974](#) – [Sobolev, R.](#) (1974). Put' bez sluchajnostej [The path without accidents]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Sobolev, 1974](#) – [Sobolev, R.](#) (1974). Talant chelovechnosti [Talent of humanity]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Sobolev, 1975](#) – [Sobolev, R.](#) (1975). Pepel Klaasa [Ashes of Klaas]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 1-2. [in Russian]
- [Sobolev, 1976](#) – [Sobolev, R.](#) (1976). Idushchie vpered' [Going ahead]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Sobolev, 1977](#) – [Sobolev, R.](#) (1977). Trudnye puti samopoznaniya [Difficult ways of self-knowledge]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Sobolev, 1980](#) – [Sobolev, R.](#) (1980). Romeo i Dzhul'etta iz N'yu-Jorka [Romeo and Juliet from New York]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 5. [in Russian]
- [Sofi..., 1965](#) – Sofi Loren vstrechaetsya s Moskvoy [Sophia Loren meets Moscow] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 17-18. [In Russian]
- [Sokolov, 1929](#) – [Sokolov, I.](#) (1929). Srednyaya zagranichnaya fil'ma [Average Foreign Film]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 26: 5. [in Russian]
- [Sokolov, 1958](#) – [Sokolov, I.](#) (1958). Mary Pickford. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 5. [In Russian]
- [Sokolov, 2010](#) – [Sokolov, V.](#) (2010). Kinovedenie kak nauka [Film Studies as a Science]. Moscow. [in Russian]
- [Solovieva, 1960](#) – [Solovieva, I.](#) (1960). Solovieva, I. Sud'ya [The Judge]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 18. [In Russian]
- [Solovieva, 1962](#) – [Solovieva, I.](#) (1962). Smekh vypolnyaet svoi obyazannosti [Laughter fulfills its duties]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 18. [In Russian]
- [Solovieva, 1968](#) – [Solovieva, I.](#) (1968). Solovieva, I., Shitova V. Ih bylo shest' [They were six]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 14. [In Russian]
- [Solovieva, Shitova, 1972](#) – [Solovieva I., Shitova, V.](#) (1972). Jean Gabin i eshche odin Gabin [Jean Gabin and another Gabin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Solovieva, Shitova, 1973](#) – [Solovieva I., Shitova, V.](#) (1973). Eti troe segodnya [These three today]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 5-6. [in Russian]
- [Solovieva, Shitova, 1973](#) – [Solovieva I., Shitova, V.](#) (1973). Mnogie i eshche dvoe [Many and two more]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20. [in Russian]

- [Solovieva, Shitova, 1976](#) – *Solovieva I., Shitova, V.* (1976). Alain Delon bez svoej teni [Alain Delon without his shadow]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Solovieva, Shitova, 1976](#) – *Solovieva I., Shitova, V.* (1976). Signor Vittorio. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Sorokin, 1926](#) – *Sorokin, T.* (1926). Novyj Chaplin [New Chaplin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 11-12. [in Russian]
- [Soviet..., 1929](#) – *Sovetskij ekran* – na novye rel'sy [*Soviet Screen* to new rails] (1929). *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 3. [in Russian]
- [Spiridovsky, 1927](#) – *Spiridovsky, N.* (1927). Kinohronika v Amerike [Newsreel in America]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 5. 18: 5. [in Russian]
- [Spiridovsky, 1928](#) – *Spiridovsky, N.* (1928). Kinohronika v Amerike [Newsreel in America]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 6-7. [in Russian]
- [Stam, 2000](#) – *Stam, R.* (2000). Film Theory: an Introduction. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- [Stepanov, 1983](#) – *Stepanov, L.* (1983). Val'ter Bannert brosaet vyzov [Walter Bannert challenges] *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 16. [in Russian]
- [Stishov, 1989](#) – *Stishov, M.* (1989). "Drugoj" smekh Francis Weber ["The Other" Laughter of Francis Weber]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 26-27. [in Russian]
- [Stishova, 1990](#) – *Stishova, E.* (1990). Bez steny [Without a Wall]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 27. [in Russian]
- [Stolbov, 1991](#) – *Stolbov, B.* (1991). Golosa chuzhoj boli [Voices of other people's pain]. *Ekran*. 13: 25. [in Russian]
- [Strong, 1930](#) – *Strong.* Tonfil'm v Amerike [Tonfilm in America]. *Kino i zhizn*. 15: 14-15. [in Russian]
- [Sturua, 1987](#) – *Sturua, M.* (1987). Dolg hudozhnika i "shlem amnezii" [The Duty of the artist and the "helmet of amnesia"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 2-3, 11. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1981](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1981). Na izlome sud'by [At the break of fate]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 4-5. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1981](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1981). Sotvorenie uspekha [Creation of success]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 20. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1982](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1982). 70 rolej Franco Nero [70 roles of Franco Nero]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1982](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1982). Trudnyj start [Difficult start]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1983](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1983). Ee blestyashchaya kar'era [Her brilliant career]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 9. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1983](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1983). Fest-83: mezhdru proshlym i budushchim [Fest-83: between the past and the future]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 16-17. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1983](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1983). Takova sportivnaya zhizn' [Such is the sporting life]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 8-9. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1984](#) – *Sulkin, M.* (1984). O proshlom – radi budushchego [About the past – for the sake of the future]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 21: 21. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1984](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1984). Pochti po Oruellu, ili Kak Gollivud «ekraniziruet» nashumevshij roman [Almost according to Orwell, or How Hollywood "screens" a sensational novel]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1985](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1985). Rodom iz "Krasnoj Toskany" [Originally from "Red Toscana"] *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 21. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1986](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1986). Agressiya psevdokul'tury [The Aggression of Pseudoculture]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 22. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1986](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1986). Marcello Mastroianni: desyat' dnei v krugu družej [Marcello Mastroianni: Ten days in the circle of friends]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 21-22. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1986](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1986). Tol'ko li na prodazhu?.. Polemicheskie zametki o prokate zarubezhnyh fil'mov [Is it only for sale? Polemical notes on the distribution of foreign films]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 10. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1987](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1987). Kto zhe pravit bal? [Who rules the ball?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1987](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1987). Pod krylom dobrogo Grifona [Under the Wing of a Griffin]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 18-19. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1988](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1988). Kogda v chitatel'nyh soglas'ya net. Zarubezhnyj fil'm v sovetskom prokate [When the readers don't agree. Zarubezh films in the Soviet box office]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 20-21. [in Russian]
- [Sulkin, 1988](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1988). Majkl Dandi v Amerike i doma [Michael Dundee in America and at Home]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 21-22.
- [Sulkin, 1991](#) – *Sulkin, O.* (1991). Rasplata spustya 45 let [Payback after 45 years]. *Ekran*. 10: 10. [in Russian]
- [Surin, 1967](#) – *Surin, V.* (1967). Kinomarafon v Cannes [Cinema Marathon in Cannes]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 14. [In Russian]
- [Surkova, 1975](#) – *Surkova, O.* (1975). Harriet Anderson. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 6-7. [in Russian]
- [Surkova, 1979](#) – *Surkova, O.* (1979). Stradaniya molodogo Elvisa [The suffering of young Elvis]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 3-4. [in Russian]
- [Sven, 1926](#) – *Sven, D.* (1926). Fred Niblo. *Sovetskij ekran*. 50: 13. [in Russian]
- [Svistunov, 1987](#) – *Svistunov, A.* (1987). Gerard Depadieu: "Mne blizka stihiya russkoj dushi" [Gerard Depadieu: "The element of the Russian soul is close to me"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 11. [in Russian]
- [Svistunov, 1987](#) – *Svistunov, A.* (1987). Tajna dvuh "K". Vstrecha s Claudia Cardinale [The Mystery of the CC. Meeting with Claudia Cardinale]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 22-23. [in Russian]
- [Svistunov, 1988](#) – *Svistunov, A.* (1988). Raznye lica Roberta Redforda [Different faces of Robert Redford]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 20. [in Russian]
- [Svistunov, 1989](#) – *Svistunov, A.* (1989). Marina Vlady: "My igrali nashu yunost'" [Marina Vlady: "We were playing our youth"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 26-27. [in Russian]

- Svistunov, 1989** – *Svistunov, A.* (1989). Russkij bogatyr' iz FRG [Russian bogatyr from West Germany]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 4: 27. [in Russian]
- Svistunov, 1989** – *Svistunov, A.* (1989). Volshebника zovut Rambaldi [The Wizard's Name is Rambaldi]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 3: 29, 32. [in Russian]
- Svobodin, 1975** – *Svobodin, A.* (1975). Dvenadcat' stykovannyh fil'mov [Twelve docked films]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Swedish..., 1925** – Na sovetском ekrane shvedskaya fil'ma [Swedish film on the Soviet screen] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 9. [in Russian]
- Taimanov, 1986** – *Taimanov, I.* (1986). Svershilos' li chudo? [Has a miracle happened?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 19. [in Russian]
- Takova..., 1970** – Takova pravda [Such is the truth] (1970). *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 17. [in Russian]
- Talking..., 1926** – Govoryashchaya kartina [Talking picture] (1926). *Sovetskij ekran.* 38: 14. [in Russian]
- Talov, 1979** – *Talov, I.* (1979). Francesco Rosi: Ostayus' veren teme antifashizma [Francesco Rosi: I remain true to the theme of anti-fascism]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 20: 15. [in Russian]
- Tarzan..., 1925** – Tarzan na ekrane [Tarzan on the screen] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran.* 3: 13. [in Russian]
- Tat, 1926** – *Tat, A.* (1926). Rene Claire. *Sovetskij ekran.* 37: 13. [in Russian]
- Tatarova, 1926** – *Tatarova, A.* (1926). Adolf Menjou. *Sovetskij ekran.* 31: 13. [in Russian]
- Tatarova, 1927** – *Tatarova, A.* (1927). Francuzskie anekdoty [French jokes]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 8-9. [in Russian]
- Tatarova, 1927** – *Tatarova, A.* (1927). Happy end. *Sovetskij ekran.* 10: 8-9. [in Russian]
- Tatarova, 1927** – *Tatarova, A.* (1927). Metropolis. *Sovetskij ekran.* 4: 5. [in Russian]
- Tatarova, 1927** – *Tatarova, A.* (1927). Vozrozhdenie ital'yanskoj kinematografii [The revival of Italian cinematography]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 13: 5. [in Russian]
- Tchaikovsky, 1927** – *Tchaikovsky, V.* (1927). Pervye kinoteatry v Amerike [The first cinemas in America]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 47: 5. [in Russian]
- Tea..., 1929** – Izdatel'stvo 'Teakinopechat' torguet ideologiej [Teakinoprint publishers trades in ideology] (1929). *Izvestiya.* 41: 4. 19.02.1929. [in Russian]
- Their..., 1925** – Ih byt [Their everyday life] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran.* 4: 7. [in Russian]
- Thomas..., 1926** – Thomas Ince (1926). *Sovetskij ekran.* 44: 13. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1982** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1982). Otec i syn Dasseny [Father and son of Dassin]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 18. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1985** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1985). Ot Lira do Puaro [From Lear to Poirot]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 4: 21. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1986** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1986). Budet li snimat'sya Bardot? [Will Bardot be shot?]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 21. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1987** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1987). Goroda-pustyni Wim Wenders [Desert Cities by Wim Wenders]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 22-23. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1988** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1988). Kogda-nibud' ya udivlyu etot gorod [Someday I will surprise this city]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 10: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1988** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1988). Ne tot Hitchcock [Not this Hitchcock]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 12-14. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1989** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1989). Berlin: simfoniya bol'shogo festivalya [Berlin: Symphony of a Great Festival]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 28-29. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1990** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1990). Bob Fosse: glazami zheny [Bob Fosse: through the eyes of his wife]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 17: 29-30. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1990** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1990). Hochesh' razbogatet'? Kupi benzokolonku! [Want to get rich? Buy a petrol station!]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 13: 24-25. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1990** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1990). Vremya, kogda rushatsya steny. Berlin – otkrytyj gorod [The time when the walls are falling down. Berlin – an Open City]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 26-27. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1991** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1991). Nezasvechennye lenty [Unseen movies]. *Ekran.* 10: 12. [in Russian]
- Tirdatova, 1991** – *Tirdatova, E.* (1991). Svet Niona [Light of Nion]. *Ekran.* 2: 28-29. [in Russian]
- Tis, 1929** – *Tis, P.* (1929). Nemcy i my [The Germans and us]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 3. [in Russian]
- Tokarevich, 1960** – *Tokarevich, S.* (1960). Nochi Kabirii [Nights of Cabiria]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Tokarevich, 1961** – *Tokarevich, S.* (1961). Vera v cheloveka [Faith in Man]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9. [in Russian]
- Tokarevich, 1966** – *Tokarevich, S.* (1966). Za fil'my dlya zritelej! [For films for spectators!]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 20. [in Russian]
- Tolkachev, 1927** – *Tolkachev, E.* (1927). Charles Hutchinson. *Sovetskij ekran.* 35: 13. [in Russian]
- Trauberg, 1982** – *Trauberg, L.* (1982). Korol' smekha [King of laughter]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 1982. 13: 18. [in Russian]
- Trauberg, 1983** – *Trauberg, L.* (1983). Asta Nielsen. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 18. [in Russian]
- Trauberg, 1990** – *Trauberg, L.* (1990). Fenomen Grety Garbo [The phenomenon of Greta Garbo]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 10: 24-25. [in Russian]
- Tretiak, 1987** – *Tretiak, O.* (1987). Zorba, Pablo i drugie [Zorba, Pablo and others]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 21. [in Russian]
- Tretiak, 1988** – *Tretiak, O.* (1988). Dalida: Ya ochen' odinoka [Dalida: I am very lonely]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 17. [in Russian]
- Tri..., 1958** – Tri zerkala [Three mirrors] (1958). *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 4. [in Russian]
- Trick..., 1927** – Tryukovaya fil'ma i William Desmond [Trick film and William Desmond] (1927). *Sovetskij ekran.* 24: 13. [in Russian]

- Trombadori, 1960** – *Trombadori, A.* (1960) 1960 god budet reshayushchim. Zametki ob ital'yanskom kinoiskusstve [1960 will be decisive. Notes on Italian Cinema Art]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 10-11. [In Russian]
- Troshin, 1982** – *Troshin, A.* (1982). Maska, ya vas znayu! [Mask, I know you!]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 23: 14-15. [In Russian]
- Tseitlin, 1929** – *Tseitlin* (1929). V Berline [In Berlin]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 15: 14. [in Russian]
- Tsereteli, 1989** – *Tsereteli, K.* (1989). MOMI – chudo XX veka, ili Fantasticheskoe puteshestvie v mir kino [MOMI: The miracle of the XX century, or a fantastic journey into the world of cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 27. [In Russian]
- Tsyrukun, 1987** – *Tsyrukun, N.* (1987). Vpryamuyu i po kasatel'noj [Straight and Tangential]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 21-22. [in Russian]
- Turkeltaub, 1929** – *Turkeltaub, I.* (1929). Puti sotrudnichestva s Zapadom [Ways of Cooperation with the West]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 6. [in Russian]
- Turovskaya, 1962** – *Turovskaya, M.* (1962). Nichej most [Nobody's Bridge]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 24: 14-15. [In Russian]
- Turovskaya, 1989** – *Turovskaya, M.* (1989). Nasyshchennyj rastvor “Zhidkogo neba” [A saturated solution of Liquid Sky]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 14: 12. [in Russian]
- Turovsky, 1986** – *Turovsky, V.* (1986). Nenaglyadnoe posobie [Non-visual aid]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 17: 10-11. [in Russian]
- Tverich, 1926** – *Tverich, Y.* (1926). Amerikanskije kartiny na russkie temy [American movies on Russian themes]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 10: 14. [in Russian]
- Two..., 1925** – Dva mira [Two worlds] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran.* 5: 4. [in Russian]
- Universal..., 1927** – Yuniversal-Siti i russkie fil'my [Universal City and Russian films] (1927). *Sovetskij ekran.* 46: 14. [in Russian]
- Urenev, 1959** – *Urenev, R.* (1959). Luchshie fil'my mira [The Best films of the world]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 4: 12-13. [In Russian]
- Urenev, 1959** – *Urenev, R.* (1959). Mezhdunarodnye kinofestivali [International Film Festivals]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 15: 2, 4-5. [In Russian]
- Uriev, 1960** – *Uriev, Z.* (1960). Kartiny s zapashkom [Movies with a smell]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 20. [In Russian]
- Uspekhov..., 1965** – Uspekhov i radosti festivalyu! [Success and joy to the festival!] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran.* 13: 2, 4, 5. [In Russian]
- Uspensky..., 1929** – Uspenskij [nekrolog] [Uspensky [obituary] (1929). *Sovetskij ekran.* 16. [in Russian]
- Uspensky..., 1929** – Uspenskij [nekrolog] [Uspensky [obituary] (1929). *Kino.* 15: 1. 9.04.1929. [in Russian]
- Ustimenko, 1986** – *Ustimenko, Y.* (1986). Reportazh iz kinozala na Chestnat-strit [Reportage from the Cinema on Chestnut Street]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 20-22. [in Russian]
- Utilov, 1960** – *Utilov, A.* (1960). Vivien Leigh. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 16-17. [In Russian]
- Utilov, 1961** – *Utilov, V.* (1961). Charles Dickens na ekrane [Charles Dickens on the Screen]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2: 14-15. [In Russian]
- Utilov, 1990** – *Utilov, V.* (1990). Muzhestvo robkogo cheloveka [The Courage of a shy man]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 30-31. [in Russian]
- Utilov, 1991** – *Utilov, V.* (1991). Tam, gde skazochnik stavit tochku... [Where the storyteller put a point...]. *Ekran.* 18: 25. [in Russian]
- Utilov, 1991a** – *Utilov, V.* (1991). Legenda prodolzhaetsya... [The legend goes on...]. *Ekran.* 18: 23. [in Russian]
- V pervyj..., 1957** – V pervyj raz. Zametki iz istorii kino [For the First Time. Notes from the history of cinema] (1957). *Sovetskij ekran.* 9: 21. [In Russian]
- V..., 1976** – V kogo strelyala Katarina Blyum [Who did Katarina Blum shoot at] (1976). *Sovetskij ekran.* 15: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Valagin, 1986** – *Valagin, A.* (1986). Kak eto bylo [How It Was]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 12: 10-11. [in Russian]
- Valentinova, 1959** – *Valentinova, P.* (1959). Marina Vlady. *Sovetskij ekran.* 2. [In Russian]
- Vampire..., 1925** – Zhenshchiny-vampiry [Vampire women] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran.* 6: 12. [in Russian]
- Vasilets, 1972** – *Vasilets, V.* (1972). Nasilie, seks, obman... [Violence, sex, deceit...]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 18. [in Russian]
- Vasilieva, 1970** – *Vasilieva, N.* (1970). I vse-taki vertitsya [And yet it spins]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 21: 15. [in Russian]
- Vasin, 1985** – *Vasin, A.* (1985). Fal'shivka [Fake]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 8: 18-19. [in Russian]
- Vchera..., 1967** – Vchera, segodnya, zavtra Kosta Gavrasa [Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow of Costa Gavras] (1967). *Sovetskij ekran.* 16. [In Russian]
- Vchity..., 1974** – Vchityvayas' v pis'ma [Reading the Letters] (1974). *Sovetskij ekran.* 7: 8-9. [in Russian]
- Velikie..., 1965** – Velikie gody nemogo kino: 1918-1930 [The Great Years of Silent Cinema: 1918-1930]. (1965). *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 18-19. [In Russian]
- Ven, 1927** – *Ven, S.* (1927). Henry King. *Sovetskij ekran.* 18: 13. [in Russian]
- Venediktov, 1926** – *Venediktov, A.* (1926). Kino v Ispanii [Cinema in Spain]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 46: 14. [in Russian]
- Veraksa, 1986** – *Veraksa, L.* (1986). Kommentarij k afishe [Commentary to the Playbill]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 16: 3. [in Russian]
- Versmer, 1961** – *Versmer, A.* (1961). Majn kampf. Krovavye gody zhizni Adol'fa Gitlera [Mein Kampf. The Bloody Years of Adolf Hitler's Life]. *Sovetskij ekran.* 7. [In Russian]
- Vertinsky, 1991** – *Vertinsky, A.* (1991). V Gollivude [In Hollywood]. *Ekran.* 8: 30. [in Russian]
- Veselyj..., 1973** – Veselyj i grustnyj Gofman [Cheerful and sad Hoffmann] (1973). *Sovetskij ekran.* 11: 16. [in Russian]

- Vesenberg, 1969 – Vesenberg, K. (1969). Kinogod strany fiordov [Kinogod country fiords]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 12. [In Russian]
- Vetrova, 1980 – Vetrova, T. (1980). Luis Buñuel. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Vetrova, 1981 – Vetrova, T. (1981). “Ne pamyatnik, ne kamennoe izvayanie...” [“Not a monument, not a stone statue...”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 18. [in Russian]
- Vetrova, 1991 – Vetrova, T. (1991). Ispancy na Arbate [The Spaniards on the Arbat]. *Ekran*. 17: 26. [in Russian]
- Viastrik, 1977 – Viastrik, V. (1977). Berlinale-77. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 19. [in Russian]
- Victorova, 1979 – Victorova, E. (1979). Trudnye pobedy Volonté [Volonté's difficult victories]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Victorova, 1980 – Victorova, E. (1980). Yadovitye korni [Poisonous roots]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8. [in Russian]
- Victorova, 1981 – Victorova, E. (1981). Vozvrashchenie Istevene [Return of Istevene]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 4. [in Russian]
- Victorova, 1982 – Victorova, E. (1982). “Schitayu sebya realistom” [“I consider myself a realist”]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 17-18. [in Russian]
- Vikhlyayev, 1986 – Vikhlyayev, N. (1986). Jean Dreville: Ustranit' ugrozu vojny [Jean Dreville: Eliminate the threat of war]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 20. [in Russian]
- Vilesov, 1960 – Vilesov, A. (1960). Bankovskij bilet v million funtov sterlingov [A million pound bank note]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 7-8. [In Russian]
- Villarejo, 2007 – Villarejo, A. (2007). Film Studies: the Basics. London: Routledge.
- Vladimirov, 1960 – Vladimirov, B. (1960). Babetta idet na vojnu [Babette goes to war]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17. [In Russian]
- Vladimirov, 1961 – Vladimirov, B. (1961). Gervaise. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6. [In Russian]
- Vladimirov, 1990 – Vladimirov, A. (1990). Michelle Pfeiffer. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 16-17. [in Russian]
- Vladimirova, 1983 – Vladimirova, E. (1983). Grabiteli ponevole [Robbers involuntarily]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Vladimirsky, 1960 – Vladimirsky, Y. (1960). 12 dzhemperov i para lyzh [12 sweaters and a pair of skis]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 15: 15. [In Russian]
- Vlyublennye..., 1968 – Vlyublennye s revol'verami [Lovers with revolvers] (1968). *Sovetskij ekran*. 12. [In Russian]
- Vojna..., 1959 – Vojna i mir [War and Peace] (1959). *Sovetskij ekran*. 17. [In Russian]
- Volchenko, 1972 – Volchenko, N. (1972). Put' k sosedu [Way to the neighbor]. Oberhausen-72 *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 17. [in Russian]
- Voronova, 2019 – Voronova, E. (2019). Vospriyatie kinematograficheskikh obrazov otcov i modelej otcovstva v 1950–60-h gg. (po materialam zhurnala *Sovetskij ekran*) [Perception of cinematic images of fathers and models of fatherhood in the 1950s–60s. (Based on the materials of the Soviet Screen magazine)]. *Konstruiruya “sovetskoe”? Politicheskoe soznanie, povesdnevnye praktiki, novye identichnosti* [Political consciousness, everyday practices, new identities]. St. Petersburg: 14-20. [in Russian]
- Vstrechi..., 1970 – Vstrechi v Gollivude [Meetings in Hollywood] (1970). *Sovetskij ekran*. 1. [in Russian]
- Vyatkin, 1990 – Vyatkin, A. (1990). Bondiana. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 30-31. [in Russian]
- Vyatkin, 1990 – Vyatkin, A. (1990). Bujstvo duhov na ulice Vyazov [A Riot of Spirits on Elm Street]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 30-31. [in Russian]
- Vyatkin, 1990 – Vyatkin, A. (1990). Stephen King – korol' uzhasov [Stephen King – the king of horrors]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 28-29. [in Russian]
- Vyatkin, 1990 – Vyatkin, A. (1990). V mire zvezdnyh vojn [In the World of Star Wars]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 28-29.
- Vzvod..., 1987 – Vzvod. Fil'm, kotoryj potryas Ameriku [Platoon. The film that shook America] (1987). *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Wallace..., 1926 – Wallace Beery (1926). *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 10. [in Russian]
- Warszawsky, 1959 – Warszawsky, J. (1959). Koldun'ya [The Sorceress]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2. [In Russian]
- Warszawsky, 1969 – Warszawsky, J. (1969). Na ekranah Madrida [On the screens of Madrid]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 14-15. [In Russian]
- Warszawsky, 1973 – Warszawsky, Y. (1973). Posledovatel'nost' [Sequence]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 3. [in Russian]
- Weisfeld, 1973 – Weisfeld, I. (1973). Pora skazat' “Dovol'no!” [It's time to say "Enough!"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 2-3. [in Russian]
- Weisfeld, 1986 – Weisfeld, I. (1986). “...Drugaya forma yunosti”. O vstreche s Cesare Zavattini [“...Another form of youth”. On the Meeting with Cesare Zavattini]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 20-21. [in Russian]
- What..., 1925 – Chto stavyat v Germanii [What is staged in Germany] (1925). *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 3. [in Russian]
- Yakovlev, 1928 – Yakovlev, N. (1928). Odná iz prichin [One of the Causes]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 3. [in Russian]
- Yakovlev, 1966 – Yakovlev, V. (1966). Trudnosti i nadezhdy anglijskogo kino [Difficulties and hopes of English cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 18. [In Russian]
- Yakovlev, 1970 – Yakovlev, V. (1970). V gorode serebryanogo moray [In the city of the silver sea]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 14. [in Russian]
- Yakovlev, 1978 – Yakovlev, V. (1978). Vstrecha s legendoj [Meeting with a legend]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 20-21. [in Russian]
- Yakubovich, 1984 – Yakubovich, O. (1984). Griffit i drugie: har'kovskaya nahodka [Griffith and others: Kharkov find]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 23: 22. [in Russian]
- Yakubovich, 1984 – Yakubovich, O. (1984). Novyj Mel'es: har'kovskaya nahodka [New Méliès: Kharkov find].

- Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 22. [in Russian]
 Yampolsky, 1977 – Yampolsky, M. (1977). Issledovanie posredstvennosti [Study of mediocrity]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7: 14-15. [in Russian]
 Yampolsky, 1977 – Yampolsky, M. (1977). Nino Manfredi. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11. [in Russian]
 Yampolsky, 1977 – Yampolsky, M. (1977). Sed'maya muza Zhaka Prevera [The seventh muse of Jacques Prevert]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 19: 20-21. [in Russian]
 Yampolsky, 1978 – Yampolsky, M. (1978). Gipnoz mifa [Hypnosis of the myth]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 16-17. [in Russian]
 Yampolsky, 1978 – Yampolsky, M. (1978). Maski Lui de Fyunesa [Masks of Louis de Funes]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 18-19. [in Russian]
 Yanushevskaya, 1983 – Yanushevskaya, I. (1983). "Staret' – eto velikolepno" ["Getting old is great"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 18-19. [in Russian]
 Yartsev, 1987 – Yartsev, O. (1987). Za fasadom "srednego klassa" [Behind the facade of the "middle class"]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 18. [in Russian]
 Yukov, 1927 – Yukov, K. (1927). Ideologicheskij centr meshchanstva [The ideological center of burgers]. *Na literaturnom postu*. 24: 71-78. [in Russian]
 Yurenev, 1970 – Yurenev, A. (1970). Pravda i lozh' o V'etname na ekranah Ameriki [Truth and lies about Vietnam on the screens of America]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 2: 15. [in Russian]
 Yurenev, 1978 – Yurenev, R. (1978). Karlovy Vary – 78. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 6-7. [in Russian]
 Yurenev, 1979 – Yurenev, R. (1979). Rasizm v lichine pacifizma [Racism in the guise of pacifism]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 19. [in Russian]
 Yurenev, 1984 – Yurenev, R. (1984). Dovol'no grustnaya komediya [Pretty sad comedy]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 10. [in Russian]
 Yurenev, 1984 – Yurenev, R. (1984). Lyudi ne krysy [People are not rats]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 3: 8-9. [in Russian]
 Yureneva, 1925 – Yureneva, V. (1925). Pola Negri. *Sovetskij ekran*. 32: 7. [in Russian]
 Yutkevich, 1925 – Yutkevich, S. (1925). Mary Pickford i ee okrestnosti [Mary Pickford and its environs]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 28: 10. [in Russian]
 Yutkevich, 1981 – Yutkevich, S. (1981). Kto vy takoj, David York Griffith? [Who are you, David York Griffith?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 14-15. [in Russian]
 Zarkhi, 1984 – Zarkhi, N. (1984). Zhenshchina za zakrytoj dver'yu [Woman behind a closed door]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 18: 10. [in Russian]
 Zdravstvuj..., 1965 – Zdravstvuj, IV Moskovskij [Hello, IV Moscow Festival] (1965). *Sovetskij ekran*. 12: 2-5. [in Russian]
 Zelenko, 1974 – Zelenko, N. (1974). Poeziya i proza semejnogo ochaga [Poetry and prose of the family hearth]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1974. 11: 7. [in Russian]
 Zhemchuzhny, 1928 – Zhemchuzhny, V. (1928). Kak pokazivat' zagranichnye kartiny? [How to show foreign movies?]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 26: 5. [in Russian]
 Zhezhenko, 1973 – Zhezhenko, M. (1973). Rod Steiger: na perelome sudeb [Rod Steiger: at the turn of fate]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 14-15. [in Russian]
 Zhidkova, 2014 – Zhidkova, N. (2014). Moskovskij mezhdunarodnyj kinofestival' na stranicah zhurnala *Sovetskij ekran* (1959–1969 gg.): gendernyj analiz [Moscow International Film Festival on the pages of the *Soviet Screen* magazine (1959-1969): gender analysis]. *Zhenshchina v rossijskom obshchestve*. 2: 48-60. [in Russian]
 Zhit'..., 1968 – Zhit', chtoby zhit' [Live for life] (1968). *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 18. [in Russian]
 Zhuravlev, 1927 – Zhuravlev, A. (1927). Kino v Norvegii [Cinema in Norway]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 48: 13. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Agitprop burzhuazii [Propaganda of the bourgeoisie]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 5. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Dva polkovodca [Two commanders]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 25: 13. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Fashizaciya kino [Fascization of cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 29: 13. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Istoricheskoe... [Historical...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 49: 13. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Kino i nef' [Cinema and Oil]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 33: 5. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Kuski zhizni [Pieces of life]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 35: 14. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Letnij sezon za granicej [Summer season abroad]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 41: 5. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Muzykal'nyj nomer v amerikanskom kino [Musical number in American cinema]. *Sovetskij ekran*: 5. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Pokorennoe knyazhestvo [Conquered Principality]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 36: 5. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Voennyj departament. Tancklass... Atel'e mod [War Department. Dance class... Atelier fashion]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 39: 4. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Za kulisami kongressa [Behind the scenes of the congress]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 47: 14. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1926 – Zilpert, B. (1926). Zveri... tryuki... semejnye dramy... [Animals... tricks... family dramas...]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 26: 6-7. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1927 – Zilpert, B. (1927). Allo! Allo! Samoubijcy! [Hello! Hello! Suicides!]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 20: 10. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1927 – Zilpert, B. (1927). Na podvig [On a feat]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 14. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1927 – Zilpert, B. (1927). O, tempora, o, mores... *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 13. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1927 – Zilpert, B. (1927). Pod prikrytiem kamery [Under the cover of the camera]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 7:

6. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1927 – Zilpert, B. (1927). Skandal. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 14. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1928 – Zilpert, B. (1928). Crisis. *Sovetskij ekran*. 16: 5. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1928 – Zilpert, B. (1928). D'yavol [The Devil]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1928. 6: 10. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1928 – Zilpert, B. (1928). Geroi dnya [Heroes of the Day]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 14. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1928 – Zilpert, B. (1928). Kino-front [Cinema Front]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 1: 13. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1928 – Zilpert, B. (1928). Obez'yanij mir [The Monkey World]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 14. [in Russian]
 Zilpert, 1928 – Zilpert, B. (1928). Prilozhenie k rechi [Appendix to the speech]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 5: 14. [in Russian]
 Russian]
 Zilpert, 1928 – Zilpert, B. (1928). Spekulyaciya na golode [Speculation on Hunger]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 8: 14. [in Russian]
 Russian]
 Zilpert, 1928 – Zilpert, B. (1928). Tysyacha statistov [Thousand Statists]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 10. [in Russian]
 Znakom'tes'..., 1966 – Znakom'tes': sestry Polyakovy [Meet: Polyakov sisters] (1966). *Sovetskij ekran*. 10: 18-19. [In Russian]
 Zolotarevskaya, 1977 – Zolotarevskaya, F. (1977). Pyat' vzglyadov na Norvegiyu [Five views on Norway]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 14: 18-19. [in Russian]
 Zorkaya, 1969 – Zorkaya, N. (1969). Ubijstvo na siciljskom shosse [Murder on the Sicilian Highway]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22. [In Russian]
 Zorkaya, 1978 – Zorkaya, N. (1978). Smert' v Rime [Death in Rome]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 9: 4-5. [in Russian]
 Zorkaya, 1983 – Zorkaya, N. (1983). Fiasko Marii Braun [Fiasco of Maria Brown]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 24: 8-9. [in Russian]
 Russian]
 Zorky, 1960 – Zorky, A. (1960). Bunt na kolenyah [Rebellion on his knees]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 13. [In Russian]
 Zorky, 1962 – Zorky, A. (1962). Skazka o gektare neba [Tale about a hectare of sky]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 4: 20. [In Russian]
 Russian]
 Zorky, 1967 – Zorky, A. (1967). Na radugah festivalya [On the rainbows of the festival]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 17: 1-2, 9. [In Russian]
 Zorky, 1970 – Zorky, A. (1970). Kinouzory na gramplastinke [Film patterns on a gramophone record]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 11: 13. [in Russian]
 Zorky, 1988 – Zorky, A. (1988). Kak letit shar [How the ball flies]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 22: 20-21. [in Russian]
 Zorky, 1989 – Zorky, A. (1989). Bez tebya moj dom pust [Without you my house is empty]. *Sovetskij ekran*. 6: 28-29. [in Russian]
 Zorky, 1991 – Zorky, A. (1991). Na ekrane begali figury... [On the screen the figures were running...]. *Ekran*. 18: 19. [in Russian]
 Zorky, 1991 – Zorky, A. (1991). Videozavr v levitanovskom plese [Videosaur in Levitan's places]. *Ekran*. 1: 18-19. [in Russian]
 Zvezdy..., 1967 – Zvezdy vstrechayutsya v Moskve [The Stars Meet in Moscow] (1967). *Sovetskij ekran*. 13: 1-2. [In Russian]
 Федоров, А., Левицкая А. Тексты журнала «Советский экран» по тематике западного кинематографа с 1925 по 1991 год: контент-анализ // Вестник ВГИК. Т. 16. № 2. С. 42-58. № 3. С. 44-57.

Anastasia Levitskaya, Alexander Fedorov, Elena Kornienko

**Western cinematography on the pages of *Soviet Screen*
magazine (1925-1991)**

Moscow, 2024

Electronic edition

Publisher:
SM "Information for all"
[Emailcontact\(at\)ifap.ru](mailto:contact@ifap.ru)
<http://www.ifap.ru>

e-mail mediashkola@rambler.ru

The full text of this monograph can be freely downloaded at:

<http://www.mediagram.ru/library/>

© Anastasia Levitskaya, Alexander Fedorov, 2024.