

Alexander Fedorov

**Cinema in the
mirror of the
Soviet and
Russian film
criticism**

**Moscow
2019**

Fedorov, Alexander. Cinema in the Mirror of the Soviet and Russian Film Criticism. Moscow: ICO "Information for All", 2019. 214 p.

Second (extended) edition

This monograph is devoted to the topic of cinema in the mirror of the Soviet and Russian film criticism. The book is intended for educators, students, researchers, film / media critics, journalists, for the readers who are interested in the problems of film and media criticism, film studies.

* This research study supported of the grant of the Russian Scientific Fund (project №14-18-00014).

COPYRIGHT © 2019 BY ALEXANDER FEDOROV

1954ALEX@MAIL.RU

ALL RIGHT RESERVED.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 2 1

FEDOROV, ALEXANDER. 1954-.

CINEMA IN THE MIRROR OF THE SOVIET AND RUSSIAN FILM CRITICISM
/ALEXANDER FEDOROV.

INCLUDES BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES.

1. FILM STUDIES. 2. FILM CRITICISM. 3. CINEMA. 4. FILM. 5. MASS MEDIA.
6. SCREEN. 7. IDEOLOGY. 8. RUSSIA. 9. USSR. 10. USA. 11. FRANCE. 12. ITALY. 13.
POLAND. 14. MEDIA LITERACY. 15. MEDIA EDUCATION. 16. MEDIA STUDIES. 17.
FILM EDUCATION.

Contents

Introduction.....	4
Soviet cinema in the mirror of the Soviet film criticism.....	5
Western cinema in the mirror of the Soviet film criticism	108
Polish cinema in the mirror of the Soviet and Russian film criticism	159
Russian film critics' discussion about <i>Cargo 200</i>	189
Russian film critics' discussion about <i>Leviathan</i> and <i>Sunstroke</i>	201
About the Author	209

Introduction

The history of Soviet and Russian film criticism has more than a hundred years. Soviet film criticism knew the ups (in the 1920s, during the "thaw" and "perestroika"), a rigid Stalinist censorship stranglehold, and Brezhnev's era of stagnation. Russian film criticism of post-Soviet period still has a little more than a quarter century. However, during this time Russian film criticism, too, has gone through a number of transformations.

This book is the first attempt of a retrospective analysis of Soviet / Russian and Western cinema reflections in the mirror of Soviet / Russian film criticism.

Perhaps, the history of Russian film criticism will be written in a full volume someday. This book is just a sketch to this future history...

Soviet cinema in the mirror of the Soviet film criticism

Yearbooks *Screen* (1964-1990)

Moscow publishing house *Art* began to produce in mid-1960s annual book collection *Screen*, which was to reflect the most important cinematic events in the USSR and the world. The first collection of this kind - *Screen 1964* - was printed edition of 45,500 copies. The circulation of the next two collections were 30-35 thousand copies. From 1968 to 1985 the *Screens* were annually with a circulation of 50 thousand copies. *Screen 1987* circulation has been increased to 75 thousand, but the rest of the collection issues have returned to the circulation of 50 thousand copies. Each book is illustrated with black-and-white frames of the movies and photos masters of the screen.

However, based on the stated theme, our analysis is limited to only articles about Soviet feature films (Such collection had 15-20 about). I have not analyzed: 1) interviews; 2) reports from film sets; 3) articles written not by film critics; 4) articles about the documentary, animation and foreign films (how foreign cinema was reflected in the mirror of the Soviet critics, please, see: Fedorov, 2016).

So, these Yearbooks published (from 1965 to 1990) over four hundred articles on the Soviet cinema.

The main materials for my research were the articles of Soviet film critics about Soviet cinema. The methods of theoretical research: classification, comparison, analogy, induction and deduction, abstraction and concretization, theoretical analysis and synthesis; methods of empirical research: collecting information related to the research subjects. The effectiveness of such methods has been proven as the Western (R. Taylor, D. Youngblood, A. Lawton et al.), and Russian (N. Zorkaya, M. Turovskaya) researchers. I used also the method of hermeneutic analysis of the cultural context of media texts (Eco, 1976; Silverblatt, 2001).

Screen 1964 (published in 1965, put a set in April 1965)

The first issue of the yearbook' collection - *Screen 1964* - was distinctly "thaw", although its materials, of course, influenced the guiding line of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Resolutions: "On measures to improve the management of the art of cinematography development" (1962), "Immediate Tasks party's ideological work" (1963) and "On the "Mosfilm" (1964). The latter document, for example, said that filmmakers should "produce movies that reveal the Soviet way of thinking

and acting, the Soviet way of life; recreate on screen the story of the struggle of the Communist Party and the Soviet people for the victory of socialism and communism in our country; produce films, exposing the bourgeois way of life, to help the party in its struggle for the triumph of communist ideology" (Resolution..., 1964).

However, *Screen 1964* in general looked quite balanced despite all these Resolutions: the materials of the Soviet cinema combined with a large, saturated section of foreign films, festivals and stars, and even with the polemical articles.

For example, very noticeable at the time critics E. Surkov and M. Kuznetsov were the authors of reviews about the film *Chairman* by Y. Nagibin and A. Saltykov. Actor Mikhail Ulyanov very impressive played the role of Trubnikov - the chairman of one of the post-war collective farms. And E. Surkov (1915-1988) claimed that "those who concedes Trubnikov on the ideal of modern standards of the collective farm manager, is unlikely to do the right thing. ... In order to understand Trubnikov, we must not forget that he is a man, not some ideal personification of some abstractly formulated virtues" (Surkov, 1965, p.36).

M. Kuznetsov (1914-1980) to argue with positive view of E. Surkov: "It is very difficult to understand how such a talented writer as Y. Nagibin ... have lost all sense of proportion, and gave himself entirely to the power of the illustrative flow? And why is the young director Alexey Saltykov, whose work is very rough, but sometimes shows a clear talent, too, succumbed to this?" (Kuznetsov, 1965, p. 42).

Here I must say that untouchable Soviet "cinematic generals" with untouchable "state significant topics" have not been yet in the 1960s. Therefore, it was possible (of course, within the ruling ideology) relatively freely express their opinions. So E. Surkov, even positively assessed *Chairman*, noting that "the first part of the film is especially good, solid and perfected, but the second part, unfortunately, is not so equivalent. Especially towards the end of the film when the director and screenwriter, wanting to show the changes that have occurred on the farm, do it purely illustrative externally. ... I felt in the final episode of the film even some complacency, as if the authors would have us believe then that all the problems now resolved" (Surkov, 1965, pp. 38-39).

M. Semenov's article about the film *Space Alloy* by the future "cinematic general of era of stagnation" T. Levchuk (1912-1998) was very caustic and (rightly so!) absolutely ruthless: "The appearance of the film was preceded by broadcast advertising. It was emphasized that it is not a simple cinematographic, it is a plan of how the hymn "glorious working class." But we can see instead the weak song, even with fake notes. ... No real life, not living people. Instead, we meet with mannequins" (Semenov, 1965, pp. 66-67, 71).

Probably, the title *The Regional Secretary of Communist Party* would be a strong anti-critical indulgence for any film, even the lowest professional level, in the 1970s - the first half of the 1980s. But at the beginning of the Brezhnev's era, "the party-ideological" title and topic has not been saved opportunistic opus by V. Chebotarev (1921-2010) from the just verdict of V. Kardin (1921-2008). This critic accused this film in the absence of the real life's traces (Kardin, 1965, pp. 69-72).

The yearbook scolded (and again - for good reason) and movies on the so-called historical-revolutionary topic. For example, K. Scherbakov ironically remarked that films *Mandate* and *In the Name of Revolution* exploit the "moves and situations, images and techniques of expression, which are now, repeating many times, become empty, jaded, commonplace. ... I am far from being able to accuse the authors of *Mandate* and *In the Name of Revolution* of plagiarism ... But the lack of their own vision of art sometimes brings such bitter fruit, which does not know and direct borrowing" (Shcherbakov, 1965, pp. 86-87).

It is curious that, thanks to the "thaw", the critic J. Warsawsky (1911-2000) was still able to tell the yearbook the readers even that film *I am 20 years* has undergone alterations and, therefore, did not immediately came out on the screen: "I've seen all the options this film, and the early and final. What is the essence of reshoots? ... Of course, as always with the alterations do not guard themselves against losses, more or less offensive. Perhaps the most annoying is too cut scene performances of poets at the Polytechnic Museum" (Warsawsky, 1965, p. 45).

Analyzing M. Khutsiev's film, critic used fairly typical for the 1960s protective method: a reference to the faithfulness of goodies "light Leninist ideals" (Warsawsky, 1965, p. 50).

However, realizing that even this ideological link, perhaps, not at all will make an impression, J. Warsawsky completed his article one more polemical thesis: "You do not agree with me, dear reader? Let us not rush to conclusions, let's see it again, make sure what impact it on our young cinema, on the minds of a new generation of artists and audiences. This film has slow, but powerful steps" (Warsawsky, 1965, p. 52).

And J. Warsawsky, as time has shown, proved to be completely right: M. Khutsiev's talented film, in fact, turned out to be "long-playing", designed for decades of thinking about the thaw era...

Bright and figuratively review was written by N. Zorkaya (1924-2006) about the satirical comedy by E. Klimov *Welcome, or No Trespassing*. N. Zorkaya reasonably argued that many of the "troubles come from dogmatism and lack of talent, who are always together and prop each other, although apparently not similar, although dogmatism important inflated, pretends to be a scientist... The film *Welcome, or No Trespassing* is talented, cheerful and mischievous work of like-minded

artists. ... Professional hand, precise installation, master's sense of material: it's all there in Klimov's film" (Zorkaya, 1965, pp. 52-55).

M. Kvasnetskaya (1925-2008) wrote a good review about *Competition*: "This film is not only creative debut of young director B. Mansurov, and the approval of his peculiar talent - clever and poetic" (Kvasnetskaya, 1965, p. 63). And I. Levshina (1932-2009) was convinced that *Competition* is not only deserves accolades, but this film is so rich and complex, so difficult for the viewer's perception that the conversation about him should go to some fundamental questions. I saw in the *Competition* deeply national cinema" (Levshina, 1965, pp. 60-61).

M. Kuznetsov wrote very warm and shrewdly article about the directorial film debut of V. Shukshin *This Guy Lives*: "Not all perfect in this film, there is something to reproach not only actors, but above all the author, even reproach, but from all admiring heart. However, this uneven film has an amazing, rare integrity, and in addition, V. Shukshin achieved victory in such a difficult area as the problem of the hero. ... That's why this debut is not only successful itself, but promises even more in the future. I think not mistaken to predict that we will happy to meet V. Shukshin and on the pages of magazines and books, and in the cinema" (Kuznetsov, 1965, pp. 137, 142).

The next section of the book dealt with the creative portraits of filmmakers.

For example, I. Solovieva wrote that "Smoktunovsky's play in *Hamlet* leaves a wonderful feeling: it seems that the role is changing from time to time, as it can not be changed in the movie, and as happens only in the theater" (Solovieva, 1965, p. 99).

Perhaps the only discordant note in a very successful book, was the boring article of D. Pisarevsky (1912-1990), the chief editor of *Soviet Screen* magazine, who wrote that Vasilyev brothers' *Chapaev* "is one of pictures-titans, in which each new generation of viewers and artists draws spiritual riches and opens its consonant with time. He became part of the lives of the people, a true companion generations" (Pisarevsky, 1965, p. 219).

Screen 1965 (published in 1966, put in a set in October 1966)

The well-known Soviet film critic M. Bleyman (1904-1973) published in 1970 the article *Archaists or innovators?* (Bleyman, 1970), which served as a pretext for Soviet film bosses defeat of Ukrainian poetic cinema. But *Screen 1965* could still to publish a positive article about the film S. Parajanov (1924-1990) *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*. This masterpiece was evaluated as "explosion of many canons, disturbing many hardened tastes and concepts. And so I want to believe that this is not a coincidence, but a brilliant beginning of a new stage in the life of Ukrainian cinema. ...

Talent director Parajanov finally found their true value, slipped to a truly artistic expression. It seems that reel of film will not sustain such a frenzied pressure of the director/operator' fantasy, but this is artistic revelationin. ... Director of Photography Y. Iliencko deserves the highest praise for the highest measure accurate, ubiquitous, bottomless ingenuity. Union of director and cameraman in this film is so indivisible that it is difficult to imagine a more "ground-in" in modern cinema" (Drach, 1966, pp. 29, 32).

A number of books' articles was devoted to the poetic cinema. Critics pointed out that in the *Last Month of Autumn* "reigns light lyrical intonation and it is all full of poetry" (Ignatieva, 1966, p.52), and *Girl and the Echo* has a different artistic purpose than preaching: be able to see the world grow a purity and transparency of the soul, and then everything will open and you will respond ... The film does not proclaim anything, but this is a miracle of poetry" (Inovertseva, 1966, p. 35). And the article's title about poetic parable M. Kobakhidze *The Wedding* was, in fact, an exhaustive: *Small Masterpiece* (Semenov, 1966, pp. 138-139).

This, of course, does not mean that the annual book automatically Screens the poetic cinema of critics zone. For example, I. Rubanova rather sternly wrote about the debut work of B. Grigoriev (1935-2012) and Y. Shvyrev (1932-2013) *First Snow* and the *Clean Ponds* by A. Sakharov (1934-1999) (Rubanova 1966, p. 68).

Z. Paperny (1919-1996) was not thrilled with the movie of A. Manasarova (1925-1986) *Twenty Years Later*: "A good picture, a professional job. Just an example of a purely "cinematic" movie, which says on its "brutal" language, not only listening to the language of the writer" (Paperny, 1966, p. 117).

The polemic yearbook's section included the debate about the comedy genre. B. Medvedev (1920-1969) did not skimp on praise for the comedy of K.Voinov (1918-1995) *Bal'zaminov's Marriage*, admitting that his "dream-pantomime conquered, drew courage director" (Medvedev, 1966, p. 95). E. Kholodov (1915-1981) forcefully argued with him, regretting that "fine man replaced by the movie theme of the little man" (Kholodov, 1966, p. 97).

The satirical comedy 33 displeased Soviet cinema officials. But T. Khloplyankina not afraid to speak out in defense of the comedy: "This is a film that is the first time in many years, does not hesitate to be a satire and does not apologize for the fact that this is a satire. Negative characters in it much more than positive... It is very sharp and angry film, but where and when satire have been good? It is, finally, a film that boldly uses hyperbole, exaggeration, but where and when the satire of rejected it?" (Khloplyankina, 1966, p. 105).

She also highly appreciated the eccentric comedy of Leonid Gaidai (1923-1993) *Operation 'Y'*: "Comedy seemed to be shook off the fatigue

acquired during the years sitting in a society uninteresting people. ... It can revive old and show a cascade of mind-blowing tricks, but it is oriented perfectly in modern interiors. It is capable of equipping their goodies uncanny ease and ruthlessly confound negative, but both of them did not seem to us conditional figures" (Khloplyankina 1966, p. 100).

Another well-known film critic G. Kremlev (1905-1975) was fully agree with T. Khloplyankina: "In order to put the comedy, and even more so - the comic, not enough to be a good director, you must have a special calling. But this is not enough. It was necessary to have the quality of a religious fanatic, martyr. All these qualities are happily combined in Leonid Gaidai" (Kremlev 1966, pp. 109-110).

V. Orlov devoted his article to comedies *Give Me a Complaints Book* and *Sleeping Lion*, rightly arguing that "the everyday life presents new conflicts and new clothes evil... But these comedies are still struggling with the cartoons in gabardine raincoats" (Orlov 1966, p.114).

Articles of I. Lishchinsky and G. Kapralov (1921-2010) were about the film by G. Kalatozov (1903-1973) and S. Urusevsky (1908-1974) *I am Cuba*. I. Lishchinsky noted that "the camera in the hands of Urusevsky free and is animated. She took from the operator of his impetuosity, his emotion, his impulse. The viewer taken away immutable point of view of the observer. The camera leads him along. Every second frame can enter something new and unexpected. The audience watching the movie in the rhythm of the film. The audience must be active for the movies of Kalatozov & Urusevsky" (Lishchinsky, 1966, p. 80).

But the opinion of G. Kapralov was much more restrained: "I remember the previous film of Mikhail Kalatozov and Sergey Urusevsky - *Unsent Letter*. The criticism, polemics around the movie ultimately correct answer to the question why such a remarkable direction with which we met in some episodes of this work, and a brilliant cinematography, which marked virtually every frame, suddenly triggered largely in vain: the film there was no real drama. And in the new Kalatozov & Urusevsky' work we see the same error... It is very disappointing for me that *I am Cuba* with all brilliant fireworks skill did not work in the artistic scale, which of it was to be expected" (Kapralov, 1966, pp. 82, 84).

It seems that these two views are quite representative of the perception of *I am Cuba*, not only for film critics but the ordinary audience: today this movie is also controversial...

It is interesting today to read the discussion of the O. Efremov's long-forgotten drama *Build Bridge*. I. Levshina considered that "theater has come to the cinema not for that, to show filmmakers how to make movies. The theater went to the cinema to get a platform to express their beliefs, and brought with them a culture of its theatrical thinking. With its artistic and civil credo, his method of thinking, you can agree or disagree,

but to ignore them you cannot" (Levshina, 1966). And this is more convincing opinion of B. Kardin: "I do not think that the authors of the film *Build Bridge* consciously wanted to refurbish old plot... leaning on life, they missed something in life" (Kardin 1966, p. 90).

The *Screen 1965* published an interview with A. Tarkovsky (1932-1986) on the set of *Andrei Rublev*. This film for several years has been put "on the shelf". But this interview was possible in 1965...

Yearbook published also the article about A. Konchalovsky's *The First Teacher*. N. Lordkipanidze (1925-2014) wrote that it is "difficult due to the complexity of the organic material. And sometimes deliberately hindered by virtue of congestion symbolic imagery. ... It has all the luxuries debut, perseverance in the "statement of self", coming from the fear of being trivial. But the film is serious in the main. And it is indeed the new artist coming into the art" (Lordkipanidze 1966, p.137).

D. Pisarevsky's assessment was basically positive about the drama *Hello, It's Me!* By F. Dovlatyan (1927-1997): "Can be heard accusations of unreliability of certain episodes. To some extent they are valid. But this is not important, because the whole movie is a bold exploration of modern theme. It's real art. Truthful, intelligent, emotional" (Pisarevsky, 1966, p. 140).

And as usual, the Yearbook presents readers benevolent portraits of Russian filmmakers: A. Volodin (Warsawsky, 1966, pp. 124-132), I. Lapikov (Zelenko, 1966, pp. 56-58), V. Receptor (Kolesnikova, 1966, pp. 144-145), and others.

Screen 1966-1967 (1967, put in a set in April 1967)

XXIII Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, held in March and April 1966, did not have a noticeable effect on the content of *Screen 1966-1967*: a time when the yearbook will publish articles officious critics, interspersed with quotations from the speeches at Communist party congresses, it was yet to come...

But an unprecedented event was in the life of Soviet critics in the late 1966: forty of them were sent a questionnaire, which were asked to choose: the best Soviet film, director, cameraman, actress, actor in 1966 (*Screen 1966-1967*, pp. 12-15).

Here is the list of these film critics: L. Anninsky, M. Augstkali, V. Baskakov (1921-1999), T. Bachelis (1918-1999), L. Belova (1921-1986), M. Bleyman (1904-1973), V. Bozhovich, I. Weissefeld (1909-2003), A. Vartanov (1931-2019), J. Warsawsky (1911-2000), M. Zak (1929-2011), N. Zorkaya (1924-2006), N. Ignatieva (1923-2019), A. Karaganov (1915 - 2007), B. Kardin (1921-2008), G. Kapralov (1921-2010), N. Klado (1909-1990), N. Kovarsky (1904-1974), I. Kozenkranus, L. Kopelev (1912-1997),

I. Levshina (1932-2009), N. Lordkipanidze (1925-2014), M. Maltzene (1924-2014), J. Markulan (1920-1978), A. Macheret (1896-1979), L. Parfenov (1929-2004), D. Pisarevsky (1912-1990), L. Pogogeva (1913-1989), A. Romitsyn, S. Rassadin (1935-2012), K. Rudnicky (1920-1988), I. Soloviova (1927-2019), D. Teshabayev, K. Tsereteli, V. Shalunovsky (1918-1980), V. Shitova (1927-2002), I. Schneiderman (1919-1991), S. Freilich (1920-2005), Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978), R. Yurenev (1912-2002).

For greater clarity, I counted the number of votes for each category and identified by three films and filmmakers who have received the maximum number of votes of forty critics in each category.

*Table 1. Top films, directors, cameramen, actors and actresses in 1966, according to critics of the Soviet **

Place in the ranking	Best film	The number of votes of film critics	The number of votes of film critics (%)
1	Ordinary Fascism	20	50.0
2	Nobody Wanted to Die	7	17.5
3	The First Teacher	4	10.0

Place in the ranking	Best director	The number of votes of film critics	The number of votes of film critics (%)
1	V. Žalakevičius	9	22.5
2	S. Yutkevich	9	22.5
3	A. Konchalovsky	8	20.0

Place in the ranking	Best director of Photography	The number of votes of film critics	The number of votes of film critics (%)
1	L. Paataashvili	13	32.5
2	J. Gričius	10	25.0
3	V. Derbenyov, D. Motorny	6	15.0

Place in the ranking	Best actors	The number of votes of film critics	The number of votes of film critics (%)
1	R. Bykov	14	35.0
2	I. Smoktunovsky	11	27.5
3	D. Banionis	8	20.0

Place in the ranking	Best actress	The number of votes of film critics	The number of votes of film critics (%)
1	M. Bulgakova	29	72.5
2-3	N. Mordukova, I. Makarova, L. Savelieva	2	5.0

* some film critics as their favorites specify multiple movies and / or filmmakers.

Alas, this was only one interesting experiment without further continuation... Apparently, someone "above" thought that the opinions of film critics and film experts can very clearly be different from the preferences of the authorities and the "choice of the masses"... And further questioning of Soviet film critics were forbidden until the era of "perestroika", when in the second half of 1980 the newspaper *Week* dared to publish a table, where the leading film critics exhibited "star" for movie current repertoire.

But the polemical Yearbook's section still existed some years. And in the *Screen 1966-1967* film critics argued about the films *Your Son and Brother* by V. Shukshin (1929-1974) and *Long and Happy Life* by G. Shpalikov (1937-1974).

L. Anninsky with his usual deep insight into film context wrote that "cinema has revealed in the works of Shukshin deep moral theme running through all that it does. Shukshin's cinema has made clear to us the psychological and stylistic opening pertaining to our general psychological condition" (Anninsky 1967, p. 102).

But this does not convince experienced polemicist N. Klado (1909-1990). He cautiously admitted: "The world of the village depicted in this film, for me, is terrible. After all, Vera is the brightest in the village. But she was silent. She cannot tell people. She did not want to hear" (Klado 1967, p.100).

I. Levshina's article about the film *Long and Happy Life* was no less controversial. This article began with a sudden sharp outburst against the very popular lyrical comedy *Walking the Streets of Moscow*: "I do not like this film (by director G. Danelia and screen writer G. Shpalikov. I do not like mainly due Shpalikov, because of the fact that the playwright, making the demonstration of his creative manner, and the film builds narcotic pagan sense of thoughtlessness as the standard of happiness ... I feel closer to Shpalikov *Happy Life*, because here he grows up. He thinks in his manner, not giving a succinct breakdown. I support the idea that the viewer is invited to think, and as often as possible" (Levshina 1967, p.111).

Well, film critic not only rejects the "cult" thaw masterpiece *Walking the Streets of Moscow*, but also openly urged to think - filmmakers and the audience! I suppose, such film critic passage is almost impossible in the Soviet press in the 1970s - the first half of 1980s...

J. Warsawsky argued I. Levshina, because he (as, indeed, many of the Soviet viewers) frankly did not like "Antonioni's style of *Long and Happy Life*: "But if it's a comedy, why the screen is so boring? And because the 'comedy of errors' occurred with the author. He did not understand that he wrote. And as a director, introduced in the film boring gravitas. ... Imaginary poetic form are now often penalized for shield contacts with the audience" (Warsawsky, 1967, pp.110-111).

M. Bleyman (1904-1973), in fact, completely joined Warsawsky's opinion: "Mery capable writer G. Shpalikov directed the film *Long and Happy Life*. This is a story about how a person loses his happiness as he was afraid of it. This is a simple story and simple, even an elementary idea. But he wore a surprisingly meaningful form, in the form of an abstract, which lost for the living subjects of our time, live data" (Bleyman 1967, p.168).

I. Lishchinsky actually continued Bleyman's reasoning, choosing, however, a different target - a film lyric *Two* by M. Bogin: "Simulation of modernity is not the only function of cinema Art Nouveau. ... "Modern" style tasked to facilitate people's lives, to heal the wounds. ... The drama is absorbed by the comfort of the Riga cafes, light music and tasteful clothing" (Lishchinsky, 1967, p. 172).

Today Lishchinsky's opinion seems the archaism of 'socialist logic': if a love story has been shown not in a cozy European Riga, but somewhere in the Russian provincial town, then, of course this story will be good...

Going from author cinema to cinema genre, the compilers of the Yearbook once again turned to comedy. Here E. Bauman wrote that "movies with the duty bureaucrats would not want to give his position on the screen. They immerse the viewer in the atmosphere of his fictional life, they create their own, special world, frozen in depressing immutability. And this artificially film comedies have bad taste, vulgarity and feigned cheerfulness... Yes, stereotypes coming from the film to film... They do not want to go and liberate places. And yet the breath of life bursts into the comedy genre, destroying stamps, sweeping circuit. Proof of this is talented, intelligent and funny comedy *Adventures of a Dentist*, 33, *Beware of the Car*" (Bauman, 1967, pp.173, 175).

K. Shcherbakov wrote the article about the weaknesses of Soviet film detectives. In particular, he correctly noted that *Game Without a Draw*, "has foreign spies, which look too obviously foreigners and spies. Soviet colonel, talking with his subordinates as if teaches classes at a school for disabled children. ... And execution of an innocent twist in the film is regarded as a moral failure, which to treason at hand" (Shcherbakov, 1967, p.177).

At the same time, keeping in mind the relevant guidelines of Soviet Party Resolutions, K. Shcherbakov not forget to link the arguments with ideological struggle on the screen: "Of course, the tasks of Soviet detective and detective bourgeois are fundamentally different. But why do we often put up with the fact that the bourgeois detective better fulfills its objectives, than our, Soviet" (Shcherbakov, 1967, p. 176).

In this regard, M. Bleyman thinking about stereotypes entertainment genres highlighted "detectives in which incredibly insightful scouts can easily cope with the incredibly clumsy spies, and comedy, in

which the characters behave so stupidly that is lost even a minimum standard of compliance to the real characters. I will not list these movies. The fact that they are stereotypes, do not need to explain. This can be seen with the naked eye. Stereotype helpful and offers turnkey solutions, when the artist is not able to analyze the complex phenomenon of life. Stereotype insinuating, he invades the work unnoticed, when the artist is not fully aware of his purpose. Stereotype helpful and easily pretend to be art. ... But one thing is clear: the basis of the stereotype is the laziness of the artist, the inability or unwillingness to think about the vital phenomena that he describes and analyze" (Bleyman 1967, pp. 169-170). N. Lordkipanidze (1925-2014): also wrote about annoying clichés (Lordkipanidze 1967, p. 181).

Many of the authors of the yearbook were unhappy and current adaptations of Russian classics.

S. Rassadin (1935-2012) wrote with all critical rigor about comedy *Uncle's Dream* by K.Voinov (1918-1995), because this is the simple vaudeville, but not Dostoevsky's world (Rassadin, 1967, p.191).

And then the critic moved to, alas, then forbidden bitter satire *Nasty Anecdote* by A. Alov (1923-1983) and V. Naumov: "The authors do not play with the audience in the giveaway, their unexpected, inexhaustible, very talented means of expression designed for learning. And the authors do not always take into account the possibility of our perception. Even experienced. And we can not drink the pure essence, and it would be desirable solution. Overloaded ... Film and symbols are algebra art. This excessive algebraization pointedly, appealing to reason rather than to the heart, leading to harsh rationalistic" (Rassadin, 1967, p.192).

Analyzing *The Tale of Tsar Saltan* M. Dolinsky and S. Chertok noted with regret that, "how far A. Ptushko's film of tales by A. Pushkin. Pushkin's incompatible ease, swiftness of his verse, the perfect simplicity of shape, finally, the logic of creative thinking are absolutely not suitable for heavy-handedness of film design" (Dolinsky, Chertok, 1967, p. 208).

A. Dubrovin was very critical of the film adaptation of *A Hero of Our Time* by S. Rostotsky (1922-2001): "This film there are shots under the naturalism and 'modern'... As a result, the film disappeared Lermontov's intelligence, Lermontov's pain, Lermontov's depth" (Dubrovin, 1967, p. 203).

V. Ivanova (1937-2008) was dissatisfied with the screen adaptations of A. Tolstoy's *Viper* by V. Ivchenko (1912-1972) (Ivanova, 1967, p. 200). Equally negative she said about *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* by A. Ginzburg (1907-1972): "We saw an amazing meticulousness in his dull spectacle. ... Something from A. Tolstoy's scathing sarcasm shone only in the final for a moment. Peeped out and ... And in the hall light went on"(Ivanova, 1967, pp.199-200).

Unfortunately, V. Ivanova apparently did not notice the exquisite visual solution of black and white of this film adaptation of *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* (1965), made in the spirit of film noir: the play with light and shade line in night scenes and contrasting extremes of black and white in the daytime scenes and the use of wide-angle lens, unusual camera angles, etc. I believe that the director A. Ginzburg, a former cameraman, deliberately put such a task before the talented cameraman A. Rybin (1935-2016). The visual style of the film was also a dynamic-nervous, the music is sometimes ironic. I think that the jury of the International Festival of Fantasy Films in Trieste (1966) was primarily evaluated these audiovisual solutions and originality and awarded the film A. Ginzburg main prize...

G. Kapralov presented maybe the most positive article about current adaptations of this time. Assessing the *Daily Stars* by I. Talankin, is based on the diaries of O. Bergholz, G. Kapralov wrote: "I predict that the ratio of this film will be contradictory. It has reticence and infringement of proportions. Comparison with 'open diary' with the richness of his thought and association gives one more reason for criticism. But I think the director, who is also the author of the script, had a right to their reading of the book, its subject, and what he said, it is said with piercing force" (Kapralov, 1967, p. 20).

Of course, analyzing the current repertoire, authors of *Screen 1966-1967* could not get past the films lead the aforementioned film critics' rating. *Wings, The First Teacher, Nobody Wanted to Die* received a positive evaluations (Warsawsky, 1967, p. 24; Zinoviev, Markov, 1967, pp. 74-78; Pisarevsky, 1967, pp. 66-68).

For example, J. Warsawsky, reflecting on the drama *Wings*, wrote: "Larisa Shepitko came to an early mastery. Each frame of the film in its subordinate thoughts, develops the idea. It reminds us that the art director is primarily a thought..." (Warsawsky, 1967, p. 24).

Screen 1967-1968 (1968, put in a set in March 1968)

The Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On measures for further development of the social sciences and enhance their role in the building of communism" (Resolution..., 1967) full of standard phrases about the need to "increase" and "strengthen"... But pathetic celebration of the 50th anniversary of the 1917 revolution was the most important political event in the USSR preceding the release of *Screen 1967-1968*.

Yearbook *Screen 1967-1968* was put in a set in March 1968, i.e. a few months before the August invasion of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia. But the "Prague Spring" is already in full flourish democratic hopes... And these hopes, I think, were the key to change the structure of the yearbook. Rigid

administrative arm discarded any film critics' ratings, but gave way for ideologized materials.

For example, D. Pisarevsky stacked enthusiastic ode to the restored version of the film *October* (1927): "No, this film is not old, not lost the explosive power of this revolutionary art fiery epic! ... *October* sings the glory of victorious working class people and Leninist party" (Pisarevsky, 1968, pp.19-20). And then D. Pisarevsky snobbish glorified "panorama of national heroism" in the "historical and revolutionary" film *Iron Stream* by E. Dzigan (1908-1981) (Pisarevsky, 1968, p. 23).

Jubilee Yearbook, of course, could not pass films about Lenin. V. Baskakov highlighted the "talent embodied the image of the genius of the revolution" (Baskakov, 1968, p.72) in the film *Lenin in Poland* by S. Yutkevich (1904-1985).

But in general, the compilers of the Yearbook still managed to keep film studies level and published, for example, of two wonderful articles of L. Anninsky.

In his review of the film G. Poloka (1930-2014) *The Republic of SHKID* L. Anninsky accurately wrote that "the theme of the film is Chekhov's character, a man of the XIX century, an intellectual and humanist, caught in a situation of Sodom and Gomorrah. ... Old-fashioned competition, defenseless Culture with a young and ingenuous naiveté takes ruthless nature of mutual mystification" (Anninsky, 1968, p. 55).

L. Anninsky wrote a significant article about M. Khutsiev's masterpiece *July Rain*. The critic asked a very sharp at the time the question: "Khutsiev listen to the rhythm of the modern soul at the decisive moment of choice. The artist talks about spiritual culture, trust, humanity. ... In essence, Khutsiev continues the meditation, which was first performed in the movie *I am 20 years old*. But now with a little more alert. Why?" (Anninsky, 1968, p. 34).

L. Anninsky, of course, could not to answer this question directly, indicating director's feeling of 'thaw's collapse, for censorship reasons. Therefore, instead of a direct answer last sentence of Anninsky's review was truly a model of allegory (Anninsky, 1968, p. 34)...

S. Freilich (1920-2005) published a positive review about *Your Contemporary* by Y. Raisman (1903-1994): "This film it is a real battle, opponents do not play in the giveaway, there are broken destinies of people" (Freilich, 1968, p. 14).

Yearbook continued support of poetic cinema. I. Lishchinsky wrote about *Umbrella* by M. Kobakhidze that "the Georgian cinema is rich in young talent. In this ensemble M. Kobakhidze has original voice and its own melody: mocking, ironic, a little sad, but it is clearly distinguishable, and it is necessary to listen" (Lishchinsky, 1968, p. 63). N. Lordkipanidze generally supported the poetic debut of E. Ishmuhamedov - *Tenderness*:

"The picture is made with obvious, undisguised focus on people susceptible - and mentally, and artistically. If this susceptibility is not, you probably will be bored" (Lordkipanidze, 1968, p. 61).

M. Bleyman's article about an eccentric in a movie (*Beware of the Car, Operation 'Y', Prisoner of the Caucasus*, 33) (Bleyman 1967, p. 80-82) looks boring and banal today. But the article by Revich (1929-1997) on the fantasy genre (Revich, 1967, pp. 82-86), in my opinion, has not lost a polemical fervor.

Box office champion and audience favorite, *Amphibian Man* by G. Kazansky (1910-1983) and V. Chebotarev (1921-2010) was the first critic's object for attack: "What about a A. Belyaev's novel? This is about tragedy of disillusionment in the society of businessmen and shopkeepers. What are the ideas of the film? Political kept to a depressing straightness, and the art became a melodramatic love triangle and tasteless Ichthyander-Tarzan walks on the roofs" (Revich, 1968, p.83).

Here it is the typical anti-genre approach of ideologically socialist orientated critics, when Soviet criticism demanded a class-political conclusions from exotic folk and fairy tales, mixed with the bright melodramatic stories. As D. Gorelov correctly noted that *Amphibian Man* became "the first post-Stalin era super-blockbuster. ... A competent producer could see that ocean of gold ... But Chebotarev & Kazansky were in the wild, ugly, ruthless world of freedom, equality and fraternity, where financial profit meant nothing... Critics scolded them for their lightness and attraction... *Soviet Screen Journal* for the first time blatantly falsified the results of the annual reader's opinions, giving primacy gray and long since dead drama ..." (Gorelov, 2001).

V. Revich addressed all the same working class and political reproach to *Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin* by A. Ginzburg: "the novels' most powerful scientific, and social aspect is the mechanics of bourgeois relations, speculation, capitalist economy and morality. But the social side completely dropped out of the detective movie" (Revich, 1968, p. 83).

V. Revich buckled the theme of the ideological confrontation with the West and in the article about the film *Mysterious Wall* because "the faith in the possibility of contact between all sentient beings is opposed to the concept of fashion in the West disunity people and spiritual isolation of man" (Revich, 1968, p. 84).

Film critic A. Svobodin (1922-1999) positive appreciated the adaptation of Leo Tolstoy's novel *Anna Karenina* directed by A. Zarkhi (1908-1997) (Svobodin, 1968, p. 40).

The remaining number of pages of the yearbook, as always, took portraits of filmmakers: N. Mikhalkov (Zinoviev, Markov, 1968, pp. 64-66) O. Iosseliani (Dolinsky, Chertok, 1968, pp. 41-45), S. Ursky, A. Batalov, P. Aleynikov, D. Banionis, T. Doronina, R. Bykov (Levshina 1968, pp. 76-79).

Screen 1968-1969 (1969, put in a set in February 1969)

A secret resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio and television, film, culture and art institutions for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire" (Resolution ..., 1969) was adopted in response to the liberal events of the "Prague Spring": "Print workers, writers and artists must have more acute class and party positions to oppose all manifestations of bourgeois ideology, they must actively and efficiently promote communist ideals, the advantages of socialism, the Soviet way of life, deeply analyze and expose the different kind of petty-bourgeois and revisionist currents. Meanwhile, some authors, and directors depart from the class criteria in assessing and highlighting the complex social and political problems, facts and events, and sometimes become carriers of the views that are alien to the ideology of socialist society. Attempts have been made unilaterally, subjectively evaluate the important periods of the history of the party and the state...

Some managers of publishing houses, press agencies, radio, television, institutions of culture and art do not take appropriate measures to prevent the publication of a false ideological works, do not work well with the authors, show flexibility and political unscrupulousness in matters of publication ideologically perverse material. ... The soviet Communist Party Central Committee considers it necessary to stress the special responsibility of the heads of organizations and departments and editorial teams for the ideological orientation" (Resolution... , 1969).

Yearbook *Screen 1968-1969* was put into set in February 1969, a month after this decision, and six months after the Soviet invasion in Czechoslovakia. Therefore, the books' compilers just had to take into account the current political situation. However, they still managed broad panorama the most striking phenomena of the national film industry.

The tighter censorship on the pages of the yearbook, of course, remained. For example, in the section *Close-up* (*Screen 1968-1969*, pp. 91-93) were initially placed reflections A. Konchalovsky about his film *Asya's Happiness*. But then, apparently due to pressure from "above" and shelf destiny of this movie, this text have been replaced by an article about actress A. Demidova. The film *Asya's Happiness* initially (*Screen 1968-1969*, p. 110-115) was in the discussion chapter *Controversy*, but later this material was sealed the black stars in the table of contents (*Screen 1968-1969*, p. 317) and replaced by the discussion about the film *Running on Waves* by P. Lyubimov (1938-2010).

It is clear there was no way to avoid ideological pathos in the yearbook. The book once again reminded to readers that *Mother* by V.

Pudovkin "brought to the cinema powerful influence of socialist realism, merged the power of images Gorky's prose with the realistic performance of the actors, the highest achievements of film culture" (Pisarevsky 1969, p.19), and *The Sixth of July* is a major new step in the development of the Leninist theme. ... This victory is all the more important that the last time there were many films and performances, where most topics in the result only untalented performance compromise. *The Sixth of July* is not just a historical picture. It is living our present time. And today's struggle for communism requires reflection attacks rr-revolutionary demagogues, for the sake of playing phrases left the fate of nations" (Freilich, 1969, p. 63).

On the other hand, only a few months left before the super-officious journals *Communist* and *Ogoniok* published sharply accusatory articles about *The Sixth of July* by M. Shatrov (1932-2010), and J. Karasik (1923-2015)

The Sixth of July was clearly on the side of "socialism with a human face." And the conservative *Ogoniok* wrote: "We are convinced that the film *The Sixth of July* does not serve the education of viewers. ... Historical truth is not on the side of film's authors. ... This film violated historical truth: the main focus is not on Lenin's activity, but on the Left Socialist-Revolutionary rebellion, and their leader M. Spiridonova. We believe that the film *The Sixth of July* does not deserve Lenin Prize" (Savinchenko, Shirokov, 1970, p. 25)

But the *Screen 1968-1969* supported not only *The Sixth of July*, but also a much more daring movie *No Path Through Fire* by G. Panfilov unvarnished spoke about civil war ruthlessly divided the nation into "red" and "white". This film "is a strong, very strong, and most importantly - this film is very impressive" (Rakhmanov, 1969, p. 64).

T. Khloplyankina wrote on other notable film about civil background – *There Were Two Comrades* (writers Y. Dunskey and V. Fried, director E. Karelin) also very warmly. However the author did not say anything about a bitter essence of this wonderful film, practically openly speaking against the fratricidal civil war...

The analysis of films on "historical and revolutionary themes" (*Mysterious Monk, Emergency Order, The First Courier, Nikolay Bauman, The Seventh Companion, There Were Two Comrades, The Sixth of July*) in the article by A. Vartanov (Vartanov, 1969, pp. 134-138) was given in traditional for this time style.

Screen 1968-1969 was able to afford to support again the Ukrainian poetic cinema, this time - *Evening on the eve Midsummer* by Y. Iliencko (1936-2010): "This is the scope of the director's fancy - fancy, inventive in each frame. ... large, generous, sophisticated. ... The strong temperament of the master, even involuntary and unavoidable mistakes he has in many

cases can be converted into victory, turned into discoveries" (Drach, 1969, p.88).

Yearbook's polemic section this time was devoted to films *Women Power* by Y. Nagibin (1920-1994) and A. Saltykov (1934-1993), *The Golden Calf* by M. Schweitzer (1920-2000), and (instead of *Asya's Happiness*) *Running on Waves* by P. Lyubimov.

After seeing *Women Power*, K. Shcherbakov came to the harsh conclusion: "Given an order to tell about the hard fate of the female, to portray life as it is, without fear of its cruel side, the authors, it seems to me, not imagined what outcome they want to extract. And artistically unselected, unsought conglomeration of naturalistic, difficult-to-eye episodes begins to avenge himself, turns the moral unscrupulousness and deafness, leads to a distortion of what we are accustomed to understand by the words "popular character" (Shcherbakov, 1969, p. 99).

N. Ilyina argued with K. Shcherbakov, insisting that the artistic quality of this film is quite high: "Naturalism? Some people say this about the film. ... But if you hold the primordial meaning of the word, referring to "naturalism" rough and mechanical copying from nature, the work that is touching and shocking, cannot be called naturalistic. ... The film *Women Power* has advantages and disadvantages. But one thing it is not - the indifference and lethargy" (Ilyina, 1969, pp. 103-104).

B. Galanov (1914-2000), of course, could not yet assume that the sad comedy of M. Schweitzer *The Golden Calf* deservedly become a kind of Russian "cult film" of our day, and, I think, did not understand the depth of this brilliant movie. Therefore B. Galanov complained that (unlike the eponymous book of I. Ilf and E. Petrov) "the laughter, if not completely disappeared, but turned slightly to drama on the screen. And Ostap Bender himself as the face of a dramatic, gained some importance. ... Whether or not whether to submit the rogue as a "great strategist" intellectual, a man with the eternal sad eyes?" (Galanov 1969, p.105).

In this context, M. Dolinsky & S. Chertok gave clear and reasoned response to B. Galanov: *The Golden Calf* presented "Bender outstanding, talented person who is at odds with the times and have chosen this path, can be as just because of this disorder. ... Crashing superior man. Is this funny? And M. Schweitzer rights, which, by sacrificing some fun stakes, giving up many winning situations, created the film, not only equipped with wit, but also imbued with sadness" (Dolinsky, Chertok, 1969, p.109).

Literary critic V. Turbin (1927-1993) was unhappy with the adaptation of A. Green's novel *Running on Waves*. He insisted that "Green's novel is easy, laid-back, and the film is heavy, full of massive suggestiveness" (Turbin, 1969, pp.110-111). However Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978) was on the side of the authors of this film: "Much of the script and the film was not so, as in Green's novel, but, I think, more interesting ... In

short, a tragedy has already unfulfilled in the film has turned out sharper than the happiness of searches that can still happen" (Khanyutin, 1969, pp. 113-115).

M. Bleyman's article also was dedicated to film adaptations. The film critic thought that the "creative challenge for adaptation is to find stylistic originality means to realize other art on the screen" (Bleyman, 1969, p. 147).

And A. Macheret (1996-1979), basically agreeing with M. Bleyman, came to the conclusion that I. Pyrev managed to adequately approach to the novel *The Brothers Karamazov*: "Pyrev's personal creative features properties of artistic talent found in the film adaptation of the great Dostoyevsky's most fertile, mate them to the basis for its higher manifestations" (Macheret, 1969, p. 150).

I. Levshina wrote consistently negative review on the adaptation of the play by E. Radzinsky *104 pages about love*. She very convincingly argued that "artistic and moral potential of the film *Once Again About Love* and remained at the level of everyday history. The huge box-office success does not prevent this film become for us an example of failure in art. ... The reasons for the failure of the film are the complete absence of at least some independent thought, at least some of the image, at least some of the director's attempts, cinematic reading of the play" (Levshina, 1969, pp.148-149).

Specialist in the analysis of science fiction and adventure, V. Revich this time published an article about the spy cinema: "The main complaint, which is usually presented "detective" movies, is that the frantic pace of the action, the rapid twists, in which captures the spirit of the audience, press down psychology, characters, images. And if the hero can do to show individuality in such conditions? I must admit that, perhaps, no other kind of film genre not put his character in such a rigid framework. Most of the time he is in exceptional psychological situation - on a knife edge. Of course, the story sharpness about the man who all the time is under threat of death is very essential aspect of the film, but the sharpness is worth nothing if we cannot see the interesting character. ... The human image creation on such a narrow space surround is always difficult artistic task, and the list of failures is much higher than the premium sheet" (Revich, 1969, p. 140).

V. Revich wrote in this context about extremely popular at that time adventure war film *Shield and Sword*: "The authors often put their characters in a situation clearly implausible. Hard to believe that Soviet aircraft could have easily landed and take off in wartime Germany, and underground groups, in broad daylight, could have grab the train and prison" (Revich, 1969, p.141).

As always, a large number of pages of the yearbook dedicated to the topic of contemporary cinema. And here it is possible to note a positive review N. Lordkipanidze devoted to the analysis of one of the most acute social Soviet films - *Three Days of Victor Chernyshev* (writer E. Grigoriev, director M. Osepyan). Of course, this article is not touch to the serious social generalizations relating to talented critical interpretation of the image "representative of the working class". N. Lordkipanidze dared only to write that "passivity is the main thing that will not accept the authors in his character; passive attitude towards certain phenomena of reality" (Lordkipanidze, 1969, p. 85), but she did not go farther inland (most likely, for censorship reasons)...

J. Warsawsky wrote his review of the school drama *We'll Live Till Monday* (screenwriter G. Polonsky, director S. Rostotsky) in a similar spirit. The film earned a warm assessment, but without any attention to all the possible sharp edges of Soviet school problems...

L. Anninsky, I think, revealed the creative concept of *Triangle* by G. Malyan (1925-1988) more deeply and convincingly, stressing that "the essence of the film is not in the traditional life, but in the sense of the uniqueness of the life, its irreplaceable uniqueness" (Anninsky, 1969, p.81).

Screen 1969-1970 (1970, put in a set in March 1970)

This Yearbook was released in the year a centenary "leader of world proletariat" V.I. Lenin, therefore, the first forty pages of text were filled with a collection of most tedious officious materials dedicated to this date.

But after that Yearbook returned to the usual format: deservedly praised poetic melodrama *Lovers* by I. Ishmuhamedov (Kazakova, 1970, p. 44) and sad comedy *Do not worry!* by G. Danelia (Lipkov, 1970, pp. 46-49). In particular, A. Lipkov (1936-2007) claimed with good reason that "it is the same Danelia, who knows how to treat his characters with a smile, to forgive their weaknesses, admire their merits, in short, who knows how to love their heroes and infect his love of the audience. Properties of the artist's talent has always embodied that it creates. In the film *Do not worry!* We can see the main feature of the authors: generosity" (Lipkov, 1970, p. 46).

Critics praised the film adaptation of novels of C. Aitmatov (1928-2008). A. Zorky (1935-2006), analyzing the film *Running Pacer* by S. Urusevsky, answered for this question: "How still relate to each other and the film and story of Chingiz Aitmatov? So, as the lyric poem may be related to the social novel. A lyrical poem written by the hand of a talented like-minded" (Zorky, 1970, p. 55).

A. Troshin (1942-2008) was very positive to the movie *Jamila* by M. Poplavskaya (1924-2012): "Sincerity tone is one of the qualities of

Aitmatov's prose, which the film adaptation found in of cinematic equivalent" (Troshin, 1970, p. 58).

D. Pisarevsky wrote good review about the best L. Gaidai (1923-1993) comedy *Diamond Hand*: "genre fusion experiment was a success. Color and widescreen movie is action and entertaining, funny and ironic. ... The film is fun, mischievously, in a rapid pace with literally staggering cascades of plot surprises" (Pisarevsky, 1970, p. 58).

But Yearbook struck suddenly (as we recall, earlier *Screen* positively evaluated of poetic genre) on the poetic parable *Eastern Corridor* by V. Vinogradov (1933-2011). The article of T. Ivanova was not written specifically for the Yearbook, but reprinted from the December issue of the magazine *Soviet Screen* (Ivanova, 1969). Therefore, T. Ivanova, in my opinion, was the first Soviet film critic who wrote the harsh criticism about poetic parable cinema. However, I do not think that T. Ivanova wrote an article under the direct influence of some censorship "decisions" and "valuable suggestions". But cinema authority skillfully used this article (as M. Bleyman's article) for their own censorship's purposes.

T. Ivanova claimed that the "difficulty", "incomprehensible" film language, widely used, is the quality seemed to be self-valuable, "necessary" a sign of good cinematic tone. And *Eastern Corridor* it seems almost standard in this regard. ... From the very beginning of this film V. Vinogradov introduces the viewer to a special circle in a special atmosphere. The authors make every effort not only exacerbate, but also complicate the subject, action, conflict... *Eastern Corridor* is one of those movies, after watching that there is a need to look into the abstract: to understand the sequence of events, just to find out what's what. As if some simple picture is cut into many pieces, large and small, carefully mixed, shaken and put a new curlicue puzzle. This is the general compositional structure and is the same solution, even a purely visual, every single episode. ... The puzzle in the puzzle, ... the cruel mixture of naturalism and graphic sophistication prevails on the screen. ... This if abundance of cruel effects and extravagant entourage. This if sophisticated operator skill. All taken together this is aestheticization naturalism. But there is and the ethical aspect. It seems that people are acting in this film live in a unique country and terrible world, swept away by their feelings, strung up, crushed, they themselves hysterically and tragically exalted. And there comes a time when pumped emotional temperature of the film begins to give birth to a protest" (Ivanova, 1970, p. 93-94).

I think this piece of article strongly suggests that T. Ivanova did not understand the essence of vivid imagery this outstanding film-parable. In my opinion, cinemateque quotes (early motifs from films of A. Wajda and M. Jancso, and the Czech "new wave") organically entered in the film of V. Vinogradov. Plus philosophical, religious and visual originality of this

movie (more about *Eastern Corridor* you can read in the articles: Gershezon, 2011, pp. 136-144; Fedorov, 2011, pp. 110-116)...

By the way, the negative reaction of the Soviet critics of Vinogradov's film and many famous movies of the Czech "New Wave" of the 1960s on the war topic was very similar. For example, S. Komarov wrote about *Diamonds of the Night* (1964) by Czech director J. Nemec: "Surreal world of Kafka is embodied with a more impressive force. Operators J. Kucera and M. Ondrzichek invested in this work an important contribution. ... This film won wide acclaim from critics of the capitalist countries, and a number of awards at international festivals, but there crush sober voice, expressing his surprise at the creation of the film in one of the socialist countries" (Komarov, 1974, p. 62).

Against this background, it is surprising that the *Eastern Corridor* still came out (albeit briefly) in the Soviet cinemas...

But back to T. Ivanova's article. Having finished with the *Eastern Corridor*, she moved to the poetic parables of Y. Iliencko (*Evening on the eve of Ivan Kupala*) and T. Abuladze (*Prayer*): "The need to be understood, inherent in every person, especially for an artist. ... It is difficult to make "difficult" films. And *Prayer* and *Evening on the eve of Ivan Kupala* preserve traces of the difficult art of searching and overcoming. But one thing seems to have been abandoned by the authors neglected: searches for clarity" (Ivanova, 1970, p. 95).

Perhaps T. Ivanova's article was one of the most polemical sharp in the *Screen* yearbooks' history. Other materials of *Screen 1969-1970* were much more ordinary...

Screen 1970-1971 (1971, put in a set in February 1971)

In 1970, the USSR was celebrated not only the 100th anniversary of V.I. Lenin, but also the 25th anniversary of victory over Nazi Germany. Hence it is clear that this yearbook published many articles on the military film topic. For example, V. Fomin did not stint on the praise for the remarkable film *It was the month of May* by M. Khutsiev: "This film, organically combining in-depth with the scale of the image is psychological, modest grounded narrative style with an open and emotional pathos" (Fomin, 1971, p. 27).

Several articles were devoted to the films about the Civil War. Here Y. Warsawsky initially quite reasonably wrote that "the civil war is main topic a lot of movies. But these films often written and directed as adventurous. Reds... Whites... What decides the victory in such films? Who will outwit. Who shoots better, faster rides on horseback. ... and then the dramatic events of the civil war turned only amusing adventure" (Warsawsky, 1971, p. 92).

But then the critic, alas, went on to openly communist propaganda: "Lenin wrote on the festive energy revolution! ... There are new generations of viewers, they should see a revolution on the screen and emotionally survive, like commissars: wise, pure, honest" (Warsawsky, 1971, p. 92).

A. Karaganov (1915-2007), a very influential at that time film critic, wrote the article devoted to one of the most remarkable films about the civil war - *Run* by A. Alov and V. Naumov. He stressed that "movie camera "sees" Russian landscapes through the eyes not only of those who are fighting for a new life, but also those who are in love with the old life, fighting for it" (Karaganov, 1971, p. 60).

But then (like J. Warsawsky) A. Karaganov followed by communist ideologically passage: "In many of the current foreign films corruption of human characters are portrayed as a process and as a state that expresses the total human defeat, his eternal depravity, a fatal inability to live like human beings. But dehumanization of man stands concretely and historically and socially in *Run*. The characters are exposed deformation caused by violation of organic links with their homeland, butchery against the people, the service for historically unrighteous case" (Karaganov, 1971, p. 62).

The yearbook positively evaluated and other famous film on the topic of civil war - *The adjutant of his Excellency*. V. Revich wrote about the innovative approach of the authors to the image of the White Guard General: "Kovalevsky is far from the popular image of "Whites". He is smart, intelligent, gentle and kind, even to the extent possible for the military" (Revich, 1971, p. 104).

... Red spy Koltsov, intelligent and clever, at the White Guard General Kovalevsky. The psychological duel between Koltsov and General Kovalevsky also the smartest and intelligent... This situation was unusual story for the audience, educated *Chapayev*, where Whites (or their sympathizers) was the cruel enemies... Of course, *The adjutant of his Excellency* (directed by E. Tashkov) primarily attracted detective intrigue. But having a partner-opponent such as General Kovalevsky, Koltsov, undoubtedly gaining extra points at a mass audience. General was imposing, impressive, clever, ironic. I would say more, Kovalevsky even then, at the end of 1960, aroused sympathy and empathy.

A. Lipkov also gave the positive opinion for another film about civil war - *The White Sun of the Desert* by V. Motyl: "The history of real events - revolution, civil war in Central Asia - represent only the background of the events, they left behind the scenes, but the narrative and fiction triumphs of this film is good ironic comedy" (Lipkov, 1971, p. 94).

As usual, the yearbook analyzed the most notable movies. For example, the film *Crime and Punishment* by L. Kulidzhanov (1923-2002): "The director read F. Dostoevsky's novel seriously, quietly, carefully. ...

Read without any attempts to modernize the problems... This is a talented, serious and deep film. ... Maybe the director and the actors let something controversial, but highly interesting" (Pogozheva 1971, pp.78, 83).

A. Lipkov was stressed the originality of *King Lear* by G. Kozintsev: "This film is not trying to improve Shakespeare, retouch the world of his tragedy. The director is faithful and does not fit into any canonical frameworks" (Lipkov, 1971, p. 64).

The biographical drama *Tchaikovsky* received a more critical assessment, although the film critic noted at the same time that "I. Talankin in the best scenes of the film showed the taste and skill of the director" (Ryzhov, 1971, p. 90).

The Beginning by G. Panfilov earned the highest praise (and absolutely deserved) between the films on contemporary topics: "Reading the press on *The Beginning*, you see that 99 percent of it consists of admirable actor's work I. Chourikova. You may think that *The Beginning* it is just Churikova. But with all our surprise the brilliant performance of this extraordinary actress, *The Beginning* is primarily G. Panfilov" (Sobolev, 1971, p.72). Y. Khanutin and A. Troshin also wrote about the mastery and talent of G. Panfilov and I. Churikova (Khanyutin, 1971, pp. 116-122; Troshin, 1971, pp. 75-77).

Another very acute at the time of 1960s was the crime drama *Accused of Murder* by B. Volchek (1905-1974). And Yearbook published very important conclusion: "This film is strongly convinces us that man, trampling the rights of others, to humiliate him, not reveres his dignity, condemns himself to an animal existence, deprives himself of the right to be called a man" (Ostrovsky, 1971, p. 87).

The detailed article of A. Vartanov was devoted to television language (Vartanov, 1971, pp. 128-134).

Screen 1971-1972 (1972, put in a set in March 1972)

The most influential actions of these times were The XXIV Soviet Communist Party Congress (1971) and the year of the 50th anniversary of the USSR. And new censorship requirements in relation to the Soviet film and literature press were in the new Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee *On Literary Criticism* (January 21, 1972), which was in unison with Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio and television, film, culture and art institutions for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire" (Resolution..., 1969).

This is the significal part of this new Resolution: "The state of the criticism has not yet fully meet the requirements, which are determined by

the increasing role of artistic culture in communist construction. ... Soviet critics sometimes published materials, which gives the wrong picture of the history of Soviet and pre-revolutionary art... Criticism is still not active and consistent in approving revolutionary, humanistic ideals of the art of socialist realism, in exposing the reactionary nature of the bourgeois "mass culture" and decadent currents in dealing with various kinds of non-Marxist views on literature and art, revisionist aesthetic concepts. ... The duty of criticism is deeply analyze the phenomenon, trends and patterns of contemporary artistic process, and to help strengthen the Leninist principles of party and nation, to fight for a high ideological and aesthetic level in Soviet art, consistently oppose bourgeois ideology. Literary and art criticism is intended to contribute to the expansion of the ideological outlook of the artist and the improvement of his skills. Building on the tradition of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics, Soviet literary and art criticism must combine precision ideological evaluations, depth social analysis aesthetically exacting, careful attitude to the talent to be fruitful creative research"(Resolution ..., 1972).

Of course, the Yearbook could not ignore these guiding instructions. However, the *Screen 1971-1972* was set in March 1972, that is only a few months after the publication *On Literary Criticism* and, therefore, essentially composed in 1971. Hence it is clear that a polemical column survived (although the last time in the pre-perestroika era), and in the ratio of pages' number allocated for materials about the Soviet and foreign films, the latter percentage was "seditious" (but also the last time) is overvalued (47% articles about foreign films vs. 44% articles about soviet films).

However, crowded of propaganda and ideological clichés A. Karaganov's article under the eloquent title *Responsibility of criticism* was real respond to Communist Party Resolution: "The good film critic review, actively and skillfully conducting the Party's line, it may be an effective means not only aesthetic, but also the political education of the working people, a powerful weapon of ideological struggle; Party purposeful, smart, aesthetically soulful conversation about the film helps a person to know better, deeper understanding of art, life, politics, helps the formation of communist convictions, the education culture of feelings and thoughts. ... Criticism is designed to consistently assert the Leninist principles of party and nation, determining the direction of cinematography socialist realism. ... It is impossible not to see that our film critic has not yet risen to the level of the tasks dictated by modernity. The press still often publish articles about movies that lack of party principles, the class approach to the realities of art and life, combat offensive spirit in the fight against a hostile ideology and its influence. ... Our film critic insufficiently active in the fight against the ideological and artistic marriage" (Karaganov, 1972, pp. 92-93).

Overall, however, the inertia of the publishing industry has affected the *Screen 1971-1972* positive content. Moreover, V. Fomin's courageous article *The sublime and the earthly*, in fact, opposed the official criticism hounding a poetic parable and cinema. V. Fomin wrote: "Movies of Parajanov, Abuladze, Iliencko, Mansurov in its stylistic decision defiantly opposed the the usual rate, polemically rejected the authenticity of aesthetics. The expressive figurative form openly stands out sharply at in these films with lush and sophisticated system of imagery, lyrical and romantic actions" (Fomin, 1972, p. 98).

Contrary to the Resolution's wishes "to support movies about the working class", V. Revich, criticized the "working class" movies *Night Shift*, *Anthracite*, *Cool Horizon*, remarking that "the filmmakers would be very easy live if the seriousness of the plan could at least to some extent compensate for the weakness of films" (Revich, 1972, pp. 85-86).

Film critics argued in the polemical section about the comedy *12 Chairs* by L. Gaidai and melodrama *About Love* by M. Bogin.

V. Shitova severely (and, I think, too harshly) summarized that "colorful film directed by Leonid Gaidai is none other than the dummy's novel. That is to say, a body without a soul. ... And as a result of film *12 Chairs* as a spectacle sluggish, and sometimes simply boring" (Shitova, 1972, pp. 70-71). But G. Kozhukhova insisted that "Gaidai is the master of eccentric and entertaining comedy" (Kozhukhova, 1972, p.73).

Speaking about the film *About Love*, T. Khlopyankina generally very warmly reacted to this exquisitely lyrical works with latent intonation of "moral anxiety": "May be this line expressed not as loud as it should be: the author does not burst, no anger, no pain, but only a certain melancholy. That is why the film has several monophonic melody, reminiscent of the sad motif consisting of a repeat of the same musical phrase. But it is not false. ... And, really, we need to listen to this music..." (Khlopyankina, 1972, p.77).

But A. Zorky, in my opinion, was not able to penetrate into the fine M. Bogin's poetic watercolors: "Man in the elegant environment... It is still a symbol, not transported in life" (Zorky, 1972, p.79).

An article E. Gromov (1931-2005) was devoted to personal aspect in modern topic on the screen: *The Beginning* and *Near the Lake* "is touched a very important topic, which is in the air. This is the theme of emotional wealth of personality, intellectualism and rationalism in an age of rapid scientific and technological progress" (Gromov, 1972, p.88). But in the *Young* By N. Moskalenko (1926-1974) is example of a "characters' depersonalization. None of them, not only is not a person, but not even it tends to become" (Gromov, 1972, p. 91).

Unfortunately, E. Gromov unable to appreciate the artistic level of *Urban Romance* by P. Todorovsky (1925-2013): "The director P.

Todorovsky and screenwriter F. Mironer groped acute actual conflict situation. But, alas, the ore did not turn into metal. Drama turned into a melodrama" (Gromov, 1972, p. 89).

The section devoted to adaptations presents *Carousel* by M. Schweitzer, *Uncle Vanya* by A. Konchalovsky and *The Seagull* by Y. Karasik.

A. Lipkov wrote that sad comedy *Carousel* built "easily and gracefully, exactly freely addressing ironic stylization, parody, cartoon extravaganza, grotesque. But this rainbow heap husked comedy arsenal at the viewer from the first frame appears and starts louder sound painfully poignant note" (Lipkov, 1972, p. 37). And then he the bright and vividly spoke about the film adaptation of the play *Uncle Vanya*: "Konchalovsky reads Chekhov not only as a thin and quivering lyricism, not as sad contemplative human ills, and certainly not as a chronicler. Chekhov for his tragic artist, furious, desperate diseases tormented century. Heroes of *Uncle Vanya* inflamed unquenchable thirst for love, complicity, big present case" (Lipkov, 1972, p. 44). *The Seagull* by Yuri Karasik was fairly valued much lower (Borodin, 1972, pp. 45-46).

Chief editor of *Soviet Screen* D. Pisarevsky shared with readers arguments (and now not lost its relevance) about the results of the traditional competition in which the readers of the magazine evaluated the films of the year: "Movement of films and spectators to each other is a complex and dialectic process. And may increase the aesthetic tastes of the audience, pulling backward to the advanced level (and those, in turn, to a new, higher level), contributes to the real study of the audience and the entire system of educational work with the mass audience. It will be a school, and film club, and the mass cinema. But first and foremost, of course, by the works of film art" (Pisarevsky, 1972, p.103).

The authors of the yearbook also wrote positive articles about the films *Attention, Turtle!* (Levshina, 1972, pp. 36-38), *The End of Ataman* (Sulkin, 1972, pp. 28-32), *We and Our Mountains* (Vartanov, 1972, pp. 47-49).

Screen 1973-1974 (1975, put in a set in February 1974)

This Yearbook was the last compiler's work of S. Chertok. Then the cinema bosses apparently decided that his editorial policy to take a significant conflict with the Resolution of Soviet Communist Party Central Committee *On Literary Criticism* (1972) and no longer corresponds to the current trend. Starting with the *Screen 1973-1974*, the foreign section of the yearbooks was the decline in volumes and articles on Western movie stars gradually gave way to the "stars" of the "third world"...

Medvedev's article *Fifty-first Year* was full of the ideological fervor in the spirit of Resolution: "When I remember the films 1973, I think that this year started in the joyful and exciting days of our holiday: the golden jubilee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. New battle Kremlin chimes alerted the world about the beginning of a new history of half a century of unprecedented community of people, whose name - the Soviet people" (Medvedev, 1975, p.86).

Further there was a great quote from the report of L.I. Brezhnev *On the 50th Anniversary of the USSR*. No one critic had not allowed himself to this kind of quotes in the *Screen Yearbooks*...

But on the whole yearbook still trying to keep film studies brand. For example, analyzing a film *A Bad Good Man* by I. Kheifits (1905-1995), A. Lipkov wrote: "Chekhov saw the task of art is "to squeeze out of the slavery of man - drop by drop." Kheifits' film inspires the same hatred of slavery - to rid the person of abstract ideas dogma, violence, physical and moral terror philistine environment. Man, with all its weaknesses and imperfections, fortunately, it is still not an ant, no termite, no beetle. He is a human. Bad or good, or even that more difficult - the 'bad good', but man" (Lipkov, 1975, p. 26).

I. Levshina heartily praised adaptation of Mark Twain's novel *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, set by G. Danelia titled *Hopelessly Lost*: "unexpectedly slow, achingly sad – this film seems deliberately circumvents many of the adventures" (Levshin, 1975, p.32).

V. Demin (1937-1993) favorably reacted to freestyle adaptation of the play by Mikhail Bulgakov: the comedy *Ivan Vasilievich changes his occupation* by L. Gaidai: "Today, our comedy cannot boast a lot of luck... This alarming joke of L. Gaidai is unconditional and remarkable success" (Demin, 1975, p. 81).

The Yearbook also singled out the most important films on contemporary topics: *Happy Go Lucky* by V.Shukshin and *Monologue* by I. Averbach.

V. Fomin wrote: "Shukshin still faithful to his character, he actively empathizes... Shukshin enamored looks at his Ivan Rastorguev, admires them and then quite ruthlessly punishes him for his obvious failures and weaknesses inherent in the nature" (Fomin, 1975, p. 30).

But R. Yurenev was more strict in relation to the film *Monologue* because of Western influences: "The love of the people, attention to him, attention to the most seemingly ordinary and insignificant everyday problems - the priceless quality of the script E. Gabilovich, well understood and generally successful implementation by I. Averbach. ... In the scene of the meeting of the old academician with ageless love of his youth I seen the influence of I. Bergman; in boys trumpeter – F. Fellini..." (Yurenev, 1975, p. 21).

After paying tribute to the actor's talent of M. Ulyanov (1927-2007), L. Pogozheva (1913-1989) wrote fairly restrained about his director's work *The Last Day*, noting that "the plot of this film is not new and is not original, but it is interesting to watch. I think this is mainly due to the presence on the screen M. Ulyanov. His game is very well thought-out, very precise and absolutely reliable" (Pogozheva, 1975, p. 23).

A similar verdict was about the film *Hot Snow* by G. Egiazarov (1916-1988) (Bocharov, 1975, p. 15). In my opinion, extremely complementary reviews have been published on the films *Deep* (Sulkin, 1975, pp. 35-38), *Herkus Mantas* (Borodin, 1975, pp. 41-43), *Melodies of Veriysky Quarter* (Lordkipanidze, 1975, pp. 44-47), *And then I said: no...* (Gerber, 1975, pp. 39-40).

The Yearbook has not forgotten about the action movies. V. Revich rightly criticized feature weakness of detectives *Shah Queen of Diamonds* and *The Black Prince* (Revich, 1975, pp. 92-94.).

R. Sobolev (1926-1991) wrote a positive, but too traditional and boring review of the detective TV-series *Seventeen Moments of Spring* (Sobolev, 1975, pp. 52-54) by T. Lioznova (1924-2011).

Maybe the editor S. Chertok could venture out to reprint a brilliant review *Lessons 'Moments'* by V. Demin, published earlier in *Soviet Screen* (Demin, 1973, p. 4-5). But, firstly, D. Pisarevsky, the editor in chief of *Soviet Screen*, lost his job in 1975 because of "ill-advised" the publication of this brave article. And secondly, as the saying goes, better safe than sorry...

Although readers it would be useful to reflect on the following V. Demin's phrase: "The swastika, rituals fires and torchbearers, skulls as emblems - fascism was not averse to flirt eerie black symbols... The film does not indulge these claims. ... What is there? There people crippled fascist order, accustomed to trust "the system" more than himself. But all the same people, not monsters. This is intriguing, and this is also should not be underestimated" (Demin, 1973).

T. Khloplyankina drew the attention of readers, that "films flirting with melodrama and at the same time carefully concealing this flirtation pretentious dialogue, speculation on the topic of modern film language, appear on the screen quite often. And it's a pity, because this genre, of course, the audience favorite, and always urging him feeling good, worthy of better treatment" (Khloplyankina, 1975, p. 96).

And D. Pisarevsky, yet not dismissed from his position, referring to the results of the survey of *Soviet Screen* readers, reasonably stated that "mass surveys the audience once again confirmed that box office and their true value and evaluation audience are very different things. Films that have received the highest evaluation of the audience, not all cases can be found in the box office top list, and the comedy and adventure movies that

have gathered of millions audiences, often missing in the list of the best films of the year" (Pisarevsky, 1975, p. 99).

Screen 1974-1975 (1976, put in a set in November 1975)

Yearbook changed the editor. The new editors E. Bauman and G. Dolmatovskaya were assigned instead fired S. Chertok (by the way, in one year with D. Pisarevsky). And *Screen 1974-1975* not only reduced the presence of foreign materials to an all-time low (19% of the total volume of materials collection), but also got rid of such talented, but "too free-thinking" authors like L. Anninsky, V. Demin, Y. Khanyutin, N. Zorkaya and I. Levshina...

In 1975, USSR celebrated the 30th anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany, so the bulk of the material on the Soviet cinema was devoted to films about the war. Firstly *Liberation* by Y. Ozerov (1921-2001) and *They Fought for Their Motherland* by S. Bondarchuk (1920-1994).

V. Baskakov wrote: "Deep, bold, talented director Sergei Bondarchuk, wonderful actors, the whole shooting team embodied on the screen the ideas and images of Mikhail Sholokhov's novel *They Fought for Their Motherland*" (Baskakov, 1976, p. 24). And A. Karaganov wrote that "S. Bondarchuk created a movie, endearing courageous truthfulness" (Karaganov, 1976, p.12). But even he could not afford to respond as super positive about the rather loose and strained pathos of *Liberation*: "This film is not free of errors. ... But on the whole ... this is a remarkable work, endearing honesty and recreation events scale, purposefulness directorial solutions, carrier and the actor's art" (Karaganov, 1976, p. 11).

It seems that the updated Yearbook tried to show their loyalty to the precepts of the Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee of the *On Literary Criticism: Screen 1974-1975* wrote positively even such mediocre movie on the military theme as *Ballad of Kovpak* (Kudin, 1976, pp. 38-42), *Flame* (Shatsillo, 1976, pp. 42-46) and *High Rank* (Kazarinov, 1976, pp. 46-48). Although all three reviews noted for the sake of decency "minor deficiencies", they always stressed that these films "have become a notable event"...

But T. Ivaniva's article about L. Bykov's wonderful film *Only old men go to fight* interesting to read. And it is difficult not to agree with the fact that "the director seems to not want to work it is required to look original, relishing the unexpected turns in the threads or exclusively modern film language. Apparently, he is not afraid to appear neither too traditional nor too sentimental" (Ivanova, 1976, p.49).

The Yearbook was again under the influence of *On Literary Criticism* reviewing working class drama *The Hottest Month* (Egorov, 1976,

p. 87). But V. Mikhalkovich had a more sober view of the films on the working class topic (Mikhalkovich, 1976, pp. 116-120).

The main part of the modern section of the Yearbook was given to the analysis of *Red Kalina* by V. Shukshin, *Romance for Lovers* by A. Konchalovsky, and *Daughters and Mothers* by S. Gerasimov and other notable works of the screen.

G. Kapralov's article was correct: "In the interpretation of the history of *Red Kalina* could become commonplace and criminal chronicle and cheap melodrama. But V. Shukshin raises it to the height of moral and philosophical thoughts about life, its true and false values" (Kapralov, 1976, p.76).

L. Belova was no less convincing in his argument: "The heroic soul, ready to exploit in the name of goodness and justice, Olga Vasilyeva from the movie *Daughters and Mothers* in the same time is not a standard of positivity. ... The true value of her nature is dialectical, because its manifestations Olga also draws as little scary ... This film give us the chance to think" (Belova, 1976, p. 92).

E. Gromov wrote that the film *Romance for Lovers* "a truly talented and significant. This is a deeply poetic meditation on love and duty, the meaning of life" (Gromov, 1976, p. 82).

E. Bauman equally appreciated ironic parable *Jackass* By E. Shengelaja: "This film has many unusual, striking the imagination and eccentricity paradoxical situations, characters, dialogue, unexpected plot and thinking of the author. This is a comedy in which intertwine the seriousness of the parable and slapstick mischief, which is juicy, a visible, tangible and yet inconceivable fantastic reality coexists with the reliability of a fantastic dream" (Bauman, 1976, p. 126).

Introducing readers to his reflections on the cinema, M. Zak (1929-2011) rightly pointed out that the film *Until the last minute* is "undisclosed political biography of the hero, because word-gun reduced to the level quotational journalism" (Zak, 1976, p. 115).

Screen 1975-1976 (1977, put in a set in August 1976)

This is another issue, edited by E. Bauman and G. Dolmatovskaya.

XXV Congress of the Soviet Communist Party was held in February-March 1976. This Congress was one of the peaks in the "small cult of personality" of L.I. Brezhnev. This explains why the "report-inspiring" article by A. Kamshalov decorated the references to the report of the general secretary (Kamshalov, 1977, p. 28). A. Kamshalov, in particular, didactically wrote: "A new stage of communist construction places high demands on literature and art, including the cinema. ... Our party orients writers, artists, composers, filmmakers, television and the theater workers

of the fact that the rich possibilities of art, exciting persuasiveness of artistic images used for the enrichment of moral people, to improve their spiritual potential. ... The devotion to communist ideals – that is the main thing that I would like to see in the way of the worker or collective farmer, a scientist or a warrior, leader or an ordinary party building a new life" (Kamshalov, 1977, pp. 23, 26).

I think after such a "seed" the quotation from Brezhnev logically looked and in an article on the movies' working class subject (Korobkov, 1977, p. 48).

The communist pathos of G. Kapralov's article about working class film *Prize* was in the same key: "Screen offers us a certain model, an example of how can and should be addressed sometimes some of the issues in a socialist society, where we have the party criticism and self-criticism. But this "model" is designed not speculative, not built artificially, but life itself is born... The story of Vasily Potapov and his team is not the last place in the chain of large and small events of everyday life that add up to the overall flow of our irresistible movement towards communism" (Kapralov, 1977, pp. 68-69).

The cinema and Communist party functionary D. Shatsillo spared no compliments regarding romanticized film biography of one of Communist leaders – G. Ordzhonikidze (*I accept*) (Shatsillo, 1977, pp. 87-91).

E. Bauman wrote equally rosy about another deservedly forgotten now film *Time of her sons*: "This is the story of the triumph of life, the happiness of peaceful labor, the great love of his native land. ... the main idea sounds distinctly and clearly: this is the idea of man's responsibility to his country, ahead of its time" (Bauman, 1977, p. 80).

And usually more thoughtful E. Gromov, alas, could not resist the praise of a mediocre film *Earthly Love*, which was shown "a man of modern times, the era of socialist, a communist, was acutely aware of the enormous challenges that were then in front of the party and the country" (Gromov, 1977, pp. 86-87).

But N. Sumenov (1938-2014) did not dare to sing a solemn hymn to working class drama *From dawn to dusk* by G. Egiazarov. Film critic rebuked this movie in edification, smoothing out conflicts and problems (Sumenov, 1977, p.75).

The rest of the annual reviews were written in a more analytical manner.

For example, V. Vilchek (1937-2006) gave an interesting analysis of the letters of moviegoers (especially on the comedy *Afonya* by G. Danelia), which were not only clearly marked with different levels of perception, audience analysis of the film, but also stressed that the "naturalistic perception is a perception, dictated by lazy, consumer life experience;

People just covered (truly deceiving himself) didactic reasons, they just want do not destroy their peace of minds" (Vilchek, 1977, p. 62).

As a result, V. Vilchek reasonably come to the conclusion that "We need the concept of "integral film". That is, a film for everyone, able to satisfy the most different, even polar groups of the audience. It is anticipated that this film should have a multi-layer structure, so that each group of viewers might find it that searches and understands the art of one: interesting plot, the second: a fine plastic or of their idols, and others: deep philosophy, etc." (Vilchek, 1977, p. 63).

Yearbook praisedbook the film *Hundred days after childhood* by S. Soloviev. T. Ivanova wrote that "the very sophistication plot of this film, the game with motifs of classical works, lurked danger: to consider the region bookish reminiscences in the frame of quite closed experiment. The filmmakers were able to overcome this danger" (Ivanova, 1977, p. 95).

A historical and romantic melodrama *The Captivating Star of Happiness* by V. Motyl received a positive assessment from Y. Turin (1938-2016) (Turin, 1977, pp. 96-102). Film critic L. Rybak (1923-1988) supported screen experiment of M. Schweitzer, who, the first time in the director's biography, turned to the genre fiction parable in the film *Escape of Mr. McKinley*: "This unusual movie built on extreme aesthetic principles; its action steeped in reality, this story is woven of fantastic events. ... We see something unbelievable, inconceivable from the standpoint of ordinary logic in realistic circumstances, but it is quite convincing as an artistic metaphor, true to his moral (or immoral) nature" (Rybak, 1977, p. 105).

Screen 1976-1977 (1978, put in a set in January 1978)

This Yearbook changed one of the editors. New editors (until the last issue) became Y. Turin and G. Dolmatovskaya.

Of course, the diamond jubilee of the Soviet regime (1977) and the Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee *On working with creative youth* (October, 1976) played a important role in Soviet film criticism process. V. Baskakov (1978, pp. 29-35) and M. Alexeev (Alexeev, 1978, p. 50) wrote about clearly and directly. N. Sumenov wrote: "*Liberation* by Y. Ozerov clearly reflected as a strike force of world imperialism were broken, met on his way a monolithic multi-ethnic state of workers and peasants who defended the war the freedom and independence of their country, Lenin's motherland, the motherland of the Great October. ... *Soldiers of Freedom* shows not only the successes but also the dramatic pages of the people's liberation struggle. ... And very good episode of this film, where L.I. Brezhnev (actor E. Matveev) speaks about communism with simple Czech workers. This episode is capacious and

extremely important for the expression of the author's concept of dialogue as it sums up the film as a work of political cinema" (Sumenov, 1978, pp. 78-80).

It seems that everything has already been said in this "critical" passage... But, no: N. Sumenov with skillful pen of communist functionary added cold war sentence: "Bourgeois propagandists used up a lot of pages, arguing that the national liberation struggle, the people's democratic and socialist system in Europe was planted against the will of the peoples of these countries. Accessing historical facts refutes the malicious lies. In carrying out their internationalist duty, the Soviet Army liberated from fascism, not only his country, but also the people of other European countries that have chosen the democratic path of development. Our ideological opponents, ideological means fighting against the socialist community of nations now rely on inciting nationalist sentiment. They are trying to drive a wedge between the peoples, to oppose one another nation, to split the unity of our country. That is why today is so important political picture, excitedly and earnestly preaching the ideals of proletarian internationalism. It is no exaggeration to say that internationalism becomes the main theme of the film *Soldiers of Freedom*, its most important task" (Sumenov, 1978, p.83).

The articles about Leninist films *Trust* (Zaitsev, 1978, pp. 84-86) and *October* (Pustynsky, 1978, pp. 132-133) were additional plus to Soviet anniversary.

The alternative approach to the official analysis of war films was presented in M. Zak's article. He, not fearing the religious foundation, gave the high praise for L. Shepitko's masterpiece *Ascension*: "The director is harsh and intransigence in the image of suffering, intransigence in relation to the viewer's perception, which has its own thresholds. She leaves nothing behind the scenes, and the spectators run with the hero all painful path... Mythological paint gradually slides over the screen. ... the evangelical composition openly establish themselves in the frame" (Zak, 1978, p. 68).

But M. Zak somehow confused realistic textures in the film *Twenty Days Without War*, typical of the director's style of A. German: "The efforts of the director sometimes seem excessive, particularly in the field of decorative arts" (Zak, 1978, p. 66).

The films on contemporary topics was also in focus of the Yearbook: *Mimino*, *Own Opinion*, *The White Ship*, *Only You*, *Hoax* and *Word of Protection*.

A. Zorky wrote about one of the best G. Danelia's film: "*Mimino* has everything which you can want in good movie: humor, honesty, simplicity, seriousness, the great script, mature craftsmanship, beautiful duet of actors" (Zorky, 1978, p. 209).

N. Savitsky quite convincingly argued that the *Own Opinion* "main character is too self-confident, the winner from the start. He appeared not to study, but teach. He almost does not make mistakes, and I can't trust him. ... This film has absolutely predominant declarative tone, journalistic style, emotionally depleted" (Savitsky, 1978, p. 96).

K. Rudnicky (1920-1988) was dissatisfied with the imbalance of a characters in a film of screenwriter A. Mindadze and director V. Abdrashitov *Word for Protection* because "the fate of main heroine Kostina, like a powerful magnet attracts all interest and takes in all the excitement of the audience. Conceived (and contrived!) parallel movement of the two female roles in the living reality of the film is replaced by a powerful movement of a single Kostina's drama" (Rudnicky, 1978, p.124).

Speaking about the melodrama *Only You* by I. Kheifits (1905-1995) M. Kuznetsov (1914-1980) was, in my opinion, overly didactic, emphasizing "how important it is for our contemporaries have the own culture of senses... And this controversial, somewhat uneven, but very interesting film devoted to this area of moral life" (Kuznetsov, 1978, p.104).

Reviewing musical melodrama about the school and school children *Hoax*, T. Kukarkina began with praise: "V. Menchov has chosen for his first directorial work of dynamic form of the narrative, catchy, bright, spectacular. Pop-music, beautiful person, elegant interiors, the plot tension overshadowed psychological thoroughness. The director focused on the incessant emotional impact. It is promoted and given rhythm and unique scene transitions, and the absence of general plans and panoramas. All large, brightly. And the film looks in one breath, he excites and makes empathize heroes" (Kukarkina, 1978, p.119). But then T. Kukarkina made the negative conclusion, in my opinion, unreasonably harsh: "The stated problem, moral collision blurred, scattered in different semantic series, replacing the regulatory rules of ethics. ... The idea of the playwright essential to solve problems is obvious, but simplified to elementary commandments" (Kukarkin, 1978, p.121).

The main article in the portrait gallery of the yearbook (articles about the work of actors Y. Solntseva, R. Adomaitis, I. Churikova, G. Burkov, E. Simonova) was the text of R. Yurenev. Remembering the *Kuban Cossacks* by I. Pyrev, film critic wrote that "of course, all the circumstances of this picture is not shown of collective life. There was no criticisms, no objective assessment of the life difficulties. But it was fun and joyful chanting of the collective-farm labor, a new morality, friendship and ardent love in the conventions of the genre of musical comedy and operetta" (Yurenev, 1978, p. 139). But "modern dramatic Pyrev's movies *Our Mutual Friend*, *Light of Distant Star* were weak, and quickly got off the screen"(Yurenev, 1978, p.139).

R. Yurenev thought the main Pyrev's artistic achievement *The Brothers Karamazov* where director "boldly sacrificed many lines, many novel ideas, focusing on the problem of realization of its main characters. And here and he showed courage, and taste, and a very deep and subtle understanding of the individual characteristics quite similar to each other actors" (Yurenev, 1978, p. 142).

Screen 1977-1978 (1979, put in a set in November 1978)

Screen 1977-1978 continued the theme of the 60th anniversary of the Socialist revolutionary. A. Novogrudsky (1911-1996) wrote an article under the eloquent title *Under the Sign of the October Revolution*: "Why is the bourgeois film researchers praise the first Soviet revolutionary cinema masterpieces (even emasculating their ideological content and focusing on the purely aesthetic categories)? The answer is quite simple: to build the anti-scientific scheme of "attenuation" of Soviet cinema, to belittle the significance of such great works as *Chapaev*, a trilogy about Maxim and other outstanding films, declared "non-existent" creative achievements of Soviet filmmakers after 1920s. The Western cinema books repeated this false scheme with the dogmatic obstinacy pseudoscientific treatises ... Another false is the accusation of socialist realism in the canons of censorship" (Novogrudsky, 1979, p. 28).

It is clear that the Novogrudsky's arguments look mildly, unconvincing, because the Western festival movement and Western film studies, actually rejecting the ideology of "socialist realism" (like the 1930s and subsequent years), always supported talented Soviet movies of post-Stalin era (including many films of M. Kalatozov, A. Konchalovsky, S. Parajanov, A. Tarkovsky, G. Chuhraj, M. Khutsiev and other masters).

A. Medvedev presented his article *The feat of the people, the fate of the People*, which he wrote about very mediocre "socialist realism" films *Carpathian Mountains* ... by T. Levchuk and *Destiny* by E. Matveyev: "Much of these works is debatable. However, I would like to emphasize the important thing in the film chronicle of the national artistic feat of new lines are written, enriching our memory, spreading its horizon" (Medvedev, 1979, p. 46).

N. Savitsky published another positive-boring article about the drama on the working class topic - *Feedback* by V. Tregubovich (Savitsky, 1979, pp. 87-92).

Reflecting on the movie *Call me in the distance light* by S. Lubshin and G. Lavrov, E. Bauman wrote that "the film carefully and clearly conveyed Shukshin's intonations, Shukshin's thoughts. And a huge credit for this belongs to the ensemble cast" (Bauman, 1979, p. 102).

But Y. Turin very severely appreciated the talented drama *Wounded Game (The Orphans)* by N. Gubenko: "The main character fell apart in every sense of the word into two parts: his childhood was promised a great personality, but the maturity has been deprived of concreteness, the flesh. Here the main failure of the movie. Bartenev was forty years in the present tense only eyewitness and participant in the events does not unlike Bartenev-child wounded" (Turin, 1979, p. 97).

Surprisingly, but the *Screen 1977-1978* dared (and I think rightly) criticize S. Rostotsky, logged by this time the cohort of "untouchables directors". His adaptation of the novel *White Bim Black Ear* had a huge success with audiences, but the Yearbook published the following opinion: "The filmmakers removed the the air, breath of prose. Hard film in some of its parts has become cruel, almost tortured nerves of the audience" (Marchenko, 1979, p. 101).

Portrait Gallery of *Screen 1977-1978* was extensive (Zakrzhevskaya 1979, pp. 114-120; Lagina, 1979, pp. 121-126; Yurenev, 1979, pp. 145-147; Krivitsky, pp. 147-153; Tarasenko, 1979, pp. 136-141; Khanyutin, 1979, pp. 131-136; Vladimirova, 1979, pp. 154-157).

Summarizing the results of a creative way of film director I. Talankin (1927-2010), E. Vladimirova rightly noted that "diversity is the main quality of his work, his films is open for the emotionality, for the viewer's heart" (Vladimirova, 1979, p. 157).

Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978) wrote one of his brilliant articles: "N. Mikhalkov made his debut in directing as a secular dandy on Opening Day, with noisy, fun, dazzling cascade of film techniques. His first film *At Home Among Strangers...* has fairy-tale characters, act according to the laws of natural justice and faith in their triumph. And the director also believes with them. Negative character desperately asks: "My God, my God, why are you helping this cretin, not me?". "Because you're a greedy", - meets the positive hero of this film. As in fairy tales: brave and noble hero wins and punished negative character" (Khanyutin, 1979, pp. 131-132).

Turning to the analysis of the second work of N. Mikhalkov, Y. Khanyutin gave an exhaustive answer to the question of why the *Slave of Love* had no total box-office success: "The director chose exactly the genre corresponding to the subject: melodrama. But, it seems, he made a fatal mistake in relation to the selected genre. He puts the film with a certain ironic distance towards the character. And the romance cannot tolerate distance, she cannot live without the immediacy and simplicity. And the lack of sensitivity are not compensated by the exquisite interiors, an elegant stylized fashion and costumes and even a soft smile of the author in relation to the figures of the cinema. Perhaps the lack of spontaneity prevented the *Slave of Love* to win the success with the audience" (Khanyutin, 1979, p. 132).

Mikhalkov's *Unfinished Piece for Mechanical Piano* (on motives of the early play of Anton Chekhov, known as *Platonov*) received the highest evaluation from Y. Khanyutin: "He started (in *At Home Among Strangers...* and *Slave of Love*) in easy and artistic author's style with elegant and slightly retro. But now cutesy shell of the century is replaced by the director of a thoughtful and unhurried, develops relationships of characters, exposes the complexity of their relationships, the depth of subtext. ... Mikhalkov away from traditional interpretations of Chekhov, from the elegiac, muted emotions, halftones. This film presents Chekhov sarcastic, bitter, merciless, built on the dramatic tension, catastrophic drops, breakdowns from tragedy to farce. ... The film unfolds slowly, there is a feeling that his exposition, where it turns out "who's who" tightened. There are the shock episodes, designed for immediate impact, that were in the first Mikhalkov's film. But gradually you enter into the world of movie, and this film powerfully addictive you. This is one of those works of art that have a strong impact in the end and leave a long period of "aftertaste", the desire to think about the film and its characters. Probably, this is the quality of this serious work. No, not dapper professional, not a brilliant actor gets out of the frame of the film. This is the artist's deep penetration into the essence of phenomena, the invitation the viewer to thinking" (Khanyutin, 1979, pp. 132, 136).

Screen 1978-1979 (1981, put in a set in July 1980)

Yearbook *Screen 1978-1979* was put into set in July 1980, after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, in response to which the United States has announced a boycott of the Moscow Olympics, and an embargo on the Soviet Union in modern technologies and grain. And Soviet communist Party Central Committee Resolution "On further improve the ideological and political education work" (April 1979) adopted a year earlier: "The Communist Party organizations, agencies of culture, ideological institutions, creative unions have the task of improving ideological and political Marxist-Leninist education of the artistic intelligentsia" (Resolution ..., 1979).

In short, a "discharge" policy was ended and new peak of the cold war started. And only one month left before resuming jamming broadcasts *Voice of America* and other Western radio stations in the USSR (20-21 August 1980)...

Article of V. Drobashenko (1921-2012) (Drobashenko, 1981, pp. 11-17) and Y. Cherepanov (Cherepanov, 1981, pp. 72-75), N. Zaitsev (Zaitsev, 1981, p. 77, 80), N. Sumenov (Sumenov, 1981, pp. 80-83) were the responses to the Communist Party Resolution.

In particular, Y. Cherepanov, without the slightest shadow of a doubt, wrote that all in the film *The taste of bread* "taken from life, everything is authentic, all carefully calibrated almost scientific precision, especially for the reader who is familiar with L.I. Brezhnev's book *Virgin Lands*" (Cherepanov, 1981, p.72).

The most interesting part of this Yearbook was devoted to a school topic in the movie. Here E. Gromov correctly noted that "we can see the school life mostly on the side of the adult position. ... Oh, what are they bold and uninhibited! The creators of the films about school are often lose critical, realistic view relevant to the younger generation. ... It is, however, a long-standing problem of our children and youth film: no one had achieved the severity level of youth estimates that existed in the film *Three Days of Victor Chernyshov*" (Gromov, 1981, pp. 33, 36).

However, further critic convincingly argued that the situation in the children's and youth film at the turn of the 1980s, "in many ways better, more vital than existed a few years ago, when the main charge of emotion and admiration spent on teachers... And otherwise, a negative image of the teacher often met with hostility. Now, the teachers began to show a wide variety: from very good, almost perfect, to the purely negative. Sometimes a critical attitude to the teacher even prevails over the claim that is also not terrible. No need to worry too much about a strictly balance, if the cinema school has vivid teachers personalities in the films *Diary of School's Director, Aliens Letters, Betrayed* ... We are proud of its achievements in the field of youth and children's movies. But also see their weaknesses and unsolved problems" (Gromov, 1981, p. 35).

E. Gromov rather sharply criticized the talented film *The key is not transferable* by D. Asanova (1942-1985), insisting that "one way or another, but the teacher Marina Maximovna consciously unconsciously creates a closed microcosm for only a gifted, bright, intelligent students. But what about those who are not talented? ... Talented Marina Maximovna, focusing only on the talented guys, perforce brings them pride, of which she is not deprived. From it only a step to the arrogant neglect of a rough, everyday work, and ordinary people" (Gromov, 1981, pp. 34-35). And there are the final E. Gromov's conclusions: "The film touches on the difficult teenage problems are not easily solved, they hurt" (Gromov, 1981, pp. 37-38).

The remaining sturdy and extensive positive reviews in the yearbook were devoted to films *Strange Woman* (Gromov, 1981, p. 92), *Declaration of Love* (Zac 1981, pp. 92-95), *Nahapet* (Medvedev, 1981, pp. 95-97), *Biryuk* (Nedelin, 1981, pp. 97-99), *Centaur* (Shilova, 1981, pp. 83-87), *Price's death ask the dead* (Belova, 1981, pp. 87-89), *Man, that was lucky* (Kuznetsov, 1981, pp. 99-102), *Father Sergius* (Bauman, 1981, pp. 149-151), *Rise* (Kapralov, 1981, pp. 188-190).

Screen 1979-1980 (1982, put in a set in November 1981)

Screen 1979-1980 put in to the set in November 1981, i.e. after the last Brezhnev's XXVI Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, which was once again told that "the manifestation of lack of ideology, ideological promiscuity, a departure from the clear class assessment of individual historical events and figures can damage creativity even gifted people. Our critics, literary journals, creative unions and especially their Communist Party organizations should be able to correct those who puts in one direction or another. And, of course, the active principle to act in cases where there are works that damages our Soviet reality. Here we must be uncompromising. The Communist Party has not been and cannot be indifferent to the ideological orientation of our art" (Proceedings of XXVI Congress of the soviet communist Party, 1981, pp. 61-63).

However, only one of all Soviet film critics dared to speak in the pages of the yearbook with a genuine Communist ideological position. It was tireless V. Baskakov with the article about film *Karl Marx. Young Years* by L. Kulidzhanov: "This film enriches our understanding about the life of the founder of scientific communism, it gives ample food for serious thought about the most important, most essential in the fate of mankind. ... Marx is the great thinker, scientist, leader of the world proletariat, he first pointed out the right path of revolutionary transformation of the world" (Baskakov, 1982, pp. 84, 88).

The rest of the film critics did not support this Communistic pathos, preferring to remain in traditional reviews.

Arguing about the image of the screen character, E. Gromov came to the right conclusion that "the history of art clearly shows that the vital credibility and the strength of the aesthetic impact of the image of the hero, in essence, almost independent of the presence or absence and his character shortcomings and weaknesses"(Gromov, 1982, p. 57).

E. Stishova dedicated her article to Soviet film debuts: "Historical events connected with the revolution, civil war, and even the World are increasingly becoming for the present generation of filmmakers the only reason for the creation of the adventure movies, where history easily sacrificed riot of imagination of the author and spectator demand for exciting dynamic spectacle" (Stishova, 1982, p. 78).

R. Yurenev was also strict, by only in relation to *Five Evenings* by N. Mikhalkov: "I dare to accuse the director of the film in theatrical compositions. ... It is necessary to destroy gravitating to the dramatic unities theatrical composition, build a free cinematic composition with multiple places of action" (Yurenev, 1982, p. 102).

A. Medvedev published one of his best reviews about the sad comedy *Autumn Marathon* by G. Danelia: "This is a pleasing example of the harmony of all its beginnings: drama, director, actor, visual, musical. It's all happily found each other and each is fully expressed himself" (Medvedev, 1982, p. 89).

L. Melville generally supported the poetic parable *Babylon-XX* by I. Mykolaychuk (1941-1987): "Fine fragmentary structure of the film at first glance may surprise... But we can see more and more that its creators based on eternity of life and folk culture. ... *Babylon-XX's* stylistic is aesthetic principle of popular culture, its moral and artistic syncretism. Beautiful is always good, and the good is the way to beautiful. ... We know the age-old tradition of native culture, always beautiful and good. The film keeps these traditions" (Melville, 1982, pp.112, 114).

Socio sharp detective *Interrogation* (Freilich, 1982, pp. 92-95), dramas *Early Cranes* (Zak, 1982, pp. 103-106) and *Several interviews on personal matters* (Sumenov, 1982, pp. 106-109) also received the support from the authors of the Yearbook.

Y. Turin's article about great Russian actor A. Solonitsyn (1934-1982) was the best among the actors' portraits. Here, perhaps, for the first time, the Yearbook so vividly and clearly published the analysis of the works of this outstanding actor, the main actor of A. Tarkovsky (1932-1986). Y. Turin wrote that *Stalker* "was for Solonitsyn and Tarkovsky a fantastic environment material, the nature of the mysterious, unknown world. ... in general, purely earthly problems as a matter of priority: to heal the soul, a disturbed conscience, fix the personal balance. ... The film brings to the indissoluble triangle regulations humanism, technocracy and faith..." (Turin, 1982, pp.139-141). And here Y. Turin rightly argued that the high-rise Tarkovsky's film compositions "resemble the crystal structure: proportionality and indispensability of each item, mathematically calculated harmony of all the parts" (Turin, 1982, p.138).

Screen 1980-1981 (1983, put in set in December 1982)

July 30, 1982 was the time of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Resolution *On the creative connections literary journals with the practice of communist construction*, where Communist Party once again called for the tightening of ideological censorship and nuts.

Screen 1980-1981 has been put in set in December 1982, already under the reign of Y. Andropov (1914-1984), so Yearbook's content was probably one of the most boring and unsuccessful.

I. Rachuk (1922-1985) was crowded of false pathos about politically conjunctural film *From Bug to the Vistula* by T. Levchuk T. (1912-1998): "This is struggle for communism"(Rachuk, 1983, p.76). F. Kuznetsov

similarly positive and pathetic wrote about as weak working class drama *Horses in midstream* is not by G. Egiazarov (Kuznetsov, 1983, p.68).

E. Gromov also was noted in the margin of the ideological front with respect to the communist orientated film *Your son, the land*: "What is the main result of the film, its principal novelty? A vital and artistically valid ideal hero, the perfect Communist party worker appeared on the screen" (Gromov, 1983, p.75).

V. Baskakov wrote another pathetic lines: "S. Gerasimov, one of the founders of the creative method of our cinema, highlights the kinship of this art with the most humane system of social relations: the system of socialism-communism. This is an essential feature in the work of this artist" (Baskakov, 1983, p. 120).

Against this background, A. Romanenko's article looked much more attractive. First, she rightly wrote about how hard to find "a movie in our cinema, where talent truthfully described the all-consuming love, poetic and happiness, the dreams of young and mature people" (Romanenko, 1983, p.32). And then, she sadly noted that "screen tale is transformed, changes the appearance, language, and most importantly - the address. It is increasingly becoming a holiday, which is fairy tale, but not for children" (Romanenko, 1983, p.34).

Y. Turin was a little more positive, but in relation to the historic theme: "We can see the existence of cinema, associated with the history of the peoples of our country. Although the force of inertia is still very high" (Turin, 1983, p.43).

R. Yurenev wrote the article about one of the Soviet box office leaders - melodrama *Guys ..!* This article was actively supported the line of the Soviet State Committee for Cinematography for increasing screen entertainment: "*Guys ..!* clear expressed the idea alive and strong characters people and calm, reliable life. Melodrama wins his love of the audience" (Yurenev, 1983, p.84).

Screen 1981-1982 (1984, put in set in December 1983)

Shortly after the solemn celebration of the 60th anniversary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee published the Resolution *Topical issues of ideological and mass political work of the Communist party* (June, 1983). It is clear that the faithful soldiers of the ideological front, like, for example, V. Baskakov, respond to this demands: "There are vain efforts of the western film critics who are trying to impose their orientations to the Soviet cinema, their ideas how to rewrite the history of our new movies. We can do the cinema without the help of such advisers and well-wishers..." (Baskakov, 1984, p. 7).

Y. Cherepanov was also advocate of the Communist party topic: thinking about a weak film *Hope and Support*, he wrote: "This film reflects the topical problems of modern life, the important issues *State Food Program*" (Cherepanov, 1984, p.60).

E. Gromov praised very highly the film *Lenin in Paris*: "This work of our oldest masters S. Yutkevich and E. Gabrilovich passionately and convincingly reveals the deep modernity Lenin and Leninism. *Lenin in Paris* fundamentally enriches our Leninist cinema" (Gromov, 1984, p. 58).

As usual some Yerabook's articles dedicated to the military topic. Y. Turin wrote that the film *Fact* "extremely reliably demonstrated the bitter, harsh truth of the war without discounts for a range of events, with no allowances for the time it takes away even a hint of pacifism, forgiveness" (Turin, 1984, p.64). And E. Bauman noted that "*Starfall* by I. Talankin is a very human and very sad movie. This film is permeated with bitterness about youth, war, love" (Bauman, 1984, p. 67).

A. Romanenko's article was about *The Night is Short*, the film with post-war childhood topic, where "the theme of domestic growth boy inscribed in the frame a true story, in harmony with the theme of the post-war renewal of life. ... This film acquires an epic breath in the final" (Romanenko, 1984, p.74).

E. Stishova presented the highly controversial thesis, arguing that "detectives and blockbuster, horror and disaster films have lost their absolute power over the spectators' hearts, but a modest life stories of ordinary, unremarkable women have, as it turned out, a huge attraction" (Stishova, 1984, p.32).

And, as if confirming this thesis, G. Dolmatovskaya explains the reasons for the success of melodrama *Beloved Woman of Mechanic Gavrilov*: "This film was conceived and written specifically for Ludmila Gurchenko. And she was generously rewarded for widely show her multi-colored iridescence talent, keeping a sense of proportion and tact" (Dolmatovskaya, 1984, p.76).

M. Vlasov (1932-2004) dedicated his article to the positive image of film critic R. Yurenev (Vlasov, 1984, p.103).

Screen 1982-1983 (1985, put in a set in August 1984)

Screen 1982-1983 was put in the set already during the brief reign of K. Chernenko (1911-1985), in August 1984. The Cold War was still in full swing. And the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee published new Resolution (April 1984) *On measures to further improve the ideological and artistic quality of films and strengthen the material and technical basis of cinematography*.

Surprisingly, but the previously fairly sensitive to the Communist Party guidance, Yearbook limited the reaction only N. Sumenov's article *Loyalty to the truth of history* (Sumenov, 1985, p.80).

Most of the materials of the Soviet part of the yearbook were devoted to films on contemporary topics.

Tone M. Zak's reviews the film *Private Life* was restrained and neutral. Film critic point out that this movie "closer to the monodrama, much depends on the central role of the artist. Ulyanov translates the problem into the character ... when the fate of the human break" (Zak, 1985, p.77).

The tragic film *Farewell* by E. Klimov got appreciation of Y. Turin: "This film not turned into a way of idealization of patriarchal heroes, but ... enriched our common memory, our conscience..."(Turin, 1985, p.89).

Y. Turin (under the pseudonym Samarin) gave same high mark to wonderful film *Boys* by D. Asanova: "Asanova is maximalist by nature. ... She loves and knows how to think, to analyze and even risky. She believes in moral and hence aesthetic value in the spiritual screen power" (Samarin, 1985, p.93).

I. Shilova wrote the deep review about *Heiress Straight* by S. Soloviov: "The man in the face of life, people in the face of great culture, a man to himself - there are Soloviov's films topics (*One hundred days after childhood, Lifeguard*). Soloviev is most ironic in the new work. Time makes its own amendments to the simple and clear relations, the artist not only feels them, but also offers the moral changes in his trilogy cardiogram" (Shilova, 1985, p.35).

E. Gromov and M. Kuznetsova devoted their review of the most notable comedies of those years: *Train Station for Two* by E. Ryazanov and *Native* by N. Mikhalkov.

E. Gromov wrote that *Train Station for Two* "looks tense, with great excitement. This is the comedy. Do not lyrical although it has a lyricism; not satirical, but it has a sarcasm and anger; not tragicomedy, although it has sorrow and grief. ... This is dramatic and conflict work, by causing laughter and fun high catharsis: cleansing, enlightenment, faith in life and hope for good luck" (Gromov, 1985, p. 85).

M. Kuznetsova went to the *Native* with a retrospective point of view: "Previous Mikhalkov's films were the fireworks talents with the coldness of the mind. ... In the *Native* director refused many means of cinematic expression: strict realism, no frills, sophisticated visual metaphors" (Kuznetsova, 1985, p. 92).

Screen 1983-1984 (1986, put in a set in September 1985)

Screen 1983-1984 was put into the set in September 1985, already in power times of M. Gorbachev, in the year of the 40th anniversary of victory over Nazism. Perestroika was still in its infancy, and so Yearbook could still afford even then very dubious assertion that *Victory* by E. Matveev and *Duma about Koupak* by T. Levchuk gave the examples of how "deeper and more objective understanding of the history of the war in the cinematographic art" (Turin, 1986, p.56).

But in general, the content of *Screen 1983-1984* was significantly different for the better on a number of previous yearbooks.

And today I, of course, agree with the fact that "The film *Wartime Romance* by P. Todorovsky has the plaintive lyricism of memories when the wounds still bleeding in the hearts of people recently graduated from war" (Bauman, 1986, p. 140).

L. Anninsky appeared after a long absence from the pages of the Yearbook, in this case – with the analytical article of the film *Leo Tolstoy* by S. Gerasimov (Anninsky, 1986, pp. 82-87).

E. Gromov is not tempted by ideological rhetoric this time. He wrote that the film *Time of Desires* has "peculiar comic and satirical tone, which is particularly felt in the first half. This does not prevent, but rather helps to highlight the strikingly posed in the picture sharp social and psychological problems. ... As any Y. Raizman's film, his new movie is professionally perfect and talent, and most importantly - without the didactics"(Gromov, 1986, p. 90).

M. Zak compared the films *Without Witnesses* by N. Mikhalkov and *Epilogue* by M. Khutsiev: "There are movies-dialogues on the conflict basis. The conflict between humanistic positions and moral anomaly" (Zak, 1986, p. 37).

Drama *Life, Tears and Love* also received the high mark from the Yearbook: "This film has sophistication and beauty (landscape, music, expressions of human faces), stylistically underlined. It is generally characteristic of the artistic handwriting of the director N. Gubenko" (Afanasyev, 1986, pp. 92-93).

A. Gerber wrote an excellent review about the parable *The Parade of Planets*: "Cinema world of V. Abdrashitov and A. Mindadze does require active participation from the audience. Live your life without thinking and without straining too, of course, possible. But if we remember that we live the last time, and other such case is no longer imagine involuntarily want to present to him the requirements higher than the simplest organism... We still belong to the world, and all the disasters in us. *The Parade of Planets*, in my opinion, just about it" (Gerber, 1986, p. 97).

Young at that time film critic A. Erokhin (1954-2000) published perhaps his most traditional style review (on the crime drama *Joint Offenders*): "Do we always happen are attentive and sympathetic to the family and others? It always give the right to vote their conscience? Whether always you live as it should, as a decent man? That's what the film says" (Erokhin, 1986, p. 103).

R. Yurenev was extremely strict and harsh against Y. Yevtushenko's poetic autobiography *Kindergarten*: "The main failure of the movie is cluttered, pretentious script. Its episodes are loosely coupled, multi-style, often imitative, secondary" (Yurenev, 1986, p. 100).

Screen 1987 (1987, put in a set in September 1986)

At first glance, it seems strange that *Screen 1987* was published right after *Screen 1983-1984*. However, in reality everything is explained quite simply: the compilers of the Yearbook felt that the gap between the year indicated on the cover of the book and real year sales become too large. For example, *Screen 1983-1984* came to buyers only in 1986. Thus, it was decided to "jump" a few years: *Screen 1987* arrived in bookstores in 1987.

Yes, *Screen 1987* reached readers in rough perestroika in 1987, but this Yearbook was put into a set in a relatively quiet 1986, and its content is still reminiscent of *Screen 1983-1984*.

Of course, the impact of the perestroika are already felt in the pages of *Screen 1987*. Obvious signs of this: no servile reactions critics on solutions of XXVII Soviet Communist Party Congress and the Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee *On the shortcomings in the practice of the acquisition or rental of foreign films*.

Yes, *Screen 1987* released the propagandist article of V. Baskakov about week film *Battle for Moscow*, arguing that "This movie is actively involved in the ideological struggle, fighting fakes and insinuations about the second world war, which threw a lot of screens western film market" (Baskakov, 1987, p. 90).

However, others trends dominated in this times. For example, E. Gromov published a positive review of the war drama *Come and See* by E. Klimov (he was elected the head of the Union of Cinematographers in May 1986): "If you plunge into the atmosphere of the idea of the film, the more clearly realize the highest truth of the artist, who has decided to show the suffering of the people, the height of their spirit and lowlands fall as they were in their stark reality" (Gromov, 1987, p. 92).

E. Stishova gave the highest praise recently "bookshelf"'s masterpiece *My Friend Ivan Lapshin* by A. German, noting that "the density of this cinema world, such as in the third and fourth viewing, discover new details. The author controls every piece of cinematic, nothing

is "just so". Each plan, each angle, every detail are associated with the concept, with the plan as closely as possible the past. There is nothing accidental, nothing official, drawn into the frame as a backup story" (Stishova, 1987, p. 109). L. Mamatova supported satirical film *The Blue Mountains* by E. Shengelaja (Mamatova, 1987, p. 106).

A. Plakhov wrote meaningful and thoughtful article on the relationship between film and literary classics. Reflecting on the S. Soloviev's films, A. Plakhov noted some "curious clash of the "two cultures" of moral and everyday behavior made in his teen trilogy. Drama emerging young soul is checked each time in the spirit of the classics, whether Lermontov, Tolstoy or Pushkin. And, there are (sometimes even contrary to the intentions of the author) reveal the cultural incompatibility of classic designs and the world hits, jeans, chewing gum" (Plakhov, 1987, p. 39).

Going further to the analysis of the film *A Few Days in the I.I. Oblomov's Life* A. Plakhov concluded that "this is the most complicated case of experiments with classics... The artistic consciousness of the director N. Mikhalkov with equal ease to adapt classical harmony, stylistic elegance of the forms and momentary, sometimes the surface tension builds. Doing *Oblomov*, he famously included the characters of the novel in the epicenter of the current talk about "business people"... This film is too relevant, in order to preserve the continuity of the thread with a Goncharov's masterpiece, but the movie turned out to be one of the possible interpretations and found novel characteristic of classical perfection" (Plakhov, 1987, p. 43).

In this context, A. Plakhov was convinced that *Vassa* by G. Panfilov "especially weighty in recent years confirms the intrinsic value of a specific type of film adaptation based on the inner, but not on a formal relationship with the classical primary source" (Plakhov, 1987, p. 43).

D. Urnov wrote about the screen versions of Russian classic play much more severely: criticizing *Cruel Romance* by E. Ryazanov: "Classic text does not allow for such treatment themselves. Text dies but does not surrender, and the "winner" received anything. And at the same time and the audience also left with nothing" (Urnov, 1987, p. 32).

A. Romanenko, in my view, correctly noted that film *We Were Young* by M. Belikov (1940-2012) "is a continuation of his film *The Night is Short*. But the style is fundamentally different. If there would be difficult to draw the line between lyrical feelings of the characters and the author's confession, the author here is not so fused with their characters, not so frank, not in the least gives himself" (Romanenko, 1987, p. 114).

S. Shumakov exactly defined the genre of comedy *Love and Pigeons* by V. Menshov: a tantalizing folk fantasy: "The authors passionately want to please their audience. ... The simplicity of *Love and Pigeons* is deceptive.

Before us, of course, a splint, but it is quite modern" (Shumakov, 1987, p. 115).

Screen 1988 (1988, put in a set in September 1987)

Screen 1988 was already really the product of perestroika. The first time the authors of this Yearbook wrote their articles without regard to censorship and even on the 70th anniversary of Soviet power.

L. Mamatova (1935-1996) gave the sharp critical intonation: "The landscape of cinema changed in the late 1970s and early 1980s... For example, about 360 movies on a contemporary topic was filmed in 1981-1985. And how many of them are phenomena of true art? There may be disputes: 5, 15 or 20. ... The others films escaped from the conflicts, in other words - from the problems of reality itself..." (Mamatova, 1988, p. 20).

N. Zorkaya (1924-2006) presents the remarkable article dedicated to the main film person of cinema-perestroika - T. Abuldaze (1924-1994). She considered his anti-totalitarian parable *Repentance* in the frame of philosophical and poetic trilogy: "Film says convincingly historical and artistic truth - "evil, which came to power is a dead end." And "social evil is so destructive, that is able to destroy itself". This is the main idea of the film director. His creation, Screen terrible and absurd time, illuminated by faith and love, it inspires, gives a clue of hope" (Zorkaya, 1988, p. 118).

K. Scherbakov wrote about another previously banned the film - *Tests on the Roads* by A. German: "Bitter that the film lay on the shelf for many years. Well, it turned out that the breath so long" (Shcherbakov, 1988, p. 90).

E. Gromov published a positive review of "shelving" drama *Theme* by G. Panfilov: "This film is unusual for our cinema... The main questions of art are questions not only aesthetic, but also ethical, ideological, universally valid... *Theme* is bold, bright, deeply patriotic film. ... Burned ice and fire of truth. Probably, and now the film there will be opponents. But I am convinced, the supporters will be immeasurably more" (Gromov, 1988, pp. 95-98).

G. Kapralov praised fantastic antiwar film *Dead Man's Letters* (Kapralov, 1988, p. 85). A. Troshin praised the exquisite film *Keep me, my talisman* by R. Balayan (Troshin, 1988, p.108). A. Romanenko highly commended the film *Games for children of school age*: "This film not only about the "difficult children", but also about the difficult fate of teenagers because they need love, affection and trust" (Romanenko, 1988, p.103).

S. Shumakov unexpectedly gave a sharply critical assessment of *Wild Pigeon* by S. Soloviov (Shumakov, 1988, p.101).

It is interesting to note that *Screen 1988* has two articles devoted to the problems of film studies and film criticism.

S. Drobashenko began his article with the criticism of the situation in the Soviet film studies: "Film Studies has come to us in the mid-eighties as a narrative branch of knowledge. In fact there is a logic and historical reasons. Cinema science for a long time has been busy formulating their own methodology, collecting facts. Problem analysis (as more mature) stage is yet to come... After the war, it was, as before, with rare exceptions, inert, passive descriptive. ... And ultimately, film criticism lost a place in the public consciousness... The crisis began... because Soviet film studies is not trying (and never seriously tried) to identify patterns of vibrations level feature films in various stages of cinema, discover the causes of periodically increasing the flow of gray cinema"(Drobashenko, 1988, pp. 143-144).

Next S. Drobashenko went on to criticize the publishing activities in the field of cinema: "In 1985 it was about 60 books on cinematography; for 1986 - about the same. Fundamental research on the fundamental problems of history and theory of cinema has not been published at all in recent times. ... Film studies books, designed for professionals, as it turns out, is not profitable to publish: one continuous losses..." (Drobashenko, 1988, p. 146). It seems that a lot of this has been true. But when S. Drobashenko passed to the examples, it is clear that his criticism was form yesterday's propaganda: "Truly scientific, uncompromising civic history of the Soviet cinema has not yet been written. ... Out of sight out of researchers and something more important: ... on-screen interpretation of socialism as the leading, uniting the forces of society. And that's not film studies, but a serious ideological blunder" (Drobashenko, 1988, p. 145).

M. Zak expressed his opinion about the movie and film studies process, based on the more advanced position: "We must equally refers directly to the creative process and to estimates of ready-made films"(Zak, 1988, p.31).

Screen 1989 (1989, put in a set in September 1988)

Screen 1989 was put into a set in the autumn of 1988, when perestroika continued to gain momentum. And Yearbook published the analytical text about A. Tarkovsky (1932-1986): "His film *The Mirror* could be called even shorter word - *Home*... Home, family, holy trinity: mother, father, child are an echo of the *Andrei Rublev*, Tarkovsky's movie about the destruction, devastation of his native land, the destruction of the house and its reunification in the frescoes. Man, losing the house, leaving the house, cut off or break away from home, becomes a blade of grass in the wind, it blows in the world's oceans, and the oceans too sensitive to apostasy, to break away from the parental home, to the emptiness of the parental nest. Recall the final of *Solaris*: the prodigal son on his knees before his father, the citation of Rembrandt in the midst of the rebellious ethereal matter,

which, however, return it to pacify his son to his father, his remorse, his request for forgiveness" (Zolotusky, 1989, p. 78).

E. Stishova's article was the key article in *Screen* 1989. She wrote: "The audience began to ignore the social problem films: this fact which needed and needs to be explained. Film critics, sociologists and cultural studies researchers offer different concepts. Some complain of stiffness, the rationality of the director's thinking, the deficit mentality. Others draw attention to global processes, and seized us sinners. Yes, the polarization of the tastes and preferences, yes, the prevalence of younger audiences and the related need for entertainment genres: all these is true. But is the ability to light up a general social interest, general social emotions lost forever? And the final burst of romanticism is gone, along with the 1960s? It turned out there, is not lost. Will see very soon" (Stishova, 1989, pp. 31-32).

E. Stishova tried to summarize the cinema tendencies: "Criticism has not answered the question, to whom and why it was necessary to uproot from the cinema all that is connected with the drama of human life in general. Born slang word "blackness". A new look at the last war is the blackness. The crisis of the Russian Empire, gave birth to a revolutionary situation in Russia is blackness. The difficulties of post-war life is blackness. Objective contradictions of modern social development is blackness. Non conformist talent is blackness ... Cinematography rescued two factors. Factor of the objective cinema development, which it is impossible to curb... The second factor is the persistent artists, true to himself... They are exist, luckily for us... We have to understand the differences and paradoxes of cinematic development of 1970s-1980s. On the one hand, an unprecedented drop the zero level. And world-class achievements on the other. And all this in parallel, in a historical situation" (Stishova, 1989, pp. 33-34).

Thinking about the future of the national cinema, E. Stishova was convinced that "cinema needed the injection of culture... But this is the problem more difficult. ... What the viewer is necessary? It is the question of questions. Here it is necessary to determine in the main, strategic point: whether to go for cinematography audience, or try to lead him away. The second way is much more difficult: in contrast to the first, a proven practice of the last decade, there is no recipe. In addition, this way is long: it is designed for a certain level of culture of perception" (Stishova, 1989, pp. 34-35).

V. Tolstykh supported the thoughts of E. Stishova: "The relationships between film and spectator are dialectical. This means that the viewer, being the customer cinema, at the same time is the object of art education. ... The viewer do not always selective and demanding in their tastes and expectations. ... The problem is probably exists in the nature of the relationships that are emerging and established between the spectator

and the cinema. In fact, usually a "magnetic field", social and aesthetic, there is between the screen and the viewer" (Tolstykh, 1989, p. 142).

Against the background of the current total domination of the entertainment cinema further arguments of V. Tolstykh read already tinged with nostalgia for the lost: "Personally, I'm not against entertainment. But when they become the main or primary spiritual food of millions, the state agree that there is more than strange and disturbing. ... However, another point of view expressed, according to which each of us is only "employee plus consumer" who is entitled to fun and relax after a hard day. But this view of man has nothing in common with socialism, but very satisfied with the bureaucrats. ... The idea is unenviable: you did a good job, and I will give you the opportunity to relax. And then cinema turns to filmmaking satisfaction of the working masses' current needs, and the main function of the film is declared "restoration" of physical and nervous powers of man (more precisely, the employee). ... As soon as the market will begin to penetrate into the sphere of culture, worsen the problem of humanization of our art and its relationship to human beings and human needs" (Tolstykh, 1989, p.143).

The bulk of the Yearbook dedicated to national cinema, was re-assigned to the movies on a contemporary topic. And polemical section again appeared on the pages of the book: A. Gerber, M. Kuznetsova and S. Shumakov arguing about the film *Plumbum, or The Dangerous Game*.

A. Gerber believes that "this film about the destructive power of the social activity that it carries, is not supported by moral ideals, devoid of moral guidelines" (Gerber, 1989, p.124).

But M. Kuznetsova was strongly disagrees with this view: "I am afraid that the younger generation can perceive *Plumbum* as an example for others to follow" (Kuznetsova, 1989, p. 130).

S. Shumakov was even harsher in his assessment: "Cold outside perspective in which no sympathy... And as a result the authors are also prisoners of their own design. The main character sensitively shamelessly manipulates people. It's immoral. But, proving to us that, the filmmakers have not noticed, as the hero began to manipulate, have lost their moral guidelines" (Shumakov, 1989, pp. 131-134).

A. Romanenko created generalization of interpretations of youth topics in the cinema: "We need to recognize that the inner life of a young man remained closed for decades, not because so complex and non-contact our children, but because art dreaded look into their features, describe their habits, listen to sincere confession. Because it would require new methods and analysis, and civil courage, and readiness even to the fact that the film can be forbidden. The obstacles were too strong for such films and books... Now the art has begun to catch up, but it does sometimes frantically and quickly penetrates only the top layer of life. Because the life requires new

forms of art and communication, and new analysis tools, equipment and philosophical and sociological thinking, and the gift of a publicist. ... Even a decade ago it has been widely distributed three points of view on the current generation of young people. Some have argued that young people have a great, heroic, almost completely burning enthusiasm. Others have focused on the negative phenomena in the youth environment, even exaggerated their scale. Others sneered: two thousand years ago, the world lamented the fall of morals of young, and this is age-old story. But none was able to grasp the true essence of the concerns of young people themselves, to feel the guilt and responsibility of the older generation, to understand the role of the social atmosphere that prevailed in the seventies and has influenced the spiritual warehouse for young attitude. Today young people has become a key issue both in life and in art. We found a deep connection between the issues of education and the need for further democratization of society in general"(Romanenko, 1989, pp. 43-46).

The article by V. Shmyrov was a kind of illustration of this. Film critic wrote about *Courier* by K. Shakhnazarov: "This film is natural doubly: is it possible to talk about young people, without counting on the complicity of the audience? In any case, the film does not reduce the level of conversation about real spiritual values, which, in my opinion, to form his central problem" (Shmyrov, 1989, p. 122).

The Yearbook published positive articles about films *Lefty* by S. Ovcharov (Turin, 1989, p.102), *Sign of Misfortune* by M. Ptashuk (1943-2002) (Yurenev, 1989, p. 96) and the creative portrait of film director K. Muratova (Zorky, 1989, p. 157).

Screen 1990 (1990, put in a set in November 1989)

Screen 1990, alas, put the final point in the history of the Yearbook...

Freed from censorship conventions A. Erokhin wrote the brief review of the history of the Soviet cinema. He noted that the concept of "mass culture" is universal, not exclusively Western, as it was considered in the Soviet official film studies. A "mass man" is practically almost the only type of hero of Soviet films, especially in the 1930s-1940s-1950s. Bouncy hard worker, who enthusiastically welcomes any communist ordinary appeal: to raise the virgin soil or to shoot the enemies, to build a Railway or blame the intelligentsia. This character, which is produced by the official Soviet culture for decades is the ideal of "mass man." In approaching this ideal in reality, Soviet cinema achieved very great success. "Mass Man" always willingly going into easily manageable crowd. ... The history of the Soviet cinema must be rewritten" (Erokhin, 1990, pp. 8-10).

V. Shmyrov also wrote the article about the history of the Soviet cinema. He insisted that it is necessary to revise the official textbooks on

the history of the Soviet cinema, who praised conjunctural movies (like *Communist*, *Red Bells*, *Trust* or *Lenin in Paris*) in favor of the communist regime (Shmyrov, 1990, pp. 15-18).

Addressing by the recent history of the Soviet cinema, L. Elnikova wrote that even in the most difficult years of stagnation *Lenfilm* produced such sharp social films as *Old Wall*, *Prohindiada*, *Guys*, *My Friend Ivan Lapshin*, *Twenty Days Without War*, *Dead Man's Letters* (Elnikova, 1990, p. 28).

Screen 1990 discussion section was set aside for social drama *Little Vera* by V. Pichul (1961-2015), one the main sensation 1980s.

V. Bozhovich was one of the many supporters of V. Pichul's debut film: "*Little Vera* it seems to me the work of the most mature and promising. It is absolutely no stylistic frills, but achieved rare unity between the subject, manner of narration, visual solutions ... performance of the actors, reaching full compliance between the situation, gesture, intonation and a replica. Those who do not like the film (and there are sure to be many), it will throw a reproach to naturalism. I do not agree with such a reproach. ... The authors of *Little Vera* do not tend to write off the human meanness on the household environment. Here the characters are not opposed to the circumstances, do not suffer under their yoke, but there are with them in some sluggish agreement. Too candid image of sexual entertainment of young people angered many. And the other is not outraged? The whole picture of life, the truth of which can hardly be any doubt, do not make trouble? ... You want to see life as it is? Go and see *Little Vera*. If you want something "beautiful", helped to keep spiritual comfort: no problems, there are a variety of other films, a complete set of comforting and entertaining surrogates. But I prefer *Little Vera* and I hope that it will open in our cinema a new direction: the direction of the harsh and bitter realism. I think that is exactly what we need now in terms of public awareness"(Bozovic, 1990, p.128).

Y. Bogomolov was a more restrained, but also positive: "It turned out that not a cleft between the generations (as one might think, looking at the film *Courier*), but the gulf. ... Usually the conflict between "fathers" and "children" embodies of the romantic style. Here, both generations are mired in stagnation and semi-conscious in a completely mutual exasperation. ... However, the authors' courage has its limits. It is evident that at some point they could not hold on, not to smooth the acuteness of collisions. This is reflected in the fact that the "children" slightly romanticized, i.e. appear more conscious living" (Bogomolov, 1990, p. 129).

But S. Shumakov watched *Little Vera* from a different perspective: "Alas, here it is necessary to recognize that the "children" ... appear more relaxed and smarter because the adults look more stupid, primitive, and sometimes caricature" (Shumakov, 1990, p.131).

Continuing the analysis of the films of the youth topic, M. Kuznetsova emphasized that *Assa* by S. Soloviev "was a success, and not just among young people. The director gave away all the sisters on earrings, each viewer will find in the picture that corresponds to his preferences and to satisfy the demands of cinematic spectacle. ... Collage, magic charms, prudently adjusted" (Kuznetsova, 1990, pp. 132-134).

V. Ivanova wrote about *Temptation* by V. Sorokin. She urged the readers that this film "inherits the best traditions of our school movie: respect for the youngest, the conversation is not on different levels, but on an equal footing, because even the smallest creature scurrying you somewhere underfoot is personality in the highest sense of this word. That is it, it can be and is already bad, and already good, but they come to life in society, they have the amount of claims, but there is also the sum of pledges. ... Yes, some say, it is necessary as soon as possible to introduce children to the injection of adult life. I do not know. But let's still be introduced gradually, with anesthesia. And in any case, with love, as in the *Temptation* (Ivanova, 1990, p.152).

Extensive articles of L. Anninsky and S. Freilich focused on the difficult fate of the masterpieces of "thaw" cinematography: *The Story of Asya Klyachina (Asya Happiness)* by A. Konchalovsky and *I Am Twenty* by M. Khutsiev.

L. Anninsky wrote: "Konchalovsky's films are not connected in a chain, and it is aware of. He is not like those directors that, like Tarkovsky, Shukshin and Khutsiev beating at one point whole life, deep into a topic... He's different, he does not have one world, there is no single solution to it, and in every case the set "the only solutions." He should look for a new solution for each film, it is necessary to invent it again, it is necessary to reinvent the wheel. The main thing is not to be repeated. He was not repeated. Never. Strictly highlighted asceticism of *First Teacher*, crumble, elegiac *Uncle Vanya*, the playful splendor of nostalgic *The Noble Nest* and crystallized epic *Siberiade* with several generations stretched under the "night star"... The appearance of *The Story of Asya Klyachina* in this way is one of the mysteries of art. It really is a miracle: a great film, created as if at the next formal reception. Then double-double miracle and mystery. Firstly, this movie is made completely "formless", "out of style", but this film, I am convinced, is worthy to enter into the history of world cinema as a masterpiece, in which form and content are one another. And, secondly, it is here, at the junction of receptions a revelation born, making *The Story of Asya Klyachina* is not only the best work of Konchalovsky, but one of the key points in the self-knowledge of a whole generation, the whole era" (Anninsky, 1990, p.188).

S. Freilich argued that "the process of spiritual revival of the film *I Am Twenty* by M. Khutsiev occupies a special place. The film was the fact

that not only art, but also the fact of social struggle. ... Three friends, young characters of the film, freedom-loving, independent, ironic, straightforward, vulnerable, with a great sense of dignity, they cannot be lackeys, and they were potential opponents in the eyes of the pillars of the bureaucratic regime" (Freilich, 1990, p.193).

A section of creative portraits of filmmakers was very strong in the *Screen 1990*. A. Zorky (1935-2006), in particular, wrote about the works of film director A. Smirnov (Zorky, 1990, p.164), I. Shilova (1937-2011) admired the talent of the great actor O. Borisov (1929-1994) (Shilova, 1990, p. 177), and L. Zakrzewskaya appreciated actor V. Gostyukhin (Zakrzhevskaya, 1990, p. 182).

Changes of the ratio of the articles about the Soviet and foreign films under the pressure of the political situation

It is interesting to note that Yearbook significantly changed the ratio of materials about the Soviet and foreign films under the pressure of the political situation (Table 2).

Table 2. Ratio of materials about the Soviet and foreign cinema in the 'Screen' Yearbooks

Yearbooks titles	The volume of materials on the Soviet cinema (%)	The volume of materials about foreign cinema (%)	The volume of information materials (filmography, awards, etc.) (%)
Screen 1964	68	27	5
Screen 1965	63	28	9
Screen 1966-1967	59	29	12
Screen 1967-1968	54	43	3
Screen 1968-1969	62	35	3
Screen 1969-1970	46	45	9
Screen 1970-1971	63	35	2
Screen 1971-1972	44	47	9
Screen 1973-1974	51	44	5
Screen 1974-1975	75	19	6
Screen 1975-1976	62	33	5
Screen 1976-1977	64	29	7
Screen 1977-1978	60	32	8
Screen 1978-1979	57	36	7
Screen 1979-1980	65	29	6
Screen 1980-1981	60	40	0
Screen 1981-1982	67	33	0
Screen 1982-1983	69	31	0
Screen 1983-1984	72	28	0

Screen 1987	59	33	8
Screen 1988	60	31	9
Screen 1989	62	32	6
Screen 1990	66	26	8

As can be seen from Table 2, the amount of material on the Soviet cinema in the first five years an average of twice the number of pages on the amount of articles about foreign cinema. However, the Resolutions of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio and television, film, culture and art institutions for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire" (07.01.1969), "On Literary Criticism" (21.01.1972) and "On measures for further development of Soviet cinema" (02.08.1972) played a leading role. In the *Screen 1969-1970* and *Screen 1971-1972* amount of material on the Soviet and foreign cinema almost on par, and, starting with the *Screen 1973-1974*, the volume of articles on Soviet cinema has always greatly exceeded the amount of foreign materials, reaching the highest threshold in the *Screen 1974-1975* (75% vs. 19%) and *Screen 1983-1984* (72% vs. 28%).

The equality between the materials about the film industry of the socialist and Western countries in the Screens in the light of communist Party Resolutions this could be equated with the "propaganda of the bourgeois cinema", and the compilers of yearbooks were apparently sensitive for it. Yearbook listened to the directives of the Resolutions, where it was clearly stated the necessity to promote the socialist movies with communist ideology and criticism from all western movies (Resolution..., 1972).

So there is nothing surprising in the fact that, starting with the *Screen 1973-1974*, and up to the time of perestroika: the articles on the cinema of the socialist and developing countries, loyal to the Soviet Union was dominated in the materials about foreign cinema.

Why informational materials (filmography, information about prizes at festivals, etc.) disappeared on the threshold of the 1980s, and only appeared in the *Screen 1987*? Here it is hard to assume any direct influence of censorship and Resolutions: lists of the films in the Soviet box office were not secret (at the same times, they always appear in the December issue of the *Soviet Screen*). Perhaps the *Screen* wanted to save on annual volume of books?

The content of yearbooks were the materials that are already published previously (in the *Soviet Screen*, *Cinema Art*, *Soviet Culture*, *Film Festival Satellite* and others.), some texts written specifically for a particular collection. Thus, the drafters thought, "screens" were supposed to provide readers not only the annual panorama of cinema, but also the best, most relevant articles of the Soviet film critics and film experts. 24

issues of *Screen* thematic collections were published from 1965 to 1990. The volume of each of the Yearbook was from 175 to 388 pages. Each Yearbook published dozens of articles, artistic portraits and interviews relating to both the Soviet and foreign cinema.

Standard Yearbooks' structure was as follows:

- Section "Close-up" (on the achievements of the Soviet cinema of the current period);
- "Controversy", "Discussion" (review of Soviet films, caused controversy, controversial opinions);
- "Reflections and reviews" (theoretical articles that analyze trends, genres and types of films);
- "Portraits" (creative portraits of Soviet filmmakers);
- "Creative Stand" (articles of Soviet masters of the screen - directors, actors);
- "Before the film, after the film," "Club of interesting meetings" (interview with the masters of Soviet cinema);
- "Anniversaries," "People, events, films," "Pages from the history of cinema" (article to anniversaries screen masters and distinguished films, articles on the history of cinema);
- "Dating", "Screens of the world", "Meeting", "In the picture, and behind the scenes" (interview with foreign filmmakers and the articles about the foreign movie, including topics about the films and guests of Moscow and other international festivals).
- A reference section (filmographies, film awards, prizes).

From time to time Yearbook had different thematic headings (such as "Man and War", "Debuts", "Shield and Music", "Classic" and others.).

The main authors of the 'Screen' Yearbooks (1965-1990)

The compilers of the first yearbooks were critics M. Dolinsky and S. Chertok (1931-2006). S. Chertok was the only collector from 1970 to 1975. E. Bauman and G. Dolmatovskaya were the collectors of *Screen 1974-1975* and *Screen 1975-1976*. Y. Turin (1938-2016) and G. Dolmatovskaya were the *Screen* Yearbooks' collectors since 1978 and up to the last issue.

The authors of Yearbooks, in most cases were well-known Soviet film critics, many of which occupy leading positions in specialized editions of magazines and newspapers, in the film institutes (Table 3).

Table 3. The main authors of the 'Screen' Yearbooks (1965-1990)

№	The names of film experts, film critics, the most frequently published article on the subject of the Soviet feature films in the	The number of articles published by these film experts, film critics on the subject of the Soviet feature films in the <i>Screen</i> Yearbook
---	--	---

	<i>Screen Yearbook</i>	
1	Y. Turin *	17
2-3	M. Dolinsky & S. Chertok **	15
4	E. Gromov	14
5	L. Zakrzhevskaya	12
6	E. Bauman	11
7	R. Yurenev	11
8	D. Pisarevsky	10
9	M. Zak	10
10	V. Baskakov	8
11	I. Levshina	8
12	T. Khloplyankina	8
13	I. Shilova	8
14	A. Zorky	8
15	L. Anninsky	7
16	V. Ivanova ***	7
17	G. Kapralov	6
18	M. Kuznetsova	6
19	A. Medvedev	6
20	N. Sumenov	6
21	J. Warsawsky	6

* Some Y. Turin's articles were published under the pen name as Samarin.

* Some articles of M. Dolinsky & S. Chertok also printed under the pen names as M. Zinoviev and S. Markov. Some their materials are available in the *Screen* collections without reference to the authorship.

*** Some V. Ivanova's articles also printed under the pen name as V. Esina.

1. Dr. Y. Turin (1938-2016), film critic, editor, novelist and screenwriter. He graduated from the Institute of Cinematography (1962). He worked as an editor at the publishing house *Soviet Russia* (1962-1974). Since 1974, he has become a leading researcher at the Research Institute of Film Arts. He was the winner of the Award of Union of Cinematographers (1981). Author of several books on the subject of cinema.

2-3. M. Dolinsky (born in 1930) is journalist, film critic and editor. S. Chertok (1931-2006) was journalist, film critic, editor. He was the head of information section in *Soviet Screen* from 1964 to 1975, the researcher in Research Institute of Theory and History of Cinema from 1976 to 1979. Author of several books on the subject of cinema. Since 1979, he lived in Israel, where he successfully continued his journalistic activities.

4. Prof. Dr. E. Gromov (1931-2005), film critic, screenwriter, film educator. He graduated from the Moscow State University (1954). He was a member of the Communist Party. He was the researcher at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences, State Institute of Art Academy of Sciences, Research Institute of Theory and History of Cinema. He wrote the scripts for several popular scientific and documentary films. He was also

professor in the Institute of Cinematography (1967-1969, 1987-2005). Author of several books on the subject of cinema.

5. Dr. L. Zakrzhevskaya (born in 1940), film critic and screenwriter. She graduated from the the Institute of Cinematography. Author of many articles on the subject of cinema.

6. E. Bauman (1932-2017), film critic, editor. She graduated from Institute of Theater Art (1955). She was the head of Department of Soviet cinema in the magazine *Soviet Screen* for many years.

7. Prof. Dr. R. Yurenev (1912-2002), film critic, screenwriter, film educator. He graduated from the Institute of Cinematography (1936). He was the winner of the Award of Union of Cinematographers. He taught the Institute of Cinematography (1939-2002). He also worked in the magazine *Cinema Art* (1946-1948), in the Institute of Art History of the Academy of Sciences (1948-1974), Research Institute of Theory and History of Cinema (1974-2002). He was the author of many works on the history, genre and ideological problems of cinematography. He wrote the scripts of the several documentaries. He was one of the most influential representatives of the official Soviet film critics, receiving accreditation to the major international film festivals.

8. Dr. D. Pisarevsky (1912-1990), film critic, screenwriter and editor. He graduated from the Academy of Communist education (1934). He was a member of the Communist Party. He was Chief Editor of *Soviet Screen* (1961-1975), the author of several books and many articles on the topic of cinema. He was one of the most influential representatives of the official Soviet film critics in 1960s – 1970s.

9. Dr. M. Zak (1929-2011), film critic, film researcher. He graduated from the Institute of Cinematography (1952). He was a member of the Communist Party. Since 1974 he worked at the Research Institute of Theory and History of Cinema, has gone from a research assistant to the Deputy Director. He was the winner of the prize *Nika* for achievements in the field of film studies (2004), the author of many books and articles on the theory and history of cinema.

10. Prof. Dr. V. Baskakov (1921-1999), film critic. He was a member of the Communist Party. He held the post of first deputy chairman of the State Committee for Cinematography of the USSR (1963-1973), and director of the Research Institute for History and Theory of Cinema / Motion Picture Arts Research Institute (1973-1987). Author of many books and articles, mainly devoted to foreign films and ideological struggle on the screen. He was one of the most influential representatives of the official Soviet film critics, receiving accreditation to the major international film festivals.

11. Dr. I. Levshina (1932-2009), film critic, film educator. She graduated from the Moscow State University (1954). Author of books

dedicated to the works of leading Russian actors, and problems of film education in schools.

12. T. Khloplyankina (1937-1993), film critic, screenwriter and editor. She graduated from the Institute of Cinematography (1959). She worked in the *Culture* newspaper, *Literary Gazette*. She was also the deputy editor in *Soviet Screen* (1990-1992). She was the author of many articles about cinema.

13. Dr. I. Shilova (1937-2011), film critic, film educator. She graduated from the Institute of Cinematography (1962). She worked in Research Institute for History and Theory of Cinema and Institute of Cinematography. She was the author of many books and articles about cinema.

14. A. Zorky (1935-2006), film critic and journalist. He graduated from the Institute of Cinematography. For several decades he worked in the *Literary Gazette*, *Soviet Screen*, and *Cinema Art*. He was the author of many articles about cinema.

15. L. Anninsky (born in 1934), film critic, literary critic, editor. He graduated from the Philological Faculty of Moscow State University (1956). Laureate the prizes of Cinematographers' Union (1980), *Literary Russia* (1984, 1999), *October* (1983), *Literary Review* (1988, 1989), *Zvezda* (1995), *Archer* (1996; 1998), television *TEFI* (1996). He worked in the magazine *Soviet Union* (1956-1957), in the *Literary Gazette* (1957-1960), in the journal *Znamya* (1960-1967), at the Institute of Concrete Sociological Research (1968-1972), in magazine *Friendship of peoples* (1972-1991), *Literary Review* (1990-1992), *Homeland* (1992) He is the author of many books and articles on cinema.

16. V. Ivanova (1937-2008), film critic, journalist and editor. He worked in *Moskovsky Komsomolets* and *Soviet Culture*. She was a member of Communist Party. She was the author of many articles on cinema.

17. Dr. G. Kapralov (1921-2010), film critic, journalist, writer. He was a member of Communist Party. He held the prestigious post of deputy head of Department of Literature and Art in the main Soviet newspaper *Pravda*. As the correspondent of *Pravda* he visited regularly at major international film festivals. He headed the Moscow section of the critics of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR (1962-1986). He held also the post of vice-president International Federation of Film Critics (FIPRESCI) (1967-1986). He was the anchorman of a popular Soviet TV program *Cinema Panorama* (1976-1979). He was the author of several books and many articles on the topic of cinema. He was one of the most influential representatives of the official Soviet film critics in 1960s – 1980s.

18. M. Kuznetsova, a film critic, journalist, author of several articles on the cinema.

19. Dr. A. Medvedev (born in 1938), film critic, editor, film educator. He graduated from the Institute of Cinematography (1960). Honored Artist of Russia, twice winner of the *Nika* Award. He was a member of Communist Party. He worked in the Bureau of Propaganda of Soviet cinema as a guidance counselor, head of lecture department, and since 1964 - the director. He was editor of *Soviet Film* (1966-1972). Since 1972 he worked as the deputy editor, and (from 1982 to 1984) as editor in chief of the magazine *Cinema Art*. He was the first deputy (1987-1989) and chairman (1989-1991) of the State Committee for Cinematography of the USSR. The top of the career was position of the chairman of the State Committee for Cinematography of the Russian Federation (1992-1999). Since 1999 he is President of the International Fund for Film and Television Development for Children and Youth (Rolan Bykov Foundation). He is the author of several books and many articles about cinema.

20. Dr. N. Sumenov (1938-2014), film critic, editor, film educator. He graduated from the Institute of Cinematography. He was a member of Communist Party, the chief editor of experimental creative association in *Mosfilm*. He was also editor manager in *Cinema Art* and advisor of the Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation and member of the State Council, and professor in taught in Institute of Cinematography. He was the author of many works on the subject of cinema.

21. J. Warsawsky (1911-2000), film critic, screenwriter and editor. He graduated from Institute of Theater Art (1935). He was a member of Communist Party. He worked as a deputy editor of *Cinema Art*. He was the author of many books and articles on cinema topic.

Conclusions

So, *Screen Yearbooks* more than a quarter century became a sort of mirror of the Soviet criticism of the 1960s - 1980s, reflecting its ups and downs, forced to default figures, ideological passages, thaw and perestroika hopes...

Russian film criticism changed significantly now, but compared to thaw and perestroika times not always in the best possible way. For example, glamorous and glossy, often superficial film critics dominate in the press and Internet...

Many of the authors of the *Screen Yearbooks* for a long time are no longer alive... Some of the critics have gone into other professions... But life goes on, and the Russian film criticism, in my opinion, still be able to delight true fans of the film art deep level of analysis...

References

Afanasyev, A. (1986). Is still much room... *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 91-93.

- Alexeev, M. (1976). Alexander Dovzhenko. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 138-140.
- Alexeev, M. (1978). Army of the people and the movie screen. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 44-54.
- Alexeev, M. (1983). Miraculous power (Sholokhov and movie) // *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 22-27.
- Alexeeva, N. (1985). Is not so little - to be a mother... (Lyudmila Zaitseva). *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp.118-124.
- Andreev, B. (1987). The road to the title role (Marina Levtova). *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 135-140.
- Anninsky, L. (1965). Exactly what people need. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 121-125.
- Anninsky, L. (1967). It's not the point, daddy! *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 98-104.
- Anninsky, L. (1968). Eulogy for Vikniksor, connoisseur of Latin. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 53-55.
- Anninsky, L. (1968). Thoughts after the film. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 27-34.
- Anninsky, L. (1969). A Unconventional triangle. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 80-81.
- Anninsky, L. (1986). Yasnaya Polyana. Astapovo. Eternity. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 82-87.
- Anninsky, L. (1990). Asya's misfortune. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 188-192.
- Babochkina, N. (1983). In the beginning was the word. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 77-80.
- Baskakov, V. (1968). Good work. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, 1968, pp. 72-75.
- Baskakov, V. (1976). They Fought for Their Country. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 24-28.
- Baskakov, V. (1982). Life Devoted to humanity. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 84-88.
- Baskakov, V. (1983). Viability of creativity (the Word of S. Gerasimov). *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 118-120.
- Baskakov, V. (1984). Multinational Soviet cinema in motion the development. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 5-12.
- Baskakov, V. (1987). Continuity of generations (Notes on young filmmakers). *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 29-35.
- Baskakov, V. (1987). Pages of History. *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 86-90.
- Baskakov, V. (1990). Yevgeny Zamyatin and cinema screen. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 287-290.
- Bauman, E. (1967). Bureaucrat, an innovator and a pair of lovers in addition. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 173-175.
- Bauman, E. (1976). Flight Formula. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 124-129.
- Bauman, E. (1977). Sons of his time. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 76-80.
- Bauman, E. (1978). Freestyle wind romance. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 104-107.
- Bauman, E. (1979). What is the happiness of the human. *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 101-103.
- Bauman, E. (1981). Fidelity great writer. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 149-151.
- Bauman, E. (1986). Time and people (Kiev-84). *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 139-144.
- Bauman, E. (1984). Know where light. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 65-67.
- Bauman, E. (1987). Link of Times (Minsk-85). *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 146-151.
- Bauman, E. (1988). Tight Knot. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 104-106.
- Bauman, E. (1990). Passion Office. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 138-143.

- Beilin, A. (1970). Actor-69. *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art, pp. 76-81.
- Belova, L. (1976). *Mothers and Daughters*. Unexpected Hero. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 89-92.
- Belova, L. (1981). At all times. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 87-89.
- Bleyman, M. (1966). Start. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 143-144.
- Bleyman, M. (1967). Reflections on stamps. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 166-170.
- Bleyman, M. (1968). Rules. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 80-82.
- Bleyman, M. (1969). Adaptation. Again?! *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 145-147.
- Bleyman, M. (1970). Archaists or innovators? *Cinema Art*, N 7.
- Bocharov, A. (1975). Intransigence and impulse. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 15-18.
- Bogomolov, Y. (1990). 'Little Vera'. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 129-130.
- Borodin, A. (1972). *The Seagull* by Alla Demidova. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 45-46.
- Borodin, A. (1975). Genocide, the thirteenth century. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 41-43.
- Bozhovich, V. (1990). 'Little Vera' *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, p.128.
- Cherepanov, Y. (1981). The man lives. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 72-75.
- Cherepanov, Y. (1984). On the rod of life. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 58-61.
- Chernyaev, P. (1985). Freaks and their faithful wives. *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp. 40-42.
- Chertok, S. (1971). Minsk: results and suggestions. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 123-128.
- Chertok, S. (1972). Nicholas Olyalin. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 60-62.
- Chertok, S. (1975). Bolot Shamshiev and his films. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 80-82.
- Demin, V. (1973). Lessons instantaneously. *Soviet Screen*. 1973, № 24, pp. 4-5.
- Demin, V. (1975). The laughter genre. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 48-51.
- Demin, V. (1988). Work hard, tormented and do not worry! *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 119-124.
- Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S. (1965). Babkauskas, which we do not know. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 114-121.
- Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S. (1967). Two films based on Pushkin. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 207-213.
- Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S. (1968). Metamorphoses. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 41-45.
- Dolinsky, M., Chertok, S. (1969). Laughter and sadness. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 107-109.
- Dolmatovskaya, G. (1984). Twenty-four hours in the life of a woman. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 74-76.
- Drach, I. (1966). Opening. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 29-32.
- Drach, I. (1969). When an artist is generous. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 88-90.
- Drobashenko, S. (1981). Impressive panorama. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 11-17.
- Drobashenko, S. (1988). Notes on the contemporary film studies. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 143-148.
- Dubrovina, I. (1967). And that Pechorin? *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 202-203.
- Egorov, A. (1976). *The Hottest Month*. About difficult simpletons. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 83-87.

- Elnikova, L. (1990). Creed. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 28-37.
- Ermash, N. (1976). Marina Neelova. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 159-161.
- Erokhin, A. (1986). What is complicity?. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 102-103.
- Erokhin, A. (1988). Non cinema war. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 93-95.
- Esina, V. (1986). Westernization of the history... *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 38-42.
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Structural analysis of a media text: stereotypes of the Soviet cinematic image of the war and the film of V. Vinogradov "Eastern Corridor" (1966). *Questions of Cultural Studies*, № 6, pp. 110-116.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). Western cinema in the mirror of the Soviet critics (for example, thematic collections of "Myths and Reality": 1966-1989). *Media Education*, N 3.
- Fomin, V. (1971). Afterword to victory. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 27-31.
- Fomin, V. (1972). High and earth. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 96-99.
- Fomin, V. (1975). Home and Away. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 28-31.
- Fomin, V. (1977). Pink veil of melodrama. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 81-84.
- Fomin, V. (1989). Undeclared. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 97-101.
- Freilich, S. (1968). Hero of Our Time. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 14-18.
- Freilich, S. (1969). One day of revolution. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 60-63.
- Freilich, S. (1982). Thinking about the film. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-95.
- Freilich, S. (1986). Talent it is work. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 134-138.
- Freilich, S. (1990). Anticipation of change. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 192-194.
- Galanov, B. (1969). Missing laughter. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 104-106.
- Gerber, A. (1975). Boy after the war. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 39-40.
- Gerber, A. (1986). Once in a thousand years. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 97-99.
- Gerber, A. (1987). Inna Churikova. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 160-164.
- Gerber, A. (1989). The boy, who are you? *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 124-129.
- Gershenson, O. (2011). Unknown Vinogradov. *Cinema Art*. № 7, pp. 136-144.
- Gorelov, D. (2001). The first row, 1961: *Amphibian Man*. <http://www.ozon.ru/context/detail/id/200781/>
- Goryunova, N. (1985). Life Lessons. *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp. 96-98.
- Gromov, E. (1969). Paphos of profession. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 94-95.
- Gromov, E. (1972). Opening personality. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 86-91.
- Gromov, E. (1976). *Romance for Lovers*. And you will call trumpeter. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 79-82.
- Gromov, E. (1977). Masters of their own fate. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 85-87.
- Gromov, E. (1978). Our contemporary Ferdowsi. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 108-111.
- Gromov, E. (1981). Plain woman, or feelings of fullness. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 89-92.
- Gromov, E. (1981). School film valtz. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 31-38.
- Gromov, E. (1982). Dream of meeting. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 54-57.
- Gromov, E. (1983). Vine Vaio Valley. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 72-75.
- Gromov, E. (1984). Thought Wings. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 54-58.
- Gromov, E. (1985). Station hopes. *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp. 81-85.
- Gromov, E. (1986). Burden wishes. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 88-90.
- Gromov, E. (1987). Khatyn Nabat. *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 91-95.
- Gromov, E. (1988). Ice and Fire truths. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 95-98.
- Ignatieva, N. (1966). Humor, poetry, wisdom. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 52-55.
- Ignatieva, N. (1967). Conversation Continued. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 28-30.
- Ignatieva, N. (1983). Next the soul. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 81-82.

- Ilyina, N. (1969). I believe ... *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 101-104.
- Inovertseva, A. (1966). The last day of vacation. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 34-37.
- Ivanova T. (1965). Cameo. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 125-130.
- Ivanova, T. (1969). "It is hard" - "harder" - "quite difficult ... *Soviet Screen*. 1969, № 24.
- Ivanova, T. (1970). "It is hard" - "harder" - "quite difficult"... *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art, pp. 90-95.
- Ivanova, T. (1976). Boris Andreev. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 148-153.
- Ivanova, T. (1976). On Friendship front. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 48-51.
- Ivanova, T. (1977). Enchanted Hundred Days. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-96.
- Ivanova, V. (1967). Alexey Tolstoy and movie. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 199-201.
- Ivanova, V. (1967). Lubov Rummyantseva. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 79-80.
- Ivanova, V. (1968). Mother's Heart. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 21-23.
- Ivanova, V. (1977). Yevgeny Leonov. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 149-153.
- Ivanova, V. (1978). Evgenia Simonova. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 128-129.
- Ivanova, V. (1990). Madonna of the gate. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 149-152.
- Janulaitis, K. (1987). Pages of heroic chronicle. *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 99-101.
- Kamshalov A. (1977). Ruler of thoughts. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 23-35.
- Kapralov, G. (1966). Films and symbols. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 82-84.
- Kapralov, G. (1967). Through the poet's heart. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 16-20.
- Kapralov, G. (1976). Birch of Yegor Prokudin. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 74-76.
- Kapralov, G. (1977). It all started with prize. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 66-69.
- Kapralov, G. (1981). Prometheus XX century. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 188-190.
- Kapralov, G. (1988). "After", which should not be. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 84-86.
- Karaganov, A. (1971). Guilties' Drama. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 57-62.
- Karaganov, A. (1972). Responsibility of the criticism. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-96.
- Karaganov, A. (1976). The Great Patriotic War in the images of Soviet cinema. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 8-16.
- Kardin, V. (1965). Both better. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 66-73.
- Kardin, V. (1966). Is parallel lines converge? *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 88-91.
- Kazakova, R. (1970). Everything should be humanly. *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art, pp. 44-46.
- Kazarinov, V. (1976). The rank is soldier of the Fatherland. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 46-48.
- Khanyutin, Y. (1969). Unfulfilled. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 112-115.
- Khanyutin, Y. (1971). On the verge of genres. Notes about the films of young. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 116-122.
- Khanyutin, Y. (1979). Nikita Mikhalkov. *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 131-136.
- Khlopyankina, T. (1965). Versus. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 110-114.
- Khlopyankina, T. (1966). Whether the ice is broken? *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 100-107.
- Khlopyankina, T. (1969). At the far, the civil. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 70-74.
- Khlopyankina, T. (1972). "With me that's what happens..." *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 75-77.
- Khlopyankina, T. (1975). Return. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 64-66.

Khloplyankina, T. (1975). Two Shurka and Tatiana. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 94-96.

Khloplyankina, T. (1976). Two travel to youth. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 120-123.

Khloplyankina, T. (1977). Hello, Dersu! *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 170-173.

Kholodov, E. (1966). Neither the letter nor the fact. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 96-97.

Klado, N. (1967). So what's the deal, the critic? *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 98-104.

Kolesnikova, N. (1966). "Do not run after the first line..." *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 144-145.

Kolesnikova, N. (1967). Sophiko Chiaureli. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 82-83.

Komarov, S. (1974). *Cinematography Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (1945-1970)*. Moscow: Institute of Cinematography, p. 62.

Korobkov, L. (1977). Nature and circumstances. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 48-58.

Korobov, V. (1981). "... About the fate of the time". *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 139-145.

Kozhevnikova, N. Learning itself. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 135-138.

Kozhukhova, G. (1972). Ilf and Petrov and others. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 72-74.

Kremlev, G. (1966). Born comic film. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 108-110.

Krivitsky, K. (1979). Contemporary (M. Ulyanov - 50). *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 147-153.

Kudin, V. Thinking about the national heroism. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 38-42.

Kukarkina, T. (1978). Success Logic. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 118-121.

Kurbatov, V. (1989). Remembrance and Hope. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 178-180.

Kuznetsov, F. (1983). The courage and the strength of the Soviet people. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 66-68.

Kuznetsov, M. (1965). Debut that promises much... *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 136-142.

Kuznetsov, M. (1965). Victory and defeat of Yegor Trubnikov. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 39-44.

Kuznetsov, M. (1978). On the human passions. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 100-104.

Kuznetsov, M. (1981). When there is a real hero. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 99-102.

Kuznetsova M. (1984). Vasily and Vasilisa. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 67-69.

Kuznetsova, M. (1983). Dostoevsky: the image. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 87-89.

Kuznetsova, M. (1985). Anxiety. *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp. 90-93.

Kuznetsova, M. (1988). For whom is the land? *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 42-46.

Kuznetsova, M. (1989). "Boy, you are who?" *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 129-131.

Kuznetsova, M. (1990). Living Souls and low season. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 132-134.

Kvasnetskaya, M. (1965). Match. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 61-65.

Kvasnetskaya, M. (1969). Not fashion talent. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 91-93.

Lagina, N. (1979). Alexei Petrenko. *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 121-126.

Levitin, M. (1986). Wait new meetings (Natalia Vavilova). *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 122-126.

- Levitin, M. (1990). Way up or search for the perpetrators. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 38-44.
- Levshina, I. (1965). Lessons of *Match*. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 60-65.
- Levshina, I. (1965). Transformations of Donia Trubnikova. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 116-121.
- Levshina, I. (1966). An invention. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 85-87.
- Levshina, I. (1967). With author wave. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 105-11.
- Levshina, I. (1968). Actor on the screen. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 76-79.
- Levshina, I. (1969). Directing or anti-directing? *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 148-149.
- Levshina, I. (1972). Two awards. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 36-38.
- Levshina, I. (1975). Life of Huckleberry Finn almost without incident. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 32-34.
- Lipkov, A. (1970). Generosity. *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art, pp. 46-49.
- Lipkov, A. (1971). A final judgment. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 62-69.
- Lipkov, A. (1972). Chekhov Cinema. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 37-44.
- Lipkov, A. (1975). Heifits Chronicle. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 24-26.
- Lishchinsky, I. (1966). The effect of participation. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 78-80.
- Lishchinsky, I. (1967). The Price of the "modern". *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp.170-172.
- Lishchinsky, I. (1968). A Stage. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 62-63.
- Listov, V. (1989). "But there is the fate of the poet...". *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 114-118.
- Lordkipanidze, N. (1966). Other Eyes. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 133-137.
- Lordkipanidze, N. (1967). Most Dangerous. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 178-181.
- Lordkipanidze, N. (1968). Opening and repetition. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 59-61.
- Lordkipanidze, N. (1969). Who are you? *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 85-87.
- Lordkipanidze, N. (1975). And general and own. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 44-47.
- Macheret, A. (1969). The last movie of Iva Pyrev. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 150-153.
- Makarov, A. (1989). Andrei from the 170th. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 180-185.
- Mamatova, L. (1987). Incredibly obvious. *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 103-106.
- Mamatova, L. (1988). On the eve of renovation. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 20-30.
- Marchenko, V. (1979). On the brethren and faithfulness. *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 98-101.
- Markov, S. (1971). Legend and profit. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 36-38.
- Markova, F. (1970). Love, death, life ... *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art, pp. 61-64.
- Markova, F. (1971). Just War. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 40-43.
- Markulan, J. (1969). Meet Ilya Averbash. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 82-84.
- Materials of the Plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee* (1983). Moscow, p. 7.
- Matsaytis, S. (1983). Paradoxes expression (J. Budraitis). *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 110-115.
- Medvedev, A. (1970). Valentina Telichkina. *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art, pp. 64-66.
- Medvedev, A. (1972). Will be continued. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 63-65.
- Medvedev, A. (1975). Fifty-first Year. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 86-88.

- Medvedev, A. (1979). Feat of the people, the fate of folk. *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 39-46.
- Medvedev, A. (1981). Long Way to itself. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 95-97.
- Medvedev, A. (1982). Look back in sorrow. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 88-91.
- Medvedev, B. (1966). Not the letter, but the essence... *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-95.
- Medvedeva, G. (1965). Violation of traditions. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 136-139.
- Medvedeva, G. (1967). Knight without fear, but with the reproach. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 25-27.
- Melville, L. (1982). Eternal Law promised land. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 110-114.
- Mikhalkovich, V. (1976). Man and his work. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 116-120.
- Mikhalkovich, V. (1987). His voice (Leonid Kalashnikov). *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 140-144.
- Monakhova, E. (1977). Vadim Yusov. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 157-159.
- Murzina, M. (1990). "Golden Duke" Everything was good, except ... *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 219-228.
- Nedelin, V. (1981). The plot of the short story. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 97-99.
- Nesteva, M. (1965). Composer as the author of the movie. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 162-164.
- Nesteva, M. (1966). Feeling genre. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 37-38.
- Novogrudsky, A. (1979). Under the sign of the October Revolution. *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 24-28.
- Nujkin, A., Erokhin, A. (1990). Bitter account. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 6-14.
- Ognev, K. (1987). A measure of success (Anatoly Romashin). *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 131-135.
- Orlov, D. (1986). Fold the details of the order. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 28-32.
- Orlov, V. (1966). Sleeping Lion comedy. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 110-114.
- Orlov, V. (1969). With pain of the past. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 68-69.
- Ostrovsky, D. (1971). Who are they? *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 84-87.
- Pabauskaya, N. (1988). Right to their fate (Tatiana Drubich). *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 128-134.
- Pabauskaya, N. (1989). Playwright, Film and time (Evgeny Grigoriev). *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 158-166.
- Pabauskaya, N. (1990). As the stars shine ... (Gennady Shpalikov). *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 194-200.
- Paperny, Z. (1966). Be careful... *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 115-117.
- Pavlyuchik, L. (1988). Gravity (Boris Nevzorov). *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 135-138.
- Pavlyuchik, L. (1989). Under the sign of penitence. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 186-192.
- Pisarevsky, D. (1965). Lessons of "Chapaev". *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 216-219.
- Pisarevsky, D. (1966). Let's get acquainted. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 140-142.
- Pisarevsky, D. (1967). This is his own, and this is total. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 66-68.
- Pisarevsky, D. (1968). Again in formation. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 19-20.
- Pisarevsky, D. (1968). Panorama of national heroism. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 23-26.
- Pisarevsky, D. (1969). "Mother" *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 18-19.

- Pisarevsky, D. (1970). Comedy Detective. *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art, pp. 58-61.
- Pisarevsky, D. (1972). From relocation of terms... *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 100-103.
- Pisarevsky, D. (1975). Attendance and Movies. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 98-100.
- Pisarevsky, D. (1977). Artists innovators: Vasilyev brothers. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 125-128.
- Pistunova, A. (1984). The sea was great (Anatoly Petritsky). *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-96.
- Plakhov, A. (1987). Not the letter, but the essence! *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 39-44.
- Pogozheva, L. (1971). "Crime and Punishment". *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 78-83.
- Pogozheva, L. (1975). Debut took place. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 22-23.
- Povolyaev, V. (1983). It is a live picture of the history. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 69-71.
- Pritulenko, V. (1989). From what Alex runs away? *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 111-114.
- Pritulenko, V. (1990). Who is the owner on earth. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 143-149.
- Proceedings of XXVI Soviet Communist Party Congress (1981)*. Moscow, pp. 61-63.
- Pustynskaya, L. (1978). Wind of Revolution. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 132-133.
- Pustynskaya, L. (1989). Its young heroine (Vera Glagoleva). *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 171-176.
- Pustynskaya, L. (1990). Moment of fortune (M. Martinsone). *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 168-171.
- Rachuk, I. (1983). With a mission of liberation. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 75-77.
- Rakhmanov, L. (1969). Short but happy life of Tanya Tetkina. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 64-67.
- Rassadin, S. (1967). Why? *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 190-196.
- Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee (1969). *On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio and television, film, culture and art institutions for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire*. Moscow.
- Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee (1972). 'On Literary Criticism'. *The Soviet Communist Party in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee plenums*. Moscow: Politizdat, 1986, Vol. 12, pp. 170-173.
- Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee (1967). 'On measures for further development of the social sciences and enhance their role in the building of communism'. *The Soviet Communist Party in Resolutions (1986)*. Moscow, Vol. 11, pp. 237-251.
- Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On measures for further development of Soviet cinema." (1972). *The Soviet Communist Party in Resolutions (1986)*. Moscow, Vol. 12, pp. 263-268.
- Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee *On the Mosfilm (1964)*. Moscow.
- Revich, V. (1968). About Science Fiction. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 82-86.
- Revich, V. (1969). Zorge's Companions. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 139-144.

- Revich, V. (1971). Five evenings in the TV-screen. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 99-104.
- Revich, V. (1972). About the workers' cause. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 82-86.
- Revich, V. (1975). Should I announce Shah queen? *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-94.
- Romanenko, A. (1983). Holiday with me and without me. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 32-36.
- Romanenko, A. (1984). At the root of the character. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 72-74.
- Romanenko, A. (1987). How young we were. *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 113-114.
- Romanenko, A. (1988). Smile, baby ... or a game for school age children. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 102-104.
- Romanenko, A. (1989). They and we. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Arts, pp. 43-48.
- Rubanova, I. (1966). Strict test days and years. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 64-68.
- Rudnitsky, K. (1978). The parallels. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 122-124.
- Rybak, L. (1977). Failure to escape. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 102-107.
- Ryzhova, V. (1971). Composer. Music. Film. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 87-91.
- Samarin, Y. (1984). Russian epic time. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 77-79.
- Samarin, Y. (1985). We are looking for understanding and love. *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp. 93-95.
- Samarin, Y. (1986). Tale about Urals. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 104-106.
- Samarin, Y. (1987). No wonder all Russia remembers. *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 48-54.
- Samarin, Y. (1990). Last role of Anatoly Papanov in a movie. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 201-204.
- Savinchenko, N., Shirokov, A. (1970). About the film "The Sixth of July". *Ogoniok*. № 13, p.25.
- Savitsky, N. (1978). Man and his work. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-96.
- Savitsky, N. (1979). Direct connection. *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 87-92.
- Scherbakov, K. (1969). Only true? *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 98-101.
- Scherbakov, K. (1988). Long breath. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 87-90.
- Screen 1964* (1965). Moscow: Art, 388 p.
- Screen 1965* (1966). Moscow: Art, 326 p.
- Screen 1966-1967* (1967). Moscow: Art, 344 p.
- Screen 1967-1968* (1968). Moscow: Art, 288 p.
- Screen 1968-1969* (1969). Moscow: Art, 320 p.
- Screen 1969-1970* (1970). Moscow: Art, 272 p.
- Screen 1970-1971* (1971). Moscow: Art, 304 p.
- Screen 1971-1972* (1972). Moscow: Art, 288 p.
- Screen 1972-1973* (1974). Moscow: Art, 256 p.
- Screen 1973-1974* (1975). Moscow: Art, 264 p.
- Screen 1974-1975* (1976). Moscow: Art, 246 p.
- Screen 1975-1976* (1977). Moscow: Art, 272 p.
- Screen 1976-1977* (1978). Moscow: Art, 285 p.
- Screen 1977-1978* (1979). Moscow: Art, 278 p.
- Screen 1978-1979* (1980). Moscow: Art, 272 p.
- Screen 1979-1980* (1982). Moscow: Art, 270 p.
- Screen 1980-1981* (1983). Moscow: Art, 224 p.
- Screen 1981-1982* (1984). Moscow: Art, 175 p.
- Screen 1982-1983* (1985). Moscow: Art, 207 p.
- Screen 1983-1984* (1986). Moscow: Art, 207 p.

Screen 1987 (1987). Moscow: Art, 272 p.
Screen 1988 (1988). Moscow: Art, 272 p.
Screen 1989 (1989). Moscow: Art, 320 p.
Screen 1990 (1990). Moscow: Art, 320 p.
 Semenov, M. (1965). Instead anthem. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 66-71.
 Semenov, M. (1966). Small masterpiece. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 138-139.
 Shatsillo, D. (1976). Guerrilla prowess. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 42-46.
 Shatsillo, D. (1977). The Revolution Continues. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 87-91.
 Shatsillo, D. (1985). As a high score (Elena Drapeko). *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp.108-113.
 Shatsillo, D. (1986). Poem about war and peace. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 61-64.
 Shatsillo, D. (1987). Feat in ice. *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 95-99.
 Shcherbakov, K. (1965). Tradition schemes quest ... *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 85-91.
 Shcherbakov, K. (1967). Again about detectives. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 175-178.
 Shilova, I. (1978). Regimantas Adomaitis. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 156-160.
 Shilova, I. (1981). Mythology of Contemporary History. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 83-87.
 Shilova, I. (1982). Natalia Andreichenko. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 132-136.
 Shilova, I. (1984). His choosing the path ... (Michael Nozhkin). *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 82-84.
 Shilova, I. (1985). Contemporary screen. *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp. 14-40.
 Shilova, I. (1986). Afterword or Foreword? *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 94-96.
 Shilova, I. (1988). Industrial conflicts, family conflicts. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 36-41.
 Shilova, I. (1990). Duty (Oleg Borisov). *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 172-177.
 Shitova, V. (1972). Do not applause ... *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 70-72.
 Shmyrov, V. (1989). Soul of sphinx. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 118-122.
 Shmyrov, V. (1990). Returning to the theme. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 15-20.
 Sholokhov, S. (1990). Other times - other songs. *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 49-53.
 Shumakov, S. (1987). ... Good fellows a lesson. *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 115-118.
 Shumakov, S. (1988). About position of decent man. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 99-101.
 Shumakov, S. (1989). "There is no sadder ...". *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 131-134.
 Shumakov, S. (1990). "Little Faith". *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, p.131.
 Sobolev, R. (1971). "The Beginning", which has no end. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 69-74.
 Sobolev, R. (1975). Twelve meetings with the eleventh muse. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 52-54.
 Sobolev, R. (1983). Simplicity Wisdom (Vsevolod Sanaev). *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-96.
 Sologub, V. (1978). Georgy Burkov. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 164-167.
 Soloviova, I. (1965). A man named Hamlet. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 94-100.
 Stishova, E. (1981). Natalia Gundareva. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 119-124.
 Stishova, E. (1982). Entry (Notes on film debut). *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 74-78.
 Stishova, E. (1984). A few words in defense of women's virtue. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 32-36.

- Stishova, E. (1987). Close the past (*My Friend Ivan Lapshin*). *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 107-112.
- Stishova, E. (1989). Laura and thorns. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 31-36.
- Sulkin, M. (1972). Last movie of Shaken Aimanov. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 28-32.
- Sulkin, M. (1975). Brutal good truth of Tolomush Okeev. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 35-38.
- Sulkin, M. (1982). Elaman engages in battle. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 96-98.
- Sumenov, N. (1977). One day, the whole life. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 70-75.
- Sumenov, N. (1978). Poem about the brotherhood. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 78-83.
- Sumenov, N. (1981). Red Marius. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 80-83.
- Sumenov, N. (1982). Several interviews on important issues. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 106-109.
- Sumenov, N. (1984). A few days after the outbreak of war. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 69-71.
- Sumenov, N. (1985). Fidelity truth of history. *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp. 78-80.
- Surkov, E. (1965). Yegor Trubnikov and his time. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 34-39.
- Svobodin, A. (1968). Anna Karenina. A screen adaptation of 1967. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 35-40.
- Tarasenko, L. (1979). Emile Lotyanu. *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 136-141.
- Tolchenova, N. (1976). Sholokhov and cinema. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 106-110.
- Tolchenova, N. (1978). The soul must work (Julia Solntseva - 70). *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 148-150.
- Tolstysh, V. (1989). What audience we deserve? *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 142-150.
- Troshin, A. (1970). "Art like a wild horse". *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art, pp. 56-58.
- Troshin, A. (1971). "Or I die, or I will play ...". *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 75-77.
- Troshin, A. (1988). Sound of a breaking string. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 107-108.
- Tsereteli, K. (1969). "Eliso". *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, p. 28.
- Turbin, V. (1969). Alexander Green, his rights, his duties. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 110-111.
- Turin, Y. (1977). Way of the Cross. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 96-102.
- Turin, Y. (1978). Welcome win! *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 97-99.
- Turin, Y. (1979). Children after the war. *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-97.
- Turin, Y. (1981). Ivan Ryzhov. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 115-118.
- Turin, Y. (1982). Anatoly Solonitsyn. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 136-143.
- Turin, Y. (1983). Again, the historical film. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 36-43.
- Turin, Y. (1984). Film-call. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 62-65.
- Turin, Y. (1985). Earth, water, people. *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp. 86-90.
- Turin, Y. (1986). Faces of heroic themes. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 47-56.
- Turin, Y. (1987). Humanism Lessons (Sholokhov - Bondarchuk: *The destiny of man*). *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 152-158.
- Turin, Y. (1988). *Quiet Flows the Don* of Sergei Gerasimov. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 151-154.
- Turin, Y. (1989). Talent of Resistance. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 102-105.
- Tvalchrelidze, T. (1977). Sophia Chiaureli. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 145-148.
- Ungureanu L. (1984). Actor with deep temperament (Mihai Volontir). *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 88-92.
- Urnov, D. (1987). Why? What for? *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 28-32.

- Vartanov, A. (1969). Stories, events, characters. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 134-138.
- Vartanov, A. (1971). Telefilms? And what is it? *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 128-134.
- Vartanov, A. (1972). We and G. Malyan's film. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 47-49.
- Vladimirova, E. (1979). Fidelity (I. Talankin - 50). *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 154-157.
- Vlasov, M. (1984). Happy gift. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 103-106.
- Warsawsky, J. (1965). Film of action delayed. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 44-51.
- Warsawsky, J. (1966). Return to movie. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 124-132.
- Warsawsky, J. (1967). Comedy of Errors. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 105-111.
- Warsawsky, J. (1967). Work of the Film. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 20-24.
- Warsawsky, J. (1969). Dignity. *Screen 1968-1969*. Moscow: Art, pp. 75-79.
- Warsawsky, J. (1971). Through the chronicle. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-93.
- Wilchek, V. (1976). Spectrogram of success. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 58-63.
- Yurenev, A. (1977). Boris Babochkin. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 142-144.
- Yurenev, A. (1979). Happy fate (A. Khokhlova - 80). *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 145-147.
- Yurenev, R. (1975). About sensitivity of the human. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 19-21.
- Yurenev, R. (1978). Indomitable (the 75th anniversary of I. Pyrev). *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 136-142.
- Yurenev, R. (1982). Five parties and two actors. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 100-102.
- Yurenev, R. (1983). Victory of conscience. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 82-84.
- Yurenev, R. (1984). Jakov Protazanov. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 106-110.
- Yurenev, R. (1985). Vsevolod Pudovkin. *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp. 130-134.
- Yurenev, R. (1986). Failure. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 100-101.
- Yurenev, R. (1988). Military prose Poetry. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 90-92.
- Yurenev, R. (1989). Cleansing Fire. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 94-96.
- Zaitsev, N. (1978). Optimism of the revolutionary perspective. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 84-86.
- Zaitsev, N. (1981). No one is forgotten and nothing is forgotten. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 76-80.
- Zak, M. (1975). Big Picture Show. From observations of cinema. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 111-116.
- Zak, M. (1977). Master. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 134-137.
- Zak, M. (1978). Director selects the position. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 63-69.
- Zak, M. (1981). Autobiography of love. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-95.
- Zak, M. (1982). Counter-movement. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 103-106.
- Zak, M. (1985). Business man on vacation. *Screen 1982-1983*. Moscow: Art, pp. 75-78.
- Zak, M. (1986). Dialogues. *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 32-37.
- Zak, M. (1987). Checking using life. *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 22-28.
- Zak, M. (1988). Stairs analysis. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 31-35.
- Zak, M. (1989). Myocardial as a social category, or to the question of entertainment movie screen. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 106-111.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1968). Seven shots over Rediul Mare. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 56-58.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1972). Russian Nature ... *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 58-59.

- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1979). Lydia Fedoseyeva-Shukshina. *Screen 1977-1978*. Moscow: Art, pp. 114-120.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1981). Margarita Terekhova. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 111-114.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1982). Leonid Kuravlev. *Screen 1979-1980*. Moscow: Art, pp. 127-131.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1983). Roles, in tune with the time (Stanislav Lyubshin). *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 101-105.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1984). Actor on the screen. *Screen 1981-1982*. Moscow: Art, pp. 100-102.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1986). In the context of time (Evgenia Glushchenko). *Screen 1983-1984*. Moscow: Art, pp. 108-111.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1987). "I love to play strong characters ..." (Elena Tsyplakova). *Screen 1987*. M.: Art, 1987, pp. 127-131.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1988). Waits from us... (Natalia Saiko). *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 125-128.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1989). The same thought (Nina Ruslanova). *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 166-170.
- Zakrzhevskaya, L. (1990). The essence of the laws (Vladimir Gostyukhin). *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 178-182.
- Zelenko, N. (1965). Actor conducts exploration. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 142-147.
- Zelenko, N. (1966). Citizenship. *Screen 1965*. Moscow: Art, pp. 56-58.
- Zinoviev, M., Markov, S. (1967). Mid stream. *Screen 1966-1967*. Moscow: Art, pp. 74-78.
- Zinoviev, M., Markov, S. (1968). Nikina from a movie and itself. *Screen 1967-1968*. Moscow: Art, pp. 64-66.
- Zolotussky, I. (1989). Return Screen. *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 78-81.
- Zorkaya, N. (1965). Kostya Inochkin underground. *Screen 1964*. Moscow: Art, pp. 52-60.
- Zorkaya, N. (1975). Lady Luck. *Screen 1973-1974*. Moscow: Art, pp. 69-71.
- Zorkaya, N. (1988). Sketches for a biography (Tengiz Abduladze). *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 110-118.
- Zorky, A. (1970). From *Goodbye, Gulsary*. *Screen 1969-1970*. Moscow: Art, pp. 52-55.
- Zorky, A. (1971). Origins of heroism. *Screen 1970-1971*. Moscow: Art, pp. 32-34.
- Zorky, A. (1972). About Love? *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 77-79.
- Zorky, A. (1978). Mimino is Georgian Falcon. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 208-209.
- Zorky, A. (1983). Tehran Case. *Screen 1980-1981*. Moscow: Art, pp. 137-140.
- Zorky, A. (1987). Comments to the spectacle. *Screen 1987*. Moscow: Art, pp. 118-122.
- Zorky, A. (1989). "Lone White Sail ..." (Kira Muratova). *Screen 1989*. Moscow: Art, pp. 152-157.
- Zorky, A. (1990). So, we need one victory (Andrey Smirnov). *Screen 1990*. Moscow: Art, pp. 162-167.

Soviet cinema in *Cinema Art* Journal (1967)

Introduction

1967 was a special year for the USSR: the 50th anniversary of the Soviet power. It is clear that the Soviet press was ideologically obliged to do everything possible to present this half-century period as the progressive succession way of victories and landmark achievements, including, of course, in the "most important of the arts" – a movie. The magazine *Cinema Art*, the influential publication among filmmakers, professionals and spectators' elite played here a special role.

Cinema Art's monthly output was very impressive by today's edition (from 30 to 35 thousand copies). Each issue published from 6 to 14 articles about the Soviet films. Plus scripts, filmographies, etc. Traditional for the magazine headings (*New Movies, Problems of the theory, Discussion, Television, Among the actors, Abroad, Script, Filmography, Bibliography*, etc.) have been added in 1967 to the special commemorative section: *By October the 50th anniversary, Year after year, Films of the jubilee year, Soviet film for the world.*

As is well known, the final blow to the Soviet "thaw" trends was caused by the Soviet leadership in response to the events of the "Prague Spring" – in 1968. But in 1967, the magazine is still headed by L. Pogozeva whose editorship (1956-1969) almost had a peak at the "thaw", and on its decline.

Recalling this time, A. Medvedev noted that *"Pogozheva was a kind remarkable woman, rather well-known critic... I cannot say that she had some extraordinary professional qualities as a critic, even though she was the authoritative author, and her opinion was important"* (Medvedev, 2011).

Film critic M. Sulkin says much warmer about deputy chief editor of *Cinema Art* magazine – Y. Warsawsky: *"He was extraordinarily talented, accurate sense of art critic, researcher, analyst, writer endowed with the gift"* (Sulkin, 2000).

In 1967, the editorial board of the magazine *Cinema Art* consisted of 18 people, however, they were mostly known directors (G. Kozintsev, L. Kulidzhanov, I. Pyryev, S. Yutkevich) and film functionaries. The numbers of film critics amongst them there were only four: L. Pogozeva (editor), J. Warsawsky (deputy editor), A. Karaganov, and R. Yurenev.

Of course, the range of authors of the magazine was much wider. In 1967, a venerable and relatively young at that time, film critics and film scholars there were published. Of course, *Cinema Art* published the articles by no all known Soviet critics of the 1960s. But in general, the author's list was quite representative: M. Bleyman (1904-1973), Y. Bogomolov (p. 1937),

G. Bohemsky (1920-1995), V. Demin (1937-1993), S. Freilich (1920-2005), N. Ignatieva (1923-2019), G. Kapralov (1921-2010), A. Karaganov (1915-2007), Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978), T. Khloplyankina (1937-1993), V. Kisunko (1940-2010), N. Kleiman (p. 1937), L. Kozlov (1933-2006), G. Kremlev (1905-1975), M. Kushnirov (p. 1937), E. Levin (1935-1991), J. Markulan (1920-1978), V. Matusevich (1937-2009), K. Paramonova (1916-2005), L. Pogozeva (1913-1989), L. Roshal (1936-2010), L. Rybak (1923-1988), V. Shitova (1927-2002), K. Shcherbakov (p. 1938), I. Soloviova (1927-2019), A. Svobodin (1922-1999), M. Sulkin (p. 1928), E. Surkov (1915-1988), A. Vartanov (1931-2019), J. Warsawsky (1911-2000), I. Weissfeld (1909-2003), R. Yurenev (1912-2002), M. Zak (1929-2011) and others.

In 1967, the magazine wrote about such significant Soviet films like *Aibolit- 66* by R. Bykov, *The S. City* by I. Kheifits, *Journalist* by S. Gerasimov, *Prisoner of the Caucasus* by L. Gaidai, *Head of Chukotka* by V. Melnikov, *Adventures of a Dentist* by E. Klimov, *Republic of SHKID* by G. Poloka and other. *Cinema Art* also published outstanding scripts: *Pirosmani* by E. Akhvlediani and G. Shangelaya, *Holy Spirit (No Path Through Fire)* by E. Gabrilovich and G. Panfilov, *There Were Two Comrades* by Y. Dunsky and V. Frid, *Three Days of Victor Chernyshov* by E. Grigoriev. The pearls of the magazine became the articles of famous directors G. Kozintsev (*Deep Screen*) and Andrei Tarkovsky (*Telling Time*).

Ideology

So, the jubilee year obliged *Cinema Art* to carry out "an ideological mandate to the party": basically in the category *By October, the 50th anniversary, Year after year* (footage from the Soviet films with short inscriptions designed illustrate the consistently high ideological and artistic level of the cinema in the USSR in the 50 years of its existence), etc. Especially a lot of articles of this kind in the jubilee, that is, the November issue of the magazine.

As a rule, the most "ideologically" article is not signed by the author: "*Happy New Year, comrades! With the onset of the first month of the anniversary year – the year of the Great October Revolution! ... The direct participants in the revolution, comrades of Lenin still paced in our ranks... And ... the life is strongly linked with the ideas of socialism and communism*" (Year 1967: 1).

But some film critics, who did not want to succumb to the temptation of anonymity wrote their articles also with the strong communist pathos:

"The history of the Soviet cinema, militant art of socialist realism, is a shining example of active influence on the cinema of other countries" (Abramov, 1967: 17).

"October has brought world cinema a new character, the ideas, the very spirit of creative innovation. ... Screen, freed from the yoke of dictatorship and oppression of commercial reactionary ideas, has become one of the most important forms of artistic people awareness of their past, present and future" (Weissfeld, 1967: 29).

"High ideology, an inextricable link with the life of people, the revolutionary spirit - all this has created a tradition of innovation and prepared the victory of socialist realism. ... So now we are proud to recognize that our Soviet cinema and there is free art, serving millions and tens of millions of working people dreamed of Lenin" (Yurenev, 1967: 5, 8).

The praise of socialist realism and its impact on the world cinematography was in the essays of history of the Soviet cinema (Freilich, 1967: 35-45) and the review of the international symposium (Karaganov, 1967).

However the "thaw" articles of L. Pogozeva and Y. Warsawsky were out this fanfare background.

For example, J. Warsawsky recalled with pleasure thaw peak – 1957 year, when the "cinema, developing the best traditions of the past years, becoming smarter, braver, more honest - and therefore more optimistic"(Warsawsky, 1967: 4).

L. Pogozeva, sincerely supporting thaw trends, introduced readers to a very friendly overview of the development of Soviet cinema from 1957 to 1967 (Pogozeva, 1967: 39-53). Remembering such landmark films of the second half of 1950 – the first half of 1960, as *Spring on Zarechnaya Street* by F. Mironer and M. Khutsiev, *It was in Penkovo* by S. Rostotsky, *Someone else's children* by T. Abuladze, *The House I live in* by J. Segel and L. Kulidzhanov, *Forty First, Ballad of a soldier* by G. Chuhraj, *Destiny of Man, War and Peace* by S. Bondarchuk, *Pavel Korchagin, The Peace for Inbound* by A. Alov and V. Naumov, *Communist, And if this is love?, Your Contemporary* by Y. Raisman, *Lenin, Lenin in Poland* by S. Yutkevich, *The cranes Are Flying* by M. Kalatozov, *The Living and the Dead* by A. Stolper, *Ivan's Childhood* by A. Tarkovsky, *Nine days in one year, Ordinary fascism* by M. Romm, *Serioja* by I. Talankin and G. Danelia, *Chairman* by A. Saltykov, *The first Teacher* by A. Konchalovsky, *Two* by M. Bogin, *Wedding* by M. Kobakhidze, *A Guy lives here* by V. Shukshin, *Journalist* by S. Gerasimov, *Shadows of forgotten ancestors* by S. Parajanov, *Nobody wanted to die* by V. Žalakevičius, *Hamlet* by G. Kozintsev, *Wings* by L. Shepitko, *I'm twenty years* by M. Khutsiev and others films, L. Pogozeva find the exact characteristics of their artistic and audience success. In particular, she wrote about the thaw movies on the modern theme (of the second half of 1950s): "These films were very kind. They are downright shone with love for people, delight in front of our boys

and girls. This enthusiasm sometimes reached sentimentality"(Pogozheva, 1967: 41).

Film Reviews

For obvious reasons, critics of the *Cinema Art* were a priori careful approach to the analysis of films as a member of the editorial board (G. Kozintsev, L. Kulidzhanov, I. Pyrev, S. Yutkevich) and other Soviet classics or equivalent masters of the screen.

At the same time, it should be noted that the magazine was not afraid to notice significant shortcomings even in the works of the masters. I think S. Gerasimov was unhappy to read such lines about his film *Journalist: "Where the declaration overrides the dramatic action there slips edification. ... If not everything in the film came out, the "blame" in this not Gerasimov as director, but Gerasimov as screenwriter"*(Klado, 1967: 75). And even *Iron Stream* by E. Dzigan, which was made a special rate of film ideological jubilee year, received such accusations illustrative, psychological imperfection of characters, negligent actor makeup, etc. (Lvov, 1967: 68).

Even Lenin's film series by M. Donskoy (*Mother's Heart, Mother's Fidelity*) received low-key, but still subjected criticism (Kisunko, 1967: 33).

The member of the editorial board - a famous Soviet film director I. Pyryev also not escaped critical shots: his film *The Light of a Distant Star* was named too wordy (Kara, 1967, p. 59-67).

In this regard, I would suggest that when L. Pogozheva was dismissed from the post of chief editor (1969), authorities charged her not only in too obvious "thaw", but also in the fact that the magazine criticized of the classics of the Soviet screen ...

As usual, *Cinema Art* devoted much attention to adaptations. T. Shah-Azizova caustically criticized adaptation of A. Chekhov's *Darling* (directed by S. Kolosov): "*Breaking the fragile fabric of 'Darling', shifting accents, director separates the synthesis of poetry and comedy, brings up the first melodrama, the second - to the farce. The story deliberately modest and everyday style, intricate turns and spectacular*" (Shah-Azizova, 1967: 53).

Acute critical arrows pierced the adaptation of Lermontov's *Hero of Our Time* directed by S. Rostotsky because "*the screen just illustrated the individual episodes of the novel, is simplified, the cinematic embellished. We have not seen the drama of strong character in negligible time*"(Bleyman, 1967: 51).

Even harder magazine praised the *Uncle's Dream* (based on F. Dostoevsky's story) by K.Voinov: "*This discrepancy cinematographic product of literary significantly absolutely everything. ... Here it's all*

about the inability to penetrate into the essence: in the spirit, in the style of Dostoevsky"(Pitlyar, 1967: 44).

But the full support of the critic N. Kovarsky received a play adaptation of A. Sukhov-Kobylin *Death of Tarelkin - Merry Days of Razpluev* by E. Garin and H. Lokshina: *"Garin and Lokshina so precise in the formulation of the film, in spite of significant bills... It seems complete, nothing is lost on the playback screen comedy. But it is marked not only fidelity to the letter and the spirit of comedy. He is faithful and the spirit of the time"* (Kovarsky, 1967: 21).

Cinema Art responded positively on the adaptation of Chekhov's stories, taken by I. Heifetz (*In the S. city*): *"Other film adaptation set to a feuilleton way, but here is all a matter of respect, cause you more sympathy than an ironic smile. This is a serious, careful, I would even say, diligent work"*(Papernyi, 1967: 62).

As always deep in thought and an interesting shape the review came from the pen of Y. Khanutin. Analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the film adaptation of the novel A. Green's *Running on Waves* (directed by P. Lubimov), the critic did a reasonable conclusion: *"The tragedy has already unfulfilled in the film has turned out sharper than the happiness of searches that can still happen. Perhaps, for the authors of 'Running on Waves' is also to some extent their unfulfilled that beckons imperiously calls, but not always and not all awards comprehension"*(Khanutin, 1967: 62).

Several articles in the magazine were devoted to experimental musical *Aibolit-66* by R. Bykov (based on K. Chukovsky's fairy tale). B. Sarnov very aptly that *"Rolan Bykov decided to do (and succeeded) a film about the impotence of Evil. Quite deliberately he personified all the forces of Evil in the world the image of a puny, pathetic, quite insignificant (in all senses of the word) person. He seems to have decided to remove Evil from the pedestal on which it was unwittingly built bitter experience of mankind"*(Sarnov, 1967: 22). He was echoed by L. Zakrzewska: *"This is a very well - to make sure that, in general, it is possible to cope with the Evils... This is very useful - be realistic. In this and the wisdom and the present of the tale, which we told Rolan Bykov"*(Zakrzewska, 1967: 28).

Became cinema event of 1960s *Chairman* by A. Saltykov caused many heated discussions in the Soviet press. By entering into a polemic with the famous writer B. Balter (1919-1974), who told the negative things about this psychological drama of post-war rural life, E. Surkov wrote that *"if we do the third year arguing about Trubnikov as a living person, this indicate a bright talent of the director, screenwriter, actor, managed in one nature to express so many important and significant for all of us"* (Surkov, 1973: 73).

Sad comedy *SHKID Republic* by G. Poloka was very favorably disposed to the magazine: "The authors, deliberately trying to make the interesting and spectacular film, immediately take the bull by the horns and seize the attention of the audience. G. Poloka uses threads and unusual and romantic atmosphere. He openly, defiantly attract expressive means of silent cinema, in other places was a stylized this film under the old movie"(Koval, 1967: 53).

Equally warm *Cinema Art* was met and ironic comedy *Head of Chukotka* by V. Melnikov: "Smile of sympathy and compassion to the hero is transferred to us, the viewers, we are found in the funny lad living features of the Revolution: it is not on duty signs and concrete embodiment of its energy, romance, justice" (Ignatieva, 1967: 33). Of course reference to Revolution is the soft mat under the watchful censorship, but overall review was very friendly.

Another movie about Russian Revolution times reviewed in a more sober style. For example, *Elusive Avengers* by E. Keosayan. Dry praised this popular Eastern, K. Shcherbakov noticed readers that "the action ... lost happily found a combination of irony and seriousness, games and reality. There are scenes of heavy and dull" (Shcherbakov, 1967: 60).

M. Zak is very true rated film *Vale* by G. Pozhenyan: "The rift between poetry and cinema runs through the entire film. What did he cause? The answer, which is closer and easier: poet G. Pozhenyan has failed in the role of director. ... But there is something less obvious and easy. ... 'Vale' only ornamented signs of poetry" (Zak, 1967: 27-28).

The judgment of Y. Bogomolov about *Four pages of a young life* by R. Esadze was no less hard, but reasonable: "Moral is interesting. Morality is boring" (Bogomolov, 1967: 70).

But, unfortunately, magazine took, I think, purely "commanding" position in relation to the excellent ironic satire *Adventures of a Dentist* by E. Klimov. I do not remember that any other Soviet film received a resume, so devastatingly unfair to the talented directing: "The script was a deep, easy and good. The film turned out flat, strained and evil" (Svobodin, 1967: 41).

But the famous comedy *Prisoner of the Caucasus* by L. Gaidai has caused log approval: "The film was lucky (and justice) of the audience and critics. Other reviews were like toast, exclamation marks, faced as the glasses ... The sense of humor must protect authors from excessive praise" (Zak, 1967: 85).

M. Kushnirov's article also was devoted to reflections on the comic and satirical stories on the screen – in newsreel *Wick*. Here critic identified both advantages and disadvantages (Kushnirov, 1967: 15-16).

Curiously, but T. Khoplyankina made a strong and brave (for those times) the output from viewing student films. This conclusion was about

the Soviet cinema in general: *"Well shoot – yes, this is the dream of all film directors. Good idea? What for? Perhaps the absence of thought is the main problem of our cinema?"*(Khloplyankina, 1967: 51).

Alas, but this conclusion remains relevant and today. However, now many Russian filmmakers greater dream is not to shoot well, but make good money on the "kickbacks" and other tricks in the process of filming themselves...

As in other years, *Cinema Art* did not forget to review and cinematography of Soviet republics.

Thus, S. Mikhailova said a lot of good words about the Belarusian cinema. However, there are quite a few out there and criticisms, oddly enough, to the address of one of the best films of V. Turov: *"The failure befell V. Turov in his latest work. His film 'I come from childhood', he conceived as the first part of the triptych of the military youth generation as an autobiographical confession. But the scenario of G. Shpalikov written as a series of sketches led to Turov compositional looseness of the film, to the meaningful emptiness"*(Mikhailova, 1967: 101).

However, the authors of the magazine did not hasten to extol and other films of directors from the Soviet republics. M. Sulkin noted that in the *"Aimanov-director not all managed"* in *Land of the Fathers* (Sulkin, 1967: 78). A. Vartanov wrote about the film *Sky of our childhood* by T. Okeev: *"When I see the poetic perception of the world in this film, I am especially disappointed when meet with edifying episodes, straight, caused by the desire of authors to put all the dots on "i"* (Vartanov, 1967: 43).

Sometimes the "protective" historical and revolutionary themes and acute problems of the films became for *Cinema Art* an occasion is almost complete withdrawal from the evaluation of the artistic level. Article about the films *Bitter grain* and *Stairway to Heaven* were written in a similar vein (Gurov, 1967: 62).

The peak of such isolation from the critical function in favor of the ideological category was in a review of, I think, deservedly forgotten film "26 Baku Commissars" (1965): *"I do not want to follow the traditional review way to list the shortcomings of the film, pick slips author. In this case, in my opinion, it is more important to say that succeeded in the development of historical and revolutionary topics"* (Seyidbeyli, 1967: 82).

Film theory

An amazing event was in the theoretical section of the *Cinema Art*-1967, I think that had no counterparts either before or after. The debut book of a young film critic V. Demin *Film without intrigue* (Demin, 1966)

became the basis for two solid theoretical articles speculating about the features of film-plots structure.

The first line of article of the venerable film critic I. Weissfeld were as follows: *"Let's start with the literary style. Do we frequently have to read theoretical books written with a primer, painted charm of youth, spontaneity? I recently read a book: 'Film without intrigue' by Victor Demin. The stylistic feature of this book is the freedom of the narrative, the ease of "installation" passages, sometimes quite unexpected. Reading the book, you will gradually get used to it. You is not surprising that after the paragraph on the artistic perception is a story about how the first time year-old son of the author watches TV, and what thoughts these things prompted a young father and as a young writer. Do not surprise you, and "joint", say parodic descriptions of the chess scene, scene detection and evaluation Fellini's interview. ... Demin writes as thinks. Literary style matches the mood of the book. Victor Demin simultaneously captured his plan, as if surprised that he himself made discoveries, the reader wants to inspire his passion and a little ironic to himself"* (Weissfeld, 1967: 30).

And then I. Weissfeld began the debate about drama and directing the search, breaking the aesthetic canons in the film (Weissfeld, 1967: 31-33). The conclusion of I. Weissfeld was buoyant and perceptive: *"An interesting and largely controversial book 'Film without intrigue' announced to us about the appearance of one more temperamental, promising researcher"* (Weissfeld, 1967: 33).

E. Levin, in his theoretical article virtually echoed I. Weissfeld, arguing that *"film-plots theory today is perhaps the most dramatic area of film studies. ... Much of this is determined, not yet having had time to install, and is changing, undefined"*(Levine, 1967: 33).

Then critic moved on to Demin's article *Riot details* (Demin 1965), which, in fact, then went into the book *Film without intrigue*.

And here V. Levin entered to more acute dispute: *"V. Demin wrong, considering the exposure of drama static and inactive... Exposure is also a kind of an event of its composition, its plot and storyline. ... Demin understand the effectiveness of the event too poor, narrowly event treats unilaterally"* (Levine, 1967: 38, 40).

This debate on the pages of the magazine was a clear refutation of E. Weizmann's opinion that in the Soviet film studies of the 1960s there were few *"such articles about the movie that would become an event, which would be discussed, debated, which would soon read"* (Weitzman, 1967: 55).

However, when further E. Weitzman argued that *"the core of Marxist criticism with all its variety of genres and with a high ability to open all aspects and features of the product should be a sociological approach, that is, the establishment of causal links artistic discoveries with life, the*

rational cognition through the work of art of the dialectic of the individual and society" (Weitzman, 1967: 56), it became clear that his proposed ideological templates to create articles, events virtually impossible.

Against the background of such Weitzman's instruction even the arguments of one of the main ideologists of the Soviet film criticism – V. Baskakov seem quite reasonable: *"Fortunately, goes into oblivion, this approach to film studies, when it is viewed as designed to serve the filmmakers. Serve and ask at the same time: Do not disturb is this customer? And if you are concerned, then the customer will be dissatisfied and say: "Bad art, I did not understand this, who wrote not appreciated as it should be." And "Who dares to criticize me? Who but the artist can evaluate the phenomenon of art? Is it the film critic knows how to put movies like?"*. Yes, these cries, which we often hear in the past, now it is less common"(Baskakov, 1967: 30). Actually, is not it? True, as amended: today is not the directors and screenwriters, but producers are forced (using, of course, not ideological, but financial arguments / subsidies) other Russian critics "serve" them. But the crowd (including Internet) still hear the same phrases...

Film Discussions

On the decline of the "thaw" *Cinema Art* was still possible to publish polemical column, and even through "the communist party" film *Conscience* (1965), telling of a good party secretary, could write that there are *"people turned into shadows standards"* (Pajitnov, Shragin, 1967: 73). The film critics ironically show in a dispute with the author of *On Love* book V. Chertkov how many sexual taboos loaded Soviet cinema (Pajitnov, Shragin, 1967: 73).

I think, the readers must have been difficult to agree with the opinion of V. Chertkov, who tried answer to his opponents by the communist rules: *"In my book, I interpret love in terms of contradictory unity of biological and social, personal and public, universal and class, in terms of conflicting mind-feelings, chance and necessity. Critics did not even notice it, and so will inevitably interpret love only in terms of sex. ... These authors deny the debt, without which never was morality, and there can be no communist morality"*(Chertkov, 1967: 99).

Polemically pearl of *Cinema Art*-1967, in my opinion, was V. Demin's article *Around the mediocre film*. There he convincingly argued that *"the mediocre film ineradicable. And it should not be eradicated. On the contrary, it is necessary grooming, undead the mediocre film. ... It turns out that we do not know the concept of good mediocre film. But mediocre film can imitate (with modern cinematic technology) the underfulfilled masterpiece: a little bit of philosophy from scratch, a little*

moral and ethical abstractions but more tricks from the arsenal of "modern cinema": still images, flashbacks, "ragged" story ... This sort of mediocre film gives the many problems for box-office"(Demin, 1967: 80-81).

God, how relevant these lines for the Russian cinema today!

Film sociology

In the 1970s the numbers of Soviet films' box-office moved in the neck "for official use only." But in 1967 it was still possible to publish box office data. Here is a table with the number of viewers for the first year of showing Soviet films in cinemas, published in the first issue of *Cinema Art*, 1967 (For success !, 1967: 1)

Table 4. Box office of Soviet feature films mid 1960s

№	Movie Title	Number of viewers (in millions)
1	<i>Believe Me, People</i>	40.3
2	<i>State Criminal</i>	39.5
3	<i>Chairman</i> (series 1 and 2)	33.0 – 32.2
4	<i>Don Story</i>	31.8
5	<i>To Me, Mukhtar!</i>	29.6
6	<i>That Guy Lives</i>	27.0
7	<i>Daughter of Stration</i>	26.7
8	<i>People do not Know All</i>	21.1
9	<i>Hamlet</i> (series 1 and 2)	21.1 – 20.7
10	<i>Army 'Wagtail'</i>	18.7
11	<i>Letters to Live</i>	18.2
12	<i>Unexpected Love</i>	17.7
13	<i>They Walked to East</i> (series 1 and 2)	17.1 – 16.5
14	<i>Moscow - Genoa</i>	16.3
15	<i>The Secretary of the Regional Committee</i>	15.4
16	<i>Where is Ahmed?</i>	14.6
17	<i>Wait for Us at Daybreak</i>	14.3
18	<i>Mandate</i>	14.2
19	<i>Charity Train</i>	14.2
20	<i>Welcome, or No Trespassing</i>	13.4
21	<i>Young from the Schooner "Columbus"</i>	13.2
22	<i>Eternal Flame</i> (series 1 and 2)	12.1 – 12.0
23	<i>Square Foot of Land</i>	11.9
24	<i>Large Ore</i>	11.8
25	<i>General and Daisies</i>	11.8
26	<i>Green House</i>	11.3
27	<i>Russian Forest</i> (Series 1 and 2)	11.0 – 10.6
28	<i>Three Sisters</i>	9.8
29	<i>Blue Notebook</i>	9.1

30	<i>I'm Twenty Years Old (Series 1 and 2)</i>	8.8
31	<i>Ask your heart</i>	8.6
32	<i>Above the Desert Sky</i>	8.3
33	<i>Now, Let Him Out</i>	7.7
34	<i>Our Honest Bread</i>	7.2
35	<i>Story about Ptashkin</i>	7.1
36	<i>Who Saddle Horse</i>	6.6
37	<i>Match</i>	5.7
38	<i>Little Knights</i>	5.4
39	<i>I am Cuba (1 and 2 series)</i>	5.4 – 5.3
40	<i>House in the Dunes</i>	3.5

What surprises in this list today?

First of all this is unexplained in terms of contemporary logic high places (7, 8, 14-17), completely neglected the mediocre movies *Daughter of Stration*, *People do not Know All*, *Moscow-Genoa*, *The Secretary of the Regional Committee*, *Where is Ahmed?*, *Wait for Us at Daybreak*, *Mandate*, *Charity Train*. These films outstripped not only recognized movie *I'm Twenty Years* by M. Khutsiev and *I am Cuba* by M. Kalatozov, but wonderful a satirical comedy *Welcome, or No Trespassing*, which still show almost all TV Russian channels.

Boring, ideological backhand *The Secretary... The Secretary* received 15,4 million viewers and funny comedy *Welcome, or No Trespassing* – only 13.4 millions... I can only suggest that the deft film distributors have attributed *The Secretary* desired by the authorities millions from box-office of foreign hits. But it is very difficult to explain the fact that 14.6 millions were attributed to primitive comedy *Where is Ahmed...* Surely God works have mysterious ways...

Sociological theme was continued in the article of H. Khersonsky on the Film Club and film education (Khersonsky, 1967: 72-80). After describing the turbulent film club's discussions, the patriarch of Soviet film criticism cited the results of a the survey of film club's audience (people median age was 26 years), (Khersonsky, 1967: 79) (Table 5).

Table 5. Results of a survey of participants of the Moscow Film Club (1967)

1. What are you most attracted to the cinema?		Number of responses (in%)
1.1.	The desire to get aesthetic pleasure	45.5
1.2.	The desire to learn more about the life	44.4
1.3.	The desire to watch the favorite actors	41.0
1.4.	The desire to relax	34.4
1.5.	To develop the aesthetic taste	33.7
1.6.	Find out how other people live	21.5
1.7.	Escape from everyday worries	19.8

1.8.	Have fun	19.4
1.9.	To see and experience something that is not seen or experienced in his own life	19.0
1.10	Spend the leisure time	14.4
1.11	Learning how to behave in life	6.6
2. What movie genre do you prefer to watch?		
2.1.	Psychological drama	72.5
2.2	Comedy	61.5
2.3	Animation	44.4
2.4	Musical	38.9
2.5	Adventure	29.0
2.6	Tragedy	25.0
2.7	Documentaries	21.0
2.8	Sci-fi	19.7
2.9.	Historical-revolutionary	17.2
2.10	Epic of national life	17.0
2.11	Movies-tale	16.5
2.12	Popular science	15.5
2.13	Cinema-play	6.4

Unfortunately, the article of H. Khersonsky were not given very important for any sociological survey data: the total number of respondents and their gender identity.

For Table 5, you can also make claims for terms of language correctness. For example, very similar within the meaning of answers 1.4. (The desire to relax), 1.7. (Escape from everyday worries) and 1.8. (Have fun). Rather, it is better to be combined into a single paragraph. The answer to the second question are mixed in a bunch of genres, themes and even the types of film (cartoons, as well as plays, there are in fact can to be in many different genres)...

But in general, the data in Table 5 may be the basis for certain conclusions about the Moscow film club audience in 1967.

One of these findings (and quite bold at the time) made himself H. Khersonsky: *"What caused relatively little interest in the historical-revolutionary films? I am deeply convinced that the blame for this the authors of a series of recent movies, who did not like the audience because of the stamps, clichés, the absence of a truly in-depth and, most importantly, a careful study of the life, forgetting the laws of art"* (Khersonsky, 1967: 80).

The film club specific (because film club audience is, certainly, not a mass audience) to indicate, for example, that, according to Table 5, the psychological drama (72.5%) had the first line had while, the mass audience 1960s, preferred comedy (*Prisoner of the Caucasus* and others.), science fiction (*Amphibian Man* and others.), adventures (*Elusive Avengers* and others.). On the basis of the same specificity (film club audience usually seriously interested in film as art), aesthetic factor (45.5%)

had the first place in attraction causes, but not entertaining, dominant in the mass audience.

It is worth noting that the sociology of the cinema was important in the 1960s. This is evidenced by the proposal N. Kiyashchenko: to create a sociological department in planning the building Cinema Center (Kiyashchenko, 1967: 49). Moreover, N. Kiyashchenko in their arguments on the problem of film and media education, believing that the future "*Cinema Center must first be engaged in preparation of an elementary textbook on film, designed for school, create film education courses for teacher training*" (Kiyashchenko, 1967: 49).

Film critics N. Kleiman and L. Kozlov agreed with him, and believed that the Cinema Center must include the museum of cinema, film lecture hall, film history, sociological and publishing departments and Higher film criticism and film history courses (Kleiman, Kozlov, 1967: 102-112). Other panelists were more cautious in their proposals and worried more about the safety of the existing structures of film studies (Jakubowicz, 1967: 45-46; Markulan, 1967: 46-47; Nazarian, 1967: 48).

The only pity that Cinema Center that built during the second half of the 1980s, turned into a regular multiplex in the XXI century, and the Museum of Cinema was driven out...

Book Reviews

Reviews of film critics' book, alas, almost forgotten genre in modern Russia. But *Cinema Art* of 1960s tried not to miss any significant works of film criticism. For example, the review about the book *Yes and No* by M. Turoskaya (Turovskaya, 1966) noted with delight that the text preserved "the unique atmosphere of the Turovskaya's articles, that rich intellectual atmosphere, which can easily be discharged and continuously discharged bursts of mind and style. ... M. Turovskaya's articles about cinema destined to live long. They have ice and fire, intelligence and passion, style and popularity. In them there is beauty and truth" (Sanin, 1967: 87-88).

But the book *Film of a lifetime* (Martynenko, 1966) came under sharp blow of Y. Bogomolov: "*Y. Martynenko sees in each subject only two sides: the art of any person or it degrades. Addressing the complex and multifaceted phenomenon of art, the author argues, as if not in this world flatter and elementary things*" (Bogomolov, 1967: 95).

Early deceased film critic Yuri Martynenko was my university professor, and I remember him well informative lectures, straightness has never been characterized by... However, it is no secret that reviewers often try to exaggerate its conclusions for the sparkling effect...

Other Categories

Other journal's heading about Soviet cinema (*On set, Among the actors, etc.*), as a rule, was not in polemical style (Rybak, 1967; Freilich, 1967; Shiryaev, 1967). For example, L. Rybak published a long article, written with great respect for the creative filmmaking process, produced a true and accurate approach to the "portrayed" film director: "*Work of the artist, the principles and techniques of his artistic activities often appear in a fantastic independence from his personality. When I was watching the day-to-day job of film director Y. Raisman, I imbued with the conviction: it is necessary to talk about the complex skill of the master*" (Rybak, 1967: 55).

Conclusions

Thus, the analysis of the articles of magazine *Cinema Art* – 1967 identified the following key film criticism trends:

- Despite the folding thaw effects, the magazine tried to keep the ideological position of the late 1950s - early 1960s;
- The authors of the magazine tried to analyze the most notable works of the Soviet cinema, even criticized certain shortcomings in the films of famous and influential at that time masters of the screen;
- Paying tribute to the inevitable Soviet propaganda rhetoric, the magazine could afford to publish informative theoretical and sociological discussion, and the texts of outstanding script;
- However, in some cases, the magazine could (perhaps by order "from above") cause painful a critical blow to the talented work screen.

In general, the *Cinema Art* (1967) was a kind of typical model of the Soviet humanities journals (with the entire obligatory bow to censorship) that try to stay in the position of "socialism with a human face."

References

- Abramov, N. (1967). Genuine innovation Source. *Cinema Art*. № 7, 17-27.
Alenina, N. (1967). ... Not without good people. *Cinema Art*. № 10, 48-49.
Baskakov, V.E. (1967). Polemic notes. *Cinema Art* № 9, 30-38.
Bleyman, M.Y. (1967). About the *Hero of Our Time*. *Cinema Art*. № 5, 46-52.
Bogomolov, Y.A. (1967). The book is 208 pages in length and 65 illustrations. *Cinema Art*. № 6, 91-95.
Bogomolov, Y.A. (1967). What comes first? *Cinema Art*. № 8, 67-70.
Bremener, M. (1967). Reasonable, good, eternal ... *Cinema Art*. № 3, 29-30.
Chertkov, VP. (1965). About love. Moscow: Moscow Worker.
Chertkov, V.P. (1967). When ignoring the social question. *Cinema Art*. № 9, 98-100.
Gurov, L. (1967). Through time. *Cinema Art*. № 8, 62-66.
Demin, V.P. (1966). The film without intrigue. Moscow: Art.
Demin, V.P. (1965). Riot details. Questions of drama. № 5.
Demin, V.P. (1967). Around the mediocre film. *Cinema Art*. № 12, 80-84.
For success! (1967). *Cinema Art*. № 2, 1-2.

Freilich, S.I. (1967). Little big role of the actor. *Cinema Art.* № 8, 85-89.

Freilich, S.I. (1967). Way pioneers. *Cinema Art.* № 11, 35-45.

Ignatieva, N.A. (1967). Pushing the boundaries of the genre. *Cinema Art.* № 3, 31-34.

Kara, S. (1967). Simple truths and questionable judgments. *Cinema Art.* № 4, 59-67.

Karaganov, A.V. (1967). October and world cinema. *Cinema Art.* № 11, 31-34. № 12, 23-38.

Khanutin, Y.M. (1967). For Failed. *Cinema Art.* № 8, 59-62.

Khersonsky, H.N. (1967). Aesthetics in action. *Cinema Art.* № 9, 72-80.

Khlopyankina, T.M. (1967). Well shoot - so think good // Art of Cinema. № 4, 47-51.

Kisunko, V.G. (1967). Life Devoted to the Revolution. *Cinema Art* № 4, 27-34.

Kiyashchenko, N.I. (1967). Learn the spectator. *Cinema Art.* № 8, 49.

Klado, N.N. (1967). Morality and declarations. *Cinema Art.* № 12, 69-76.

Kleiman, N.I., Kozlov, L.K. (1967). Our project. *Cinema Art.* № 7, 102-112.

Koval, Y. (1967). From the old arsenal. *Cinema Art.* № 5, 53-55.

Kovarsky, N.A. (1967). *Happy days of Rasplyuev.* *Cinema Art.* № 2, 20-23.

Kushnirov, M.A. (1967). Battle Movie Collection ... *Cinema Art.* № 2, 15-17.

Levin, E.S. (1967). The plot revolves around the protection. *Cinema Art.* № 5, 33-42.

Lvov, B. (1967). "At the far, the civil ...". *Cinema Art.* № 12, 64-69.

Markulan, J.K. (1967). Of course, we are for ... *Cinema Art.* № 8, 46-47.

Martynenko, Y.Y. (1966). Film of a lifetime. Moscow: Young Guard.

Medvedev, A.N. (2011). This magazine gave not the Soviet cinema relax. *Cinema Art.* № 4.

Mikhailova, S. (1967). And there union. *Cinema Art.* № 7, 97-101.

Nazarian, N. (1967). Success business people decide. *Cinema Art.* № 8, 48-49.

Pajitnov, L., Shragin, B. (1967). Whom to love? *Cinema Art.* № 3, 70-83.

Paperny, Z.S. (1967). Arrow Arts. *Cinema Art.* № 6, 61-64.

Pitlyar, I. (1967). Dostoevsky Entertainment. *Cinema Art.* № 5, 43-45.

Pogozheva, L.P. (1967). Through the years. *Cinema Art.* № 12, 39-53.

Rybak, L.A. (1967). 500 hours with July Raizman. *Cinema Art.* № 1, 55-66. № 2, 38-50. № 5, 72-83. № 10, 59-67. № 11, 77-85.

Sanin, M. (1967). Beauty and truth. *Cinema Art.* № 3, 86-88.

Sarnov, B.M. (1967). The Good Person of Szechwan, and the good doctor Aibolit. *Cinema Art.* № 3, 18-22.

Seyidbeyli, G. (1967). Immortality meet. *Cinema Art.* № 7, 79-82.

Shakh-Azizova, T.K. (1967). Variations based on ... *Cinema Art.* № 2, 53-56.

Shcherbakov, K.A. (1967). Return genre. *Cinema Art.* № 6, 59-61.

Shiryaev, Y. (1967). Actor, which we "passed". *Cinema Art.* № 10, 77-81.

Svobodin, A.P. (1967). The benchmark. *Cinema Art.* № 3, 34-41.

Sulkin, M.S. (2000). About Warsawsky. *Cinema Art.* № 7.

Sulkin, M.S. (1967). The path to the homeland. *Cinema Art.* № 7, 77-79.

Surkov, E.D. (1967). Replica for Boris Balter. *Cinema Art.* № 6, 73-76.

Turovskaya, M.I. (1966). Yes and No. Moscow: Art.

Vartanov, A.S. (1967). Circle of Life. *Cinema Art.* № 9, 41-44.

Warsawsky, Y.L. (1967). Old issue of the magazine. *Cinema Art.* № 1, 4-6.

Weissfeld, I.V. (1967). National and international cinema art. *Cinema Art.* № 9, 19-29.

Weissfeld, I.V. (1967). Without repeating traveled. *Cinema Art.* № 5, 30-33.

Weizmann, E.M. (1967). On the sociological side of criticism. *Cinema Art.* № 12, 54-62.

Yakubovich, O.V. (1967). This is our long-cherished dream. *Cinema Art.* № 8, 45-46.

Year 1967. *Cinema Art.* № 1, 1-3.

Yurenev, R.N. (1967). The Great October Revolution and the revolutionary innovation of Soviet cinema. *Cinema Art.* № 10, 1-8.

Zak, M.E. (1967). Prose notes on a poetic film. *Cinema Art.* № 1, 25-28.

Zak, M.E. (1967). We can do without Toastmasters. *Cinema Art* № 7, 82-85.

Zakrzewska, L.F. (1967). Wisdom tales. *Cinema Art.* № 3, 27-28.

Soviet cinema in *Cinema Art* Journal (1977)

Introduction

1977 year was jubilee in the USSR: the 60th anniversary of the Soviet power was fulfilled. It is clear that as in 1967, the Soviet press (and the magazine *Cinema Art* was no exception) should have joyfully reported about all the victories and accomplishments.

Cinema Art was published monthly: from 50 to 54 thousand copies in 1977, against 30-35 thousand in 1967. In each issue included several articles about the Soviet cinema, materials of directors, screenwriters and other filmmakers, scripts and filmographies. A whole series of ideological materials were added to the traditional headings (*New Movies, Theory and History, Interview between Films, Abroad, Script, Published on the Cinema, etc.*). For example, quotation from the speeches of the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee L. Brezhnev, *Towards the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Revolution, Modernity and the Screen...*

The editorial board of the magazine *Cinema Art* – 1977 consisted of 21 persons. As before, many of them were well-known directors (S. Gerasimov, A. Zguridi, R. Carmen, S. Yutkevich) and film functionaries. However, compared to the 1960s, film critics and film experts became approximately twice as large (almost 50%) in the editorial board: E. Surkov (editor in chief) (1915-1988), N. Ignatieva (deputy editor-in-chief) (1923-2019), A. Medvedev (deputy editor-in-chief), V. Baskakov (1921-1999), I. Weissfeld (1909-2003), A. Karaganov (1915-2007), K. Paramonova (1916-2005), N. Savitsky (born 1939), N. Sumenov (1938-2014) and R. Yurenev (1912-2002).

Of course, the spectrum of the authors of the journal was wider, but in comparison with the previous jubilee year (1967), it largely lost its representativeness. Yes, the list of authors still included: A. Vartanov (1931-2019), Y. Warsawsky (1911-2000), M. Zak (1929-2011), N. Ignatieva (1923-2019), G. Kapralov (1921-2010), A. Svobodin (1922-1999), Y. Khanyutin (1929-1978), R. Yurenev (1912-2002), etc. In addition, *Cinema Art* – 1977 also published such well-known film critics as L. Anninsky, E. Bauman (1932-2017), L. Donets (1935-2016), K. Rudnitsky (1920-1988), E. Stishova, Y. Bogomolov (born 1937), V. Demin (1937-1993), L. Kozlov (1933-2006), L. Pogožheva (1913-1989), L. Rybak (1923-1988), I. Solovieva (1927-2019), T. Khloplyankina (1937-1993), V. Shitova (1927-2002) and many other well-known film critics (among the most insulting ones, for example, are the absence of N. Zorkaya and M. Turovskaya).

Cinema Art – 1977 wrote about such notable Soviet films a *Ascension* by L. Shepitko, *Aty-baty, the Soldiers Were Walking* by L. Bykov, *I ask for Words* by G. Panfilov, *Leg-pull* by V. Menshov, *Mimino* by G. Danelia, *The*

Eldest Son by V. Melnikov, *The Key Without the Right to Transfer* by D. Asanova, *The Steppe* by S. Bondarchuk, *The Tale of how Tsar Peter Married the Arap* by A. Mitta, *The Wreath of Sonnets* by V. Rubinchik, *Twenty Days Without War* by A. German, *Unfinished play for the mechanical piano* and *Slave of Love* by N. Mikhalkov, *Wounded* by N. Gubenko. Were published talented scenarios *Moscow does not believe in words* by V. Chernykh and *Reserve* by A. Bitov. But, alas, in the same year the magazine also published a servile script of a documentary about L. Brezhnev's *Story of a Communist*, and uncontrollably complimentary reviews of the very weak military drama *Thought on Koupak* by T. Levchuk, about mediocre melodramas *Love of the Earth* and *Destiny* by E. Matveev...

Anniversary texts

The jubilee articles of 1977 were often anonymous: apparently, not every film critic, even the "boss", could afford to put his signature under such, for example, articles as "*The Inspirational Care of the Party*" (*Cinema Art*, 1977, pp. 3-8) or *The Fading Light of October* (*Cinema Art*, 1977, pp. 1-5). Here is just one quote from such anonymous opuses, saturated with references to L. Brezhnev's speeches: *It is great and honorable duty of the masters of the Soviet screen, called to recreate the epoch-making picture of the life and accomplishments of the great Soviet people. Soviet cinema art was, is and will always be the military assistant of the party* (Inspiring ..., 1977, p. 8). In issues 10 and 11 of *Cinema Art* - 1977, such ideological texts occupied more than 50% of the total volume of the journal.

Of course, among these articles there were also "author's" works. For example, a long & boring article of V. Dmitriev *The Humanism of the Socialist Revolution and Cinematography* (Dmitriev, 1977), exerting on references from the L. Brezhnev's "works", where it was enthusiastically asserted that *the cinematographic art of the Soviet land became communist party. The socialist primogeniture was determined by the choice initially made-together with the communist party, with the revolution, with the people!* (Dmitriev, 1977, p. 8).

Deputy Chairman of the Soviet Cinema Committee B. Pavlenok (1923-2012) in his party-politicized article about the current film process approved the outstanding film *Ascension* by L. Shepitko, but does not stint on the praise of long-deservedly forgotten films on the historical-revolutionary topic: *Carriage from the South, Siege, Red Black Earth, Red Diplomatic Couriers* (Pavlenok, 1977, pp. 6-14).

The indefatigable fighter of the ideological front V. Baskakov, in his article *The Cinema of Socialist Realism and the Falsification of*

Sovietologists, as always (although without any convincing arguments), refuted the opinions of the bourgeois film criticism: "Whatever our ideological opponents say, no matter what "models" of the history of Soviet cinema they are, no matter how hard they try to confuse the question of the continuity of the progressive development of Soviet cinema, they will not be able to substitute the truth for falsehood, will not be able to cover up their "true" intentions and plans" (Baskakov, 1977, p. 52).

Film Reviews

Editor-in-chief of *Cinema Art* E. Surkov was famous for his ability to balance between the "communist party line" and the line of truly artistic. That is why, in addition to the above-mentioned ideological materials, *Cinema Art* of the 1970s was active supporter of many outstanding screen works, the publication of an interview with A. Tarkovsky and his script.

So in 1977 the magazine published two articles about the masterpiece of L. Shepitko – the military drama *Ascension* (1976). Boldly noting the biblical motifs of the film, E. Stishova rightly argued that "*L. Shepitko, judging by her former films, always attracted crisis situations for the individual, the model of this situation was repeatedly tested by the director. And in "Warmth" and "Wings" characters are captured at the moment of the greatest aggravation of mutual relations with the world and with themselves. Such a sequence in the choice of characters suggests that others are uninteresting to this artist: the personality is interesting in the moment of the maximum of its human luminescence*" (Stishova, 1977, p. 31). And Z. Kutorga stressed that the authors "conduct a social and moral investigation of the greatest heroism and self-sacrifice... In parallel, they mercilessly and consistently show the moves of self-deflection and self-justification, which naturally turn Rybak into a traitor" (Kutorga, 1977, p. 56).

Full support for the magazine received another masterpiece on the military theme – *Twenty Days Without War* (1976) by A. German. Y. Khanyutin noted in his brilliant article: "*It is profoundly significant that an eyewitness, front-line correspondent and writer Konstantin Simonov and young director Alexei German, who did not see this war, severely, documented the desire to tell about the war honestly, harshly. Hence, in different generations there is a need to see the era of the war as it was – in high and terrible, in tragic and ridiculous, in the greatest accomplishments and in the smallest detail*" (Khanyutin, 1977, pp. 96-97).

In general, a positive review of another notable film on the military theme – *Aty-baty, the Soldiers Were Walking ...* (1976) by L. Bykov – wrote A. Medvedev.

The film critic reasonably noted that the level of "*Bykov's directorial mastery did not rise to the skill level of Bykov-actor*" (Medvedev, 1977, p. 51), but at the same time, he asserted in a positive context, that "*Leonid Bykov is building a film on colorful and juicy details that have always worked in textures... He forces our feelings, forcing emotions, and now we laugh, loudly laughing, and then immediately, without transition, we are compressed from pain*" (Medvedev, 1977, p. 48).

V. Turovsky also gave ambivalently evaluation of the poetic film about the military childhood *The Wreath of Sonnets* (1976) by V. Rubinchik: "*The director doubted, hesitated, whether his own poetic gift would be enough for the film. He decided to back up himself with the poetry of Bella Akhmadulina, two poems and six sonnets of her live in the film with own life... These sonnets heavier and complicate the film action. ... The music of Bella Akhmadulina's verse, superimposed on the poetic nature of the film*" (Turovsky, 1977, p. 114).

I believe that if the military drama *Thought on Koupak* (1976) by T. Levchuk was on screens in 1960s, the "thawing" editorial office of *Cinema Art* would give this film a negative evaluation. But by the mid-1970s the People's Artist of the USSR, the first secretary of the Union of Cinematographers of Ukraine, candidate member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, a deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine T. Levchuk (1912-1998) joined the cohort of "*untouchable*" directors, and *Cinema Art*, despite the low artistic level of this film, it only remained to write that "*Thought on Koupak*" "*impresses with its scale and depth, causes a sense of pride in Soviet people, helps to better understand the revolutionary transforming power that the people, having defended freedom, applied to peaceful affairs. Undoubtedly, the Thought on Koupak is one of the best works in our cinema on a military theme in recent years*" (Zemlyak, 1977, p. 36).

The same opinion it was possible to print in 1977 about the director's work of People's Artist of the USSR, Secretary of the Board of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR E. Matveev (1922-2003), who played L. Brezhnev in the film *Soldiers of Freedom*. N. Tolchenova wrote the unconditionally positive review about E. Matveev's films *Earth Love* (1974) and *Fate* (1977) with not forgotten quotes from the report of L. Brezhnev (Tolchenova, 1977, pp. 34-40).

Needless to say, in the jubilee year *Cinema Art* was simply obliged to respond to current films on the so-called historical-revolutionary topic. The drama *Trust* (1976) by V. Tregubovich was in the category of "Leniniana" of this year. V. Ishimov's very positive review of *Trust* had a lot of politics, a retelling of the plot and dialogues, but did not have the serious analysis of the movie's professional qualities.

Much more interesting was the review of E. Stishova for the melodrama *Slave of Love* (1975) by N. Mikhalkov. Of course, the article did not say a word about the fact that first this film (under the title *Unexpected Joys*) was shot by R. Khamdamov, but this shooting was banned by censorship. E. Stishova did not dispense with the stereotyped ideological phrase relating to the plot of the picture (Stishova, 1977, p. 98). On the one hand, E. Stishova admitted: *"I see N. Mikhalkov as the artist endowed with creative courage and an innate sense of form, which provided him with such a vivid start"* (Stishova, 1977, p. 102). But on the other hand she criticized the director, noting that film is too refined and stylish (Stishova, 1977, p. 101). Although the *Slave of Love*, I think, is real good melodramatic nostalgia for the departing beauty of the intelligent world on the eve of its death under a communist sickle and hammer...

Further E. Stishova remembered the previous work of N. Mikhalkov, arguing that *"the plot of "Your own among strangers.." is ethically untenable already because the Communist special service officer, in order to rehabilitate himself, must act "strangers", that is, bandit methods"* (Stishova, 1977, p. 103). Here it is necessary to think, the author of the article tried seriously (albeit very recklessly) to convince the readers that the "crystal clean" Communist special service officers never used "gangster methods", anywhere in their life...

As a result E. Stishova concluded that N. Mikhalkov *"does not notice how flirting. It happens because, in my opinion, that the primary impulse of creativity is just another formal experiment. The task how to say is put on the first place, is absolutized, all outstanding forces are thrown at its decision. The downside is indifference to the material, bordering on neglecting its historically specific moral essence. Stylization turns into an aesthetic"* (Stishova, 1977, p. 103).

If you dismiss the pathos about "indifference" and "historically specific moral essence," the *Slave of Love*, I think, in fact, a brilliant stylization, refined and aesthetic.

It is curious that *Cinema Art* – 1977 wrote about another film by N. Mikhalkov: *Unfinished play for a mechanical piano* (1977), perhaps the best movie of this director. A. Svobodin detail and kindly analyzed the *Unfinished Play ...*, and noted that *"the authors of the film freely and uninhibitedly continue the confusion of genres, acting in the spirit of the current understanding of Chekhov's dramaturgy"* (Svobodin, 1977, p. 135).

Contemporary topics were presented in the journal with a number of outstanding works. A. Lipkov (1936-2007) in a review of the drama *I Ask for Words* (1976) by G. Panfilov accurately noticed that here *"the director's attitude is as if impartial: he only objectively expounds the facts. But from the viewer he demands activity – activity of thinking, analysis, evaluation"* (Lipkov, 1977, p. 56).

Another drama, *The Word for Legal Protection* (1976) by V. Abdrashitov was demanded no less activity of the audience. M. Zak generally praised this work, since "such films, probably, should encourage not only empathy, but also "co-creation" (Zak, 1977, p. 94). But he immediately drew the readers' attention to the fact that "there is a motive for a programmed discussion, well hidden in the characters and circumstances, but ready to come to the surface after" (Zak, 1977, p. 94).

N. Ignatieva wrote very warm review of the drama *Elder Son* (1976) by V. Melnikov: "The connection, the penetration of genres for this director is associated primarily with this or that psychological mood, the state of the heroes. Therefore, genre joints, genre transitions are natural and organic in this film" (Ignatieva, 1977, p. 53). And they generally work on the important thought of the film: "kindness is associated with insecurity. She is always not ready for spiritual hardness" (Ignatieva, 1977, p. 57).

I agree with T. Mamaladze's opinion about the melodrama *Sweet Woman* (1976) by V. Fetin: "Restoring ... the genre of the morality sketch, it takes a concrete drama beyond the limits of one fate, correlates it, this drama, with the antisocial essence of philistine spirituality" (Mamaladze, 1977, p. 26).

Dignity was appreciated and one of the best comedies of G. Danelia – *Mimino* (1977) (Troshin, 1977, p. 22-23).

A significant place in *Cinema Art* – 1977 was devoted to the analysis of films about childhood and adolescence.

In detail revealing the positive aspects of the drama *Wounded* (1977) by N. Gubenko, T. Jensen noted with regret that "the scenes before and after the children's home – draws, in no uniqueness, they are all from common places. ... Actually, the lessons that childhood gives us ... a poetic and sincere in its main part..., and alas, straying to the scheme, when the action is being transferred to our days" (Jensen, 1977, pp. 84-86).

T. Mamaladze preceded reflections on the films of the 1970s on the school theme in the article of D. Asanova's drama *The Key Without the Right to Transfer* (1976): "The school film" was established in the vocabulary of criticism and in the viewer's consciousness as a persistent concept. In other cases, alas, – as a persistent stereotype. It happens that our cinema "writes" on the topics of the modern school, using a set of ready-made tools, solutions and techniques. However, there are a lot of good works, although the inertia of the stamp all strives to improve the innovative reading of the topic – and sometimes leads to the course laid by the flow of the average "school film".

True, the scheme itself is also of considerable interest. First, one way or another, it fixes certain objective life-patterns: the emergence of "nonstandard" teachers, their opposition to the routine. The assertion in the school environment of an equally "non-standard" student, an

intelligent clever man: often he conflicts with a class and a doctrinaire teacher and does not always find a way to an intelligent mentor or peer. Secondly, the study of the scheme reveals a common tendency for many school films: the school in them is not part of the mainland, not a peninsula, but an island in an endless but serene sea. Of course, the island is inhabited, inhabited by actors, but what their connections with the mainland, with the "outside world" and how this world is refracted in their characters, actions, actions – we do not know. In other words, the desire to study the life of the school in depth with all its conflicts and conflicts leads to its screen isolation from the life of the general. The article with a hard-coded name "school" is attached to everything – even to moral conflicts not of local, local origin. The island remains an island, leaving it and laying a course to the mainland, linking them with a single, unstable connection, our cinema is rarely solved. The traditional two-unit formula "school and life" breaks off at the link..." (Mamaladze, 1977, pp.75-76).

Based on these reflections, T. Mamaladze claimed that the authors of the film *The Key Without the Right to Transfer* "do not assess their characters, they seem to endure the action beyond the movie, take it to the mainstream of life. And life, as you know, breaks any scheme, even the most convenient and beautifully built. In the movie, there is usually no nostalgia for the school years, which is laid down in the "school film" scheme, which provides the lyric sound, which is kind to the spectator's heart. Here lyricism is achieved due to a special knowledge of the truth that the school is an institution largely lyrical, that is, based on feelings. That school is not just part of the continent, but its beginning" (Mamaladze, 1977, p. 83-84).

V. Kichin approached more strictly to another film on the school topic – *Leg-pull* (1976) by V. Menshov, – arguing that "this film reveals an unexpected ambivalence instead of the expected purposefulness. The director arranges with the viewer that there will be a debate film, a reflection film – in a word, a serious conversation. But the same, followed, clearly sound the call-sign of the film-games, film-spectacles" (Kichin, 1977, p. 47).

And finally, *Cinema Art* gave deserved negative evaluation of V. Rogovoy's film *Minors* (1976) (Zhavoronkov, 1977, pp. 42-46) and drama *Always with me ...* (1976) by S. Schuster (Mariamov, 1977, p. 36), and *Ivan and Kolombina* (1975) by V. Chechunov, where many shortcomings "deprives the film of the main features of the debut – the lack of young audacity, maximalism and independence of creative thinking. ... If the debut film replenishes the gallery of works of overtly gray, faceless ones, this should alarm" (Bauman, 1977, p. 61).

Alas, V. Chirkov wrote only about the political aspects of the *Night over Chile* (1977) by S. Alacorn (this film dedicated to the tragic events of the military coup of September 11, 1973), bypassing any artistic analysis in an article (Chirkov, 1977, pp. 69-75).

As before, *Cinema Art* did not forget to review the movies from the national republics. Very critical, clearly argued article of A. Vartanov (Vartanov, 1977, pp. 65-77) was about the state of affairs in Turkmen cinema.

V. Silunas wrote an article about Lithuanian cinema also in the critical way. He gave a positive opinions about the films *No One Wanted to Die*, *Stairway to Heaven*, *Hercus Mantas* and *Cleaved Sky* (Silunas, 1977, pp. 15-40), but wrote about weakness of *Saduto-tuto* (Silunas, 1977, p. 29).

Reviewing the drama *The White Steamer* (1976) by B. Shamshiyev, film critic A. Medvedev noticed minor shortcomings, but on the whole gave a positive assessment (Medvedev, 1977, p. 54).

Film History

1977 year was, apparently, not rich in the thoughts of Soviet film theorists. In any case, the separate heading *Film Theory* did not become in the journal, and in the available heading *Theory and History*, there was no theory either.

But there were a lot of articles on the film history. In this way a large article, filled with many details, was published by R. Yurenev. It was the text about foreign creative business trip of S. Eisenstein (Yurenev, 1977). A few years later the material of this article organically entered into R. Yurenev's monograph on S. Eisenstein.

R. Yurenev's article about the creative path of the Soviet director I. Savchenko (1906-1950) in general was written in a positive way. I. Savchenko appeared on the pages of this boring article "*the leading, universally recognized, revered Master & Teacher*" (Yurenev, 1977, p. 102).

V. Shklovsky's article about the Soviet director A. Roome (1894-1976) was written much more vividly. In it, there was even a reference to the film *Strict Youth* forbidden by the Soviet censorship: "*A good movie, but it has not yet appeared on screens*" (Shklovsky, 1977, p. 156).

L. Anninsky wrote the interesting article on the topic of Leo Tolstoy and the cinema (Anninsky, 1977, pp. 131-139): this is a kind of fragment from the future book of L. Anninsky about Tolstoy and cinematography.

The most unfortunate and trivial article of *Cinema Art* – 1977 on a historical theme is probably the text by I. Dubrovina *Moral Potential of ordinary character* (Dubrovina, 1977, pp. 118-134), where a lively thought

is practically not seen behind the succession of timid, censored arguments about the film characters of the 1930s-1950s ...

Cinema Sociology

Sociology in the *Cinema Art* – 1977 was presented by the article of D. Dondurei, where it was correctly noted that *"there is no ideal spectator community that can always adequately perceive "true art", and, as sociological studies show, there is a clear, constant and constantly repeating division of the audience into groups. Some, with some degree of approximation, read the program of the work, given by its creators, decode the artistic "code" of its understanding. Others demonstrate this type of perception, which experts qualify as inadequate to the author's design. ... What does a viewer see in this or that film? How to understand the origins, motives and results of such "unprofessional" perception of art and how to properly assess them? Is such a perception, despite all its differences from the "true", "prepared", be nevertheless self-valuable – and in its own way artistic? Or are we still another, negative, second-rate pole of the same "true", "adequate" perception? These are questions that require special reflection, research"* (Dondurei, 1977, p. 79).

Questions, I agree, are difficult and now...

Another Dondurei's thesis was as follows: *"At the present time, the creation of a film that would be crowded by viewers of all cultural backgrounds, all social groups, when the most delicate connoisseurs of art will gather in one room, and those who just do not have anything to do have jumped into the cinema. The creation of such a film is associated with so many difficulties. The audience of the cinema was stratified, differentiated into different "sub-audience" according to their attitudes. Is a great art to please all at once"* (Dondurei, 1977, p. 60).

Here, however, the words "at the present time" are somewhat embarrassing. That such a bundle was not it earlier (for example, in the 1950s - 1960s)? But in general, D. Dondurei is right that *"there must be such a way. For example, the production of multi-layered, multi-oriented films, like mille feuille cake, which can be read by different social groups in such a way that some will see a deep comprehension of reality in them, others will be an interesting story from life, and others – lyrical digressions of the authors. Hence the special structures of the plot collisions, the inclusion of special themes of "spectator interest", "double bookkeeping" of the artistic structure of the film, and the like. Such a compact, albeit extremely complex, path will ensure in modern conditions the social functioning of the picture of its box-office and, at the same time, artistic prestige"* (Dondurei, 1977, p. 60).

Agree, as if it was written about the melodrama (and Academy Award winner) *Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears* (1979) by V. Menshov...

Discussions

The editorial board of the *Cinema Art* – 1977 decided to celebrate the fifth anniversary of the Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee *On Literary and Art Criticism* (1972). The editorial article (without any reference to the publication of concrete film specific critics) wrote: "*Many reviews are published (including in the "Cinema Art"), ... articles that are not correlated with the tasks put forward before our time and Communist*" (Criticism ..., 1977, p. 7).

Further *Cinema Art* published a discussion about the role of film criticism in modern society. The answers of some film critics (V. Baskakov, V. Zhdan, A. Karaganov) were filled with standard phrases about socialist realism, ideological struggle, etc. The film critic A. Krasinsky noted that "*you can find many reviews and articles in which a high rating of a particular film is made only on the basis of the importance and relevance of the topic. In such cases, the very low artistic level of the film is not taken into account*" (Searches ..., 1977, p. 17). A fair statement, as exemplified by some of the above-quoted reviews in the *Cinema Art* - 1977.

The most daring text about Soviet film criticism was written by Y. Khanyutin, reasonably asserting that "*our criticism is rather toothless. Rather, critical courage is manifested, but more and more for some reason in secondary scenes of secondary directors, or, better, foreign ones. ... and if you do not like the movie of the leading director, then it's best to bypass the side, keep silent - and then, as it were, you cannot make trouble!*" (Searches ..., 1977, p. 25).

Yes, Soviet film criticism for discussions (both in 1967 and in 1977) had to carefully select the material and personalities. Of course, it was impossible even to imagine that in the 1970s a principal discussion could unfold on the *Cinema Art* pages, for example, about the films "*A Story of a Communist*" (1976) or *Thoughts on Koupak* ...

But the *Cinema Art* could afford long discussions about the films not influential directors, but about, for example, fairy tales films. In 1967, such a discussion film of the year was *Aibolit-66* by R. Bykov, in 1977 – *The Tale of how Tsar Peter Married the Arap* (1976) by A. Mitta.

True, there could be no discussion about *The Tale* ... if the well-known writer, Nobel prize laureate M. Sholokhov watched this film in the year of its creation, and not two years later... An ardent opponent of the film S. Semanov wrote about: "In August 1977, the author of this book brought this Russophobic film to Sholokhov in Veshenskaya, the writer became very interested in them" (Semanov, 2006). M. Sholokhov did not

like this film, however, he was not in a hurry to express his opinion in writing, and sent his angry letter to L. Brezhnev only in March 1978, when the discussion about the film *The Tale of how Tsar Peter Married the Arap* in *Cinema Art*, fortunately, has already ended.

Here is a key extract from M. Sholokhov letter addressed to General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Leonid Brezhnev (March 14, 1978): "*World Zionism, both foreign and Soviet, is aggressively attacking the Russian culture. It is widely practiced to drag through the cinema, television and the press of anti-Russian ideas, discrediting our history and culture, opposing the Russian socialist. The appearance of "The Tale of how Tsar Peter Married the Arap" by A. Mitta is the symptomatic in this sense. The dignity of the Russian nation is openly humiliated in this film. Tsar Peter's progressive undertakings are spoiled, Russian history and our people are ridiculed*" (Sholokhov, 1978).

A tangible reaction of the authorities to this letter did not follow. The main reason for this, apparently, is that by the time of this letter the film *The Tale of how Tsar Peter Married the Arap* already widely passed across all Soviet screens, and the post factum prohibition of this movie no longer made any sense, since such actions would be a clear indication that the authorities "missed" the appearance of an "ideologically harmful" work ...

But back to the discussion about *The Tale* ... in the pages of the *Cinema Art*.

I. Zolotussky reproaching this film for the difference and genre blurring (Zolotussky, 1977, p. 62). Considering *The Tale*... as an unsuccessful stylization, I. Zolotussky stressed that talented "*stylization requires not only loyalty to a parodied source, but also a shine of a fake – a brilliance that would eclipse the original and create the illusion of complete triumph over it. The charm of stylization in its ambiguity, in unintentional balancing on the verge of seriousness and ridicule*"(Zolotussky, 1977, p. 63).

I. Rosenfeld, on the contrary, thought that "*in the sequence, in the sense of the genre, A. Mitta, you will not refuse. Moreover, in my opinion, he managed to solve the most complicated task by introducing into the conditional "action" of Tsar Peter without violating the fabric of narration, the integrity of the film and, at the same time, not turning the sovereign into a puppet*"(Rosenfeld, 1977, p 48). In a similar vein also written by A. Lipkov, who insisted that "*it is not the business of tale to give a comprehensive, psychologically and historically profound analysis*" (Lipkov, 1977, p. 67).

But L. Onyshko was even more categorical than I. Zolotussky: "*Despite the talent and efforts of the authors, you soon notice that the image of Tsar Peter does not fit into the chosen stylistics of the movie. He*

does not need this character here, not this movie. There are, after all, concepts, images, which do not joke" (Onyshko, 1977, p. 49).

Y. Seleznev, who considered that "despite the author's attitude to gaiety, the film as a whole is still boring, because it is monotonous. ... The main reason for the artistic disobedience of the film is, in my opinion, the artificiality of its internal idea, acting in the form of a scheme"(Seleznev, 1977, p. 91).

As a result, as in the case of *Aibolit-66*, the *Cinema Art* enabled critics to express different points of view, thus proving that one can always find a springboard for discussion, even in the "stagnant" times...

Book reviews

The bibliographic section of the journal was devoted to the analysis of current cinema books. I. Eventov wrote a review of the monograph by D. Moldavsky *With Mayakovsky in the theater and cinema. The book about Sergei Yutkevich* (1975). He marked controversial moments, but in general considered "it is necessary to appreciate the observations contained in it and analysis, as well as the core thoughts of the researcher"(Eventov, 1977, p. 138).

A. Vartanov gave the positive evaluation of A. Macheret's book *Feature film* (1975). The monograph *The Golden Section of the Screen* (1976) by S. Freilich also had the positive reaction (Dmitriev, 1977, pp. 114-122).

Other rubrics

The rubric *Creative Portraits* has a qualified analysis of director's and actor's works of V. Shukshin (Rudnitsky, 1977, pp. 96-125), the creative path of the actors L. Sverdlin (Varshavsky, 1977, pp. 172-187) and T. Makarova (Yagunkova, 1977, pp. 119-136) and the film critic N. Lebedev (Vlasov, 1977, pp. 171-172). The column *On the set* included the reports about the filming of *Steppe* (1977) by S. Bondarchuk (Tolchenova, 1977, pp. 101-115) and *Fate* (1977) by E. Matveev (Donets, 1977).

Conclusions

So, the analysis of the *Cinema Art* – 1977 revealed the following main film criticism trends:

- the magazine was unable to preserve the "thawing" tendencies, which were still strong even in the late 1960s, and in many ways proved to be in the ideological line of the peak of the L. Brezhnev's epoch;

- At the same time, the journal tried to analyze the most notable works of Soviet cinema, while, alas, not allowing even in minimal doses a criticism of the shortcomings in the works of the most "principally" influential at that time the screen masters;

- giving a weighty tribute to the Soviet propaganda pathos, the magazine could afford to publish the substantive discussions "on certain narrow bridgeheads".

In general, the *Cinema Art* in 1977, as in 1967, was part of a typical model of the Soviet humanitarian journal, which, with significant censorship concessions and powers, tried to retain at least 50% of the total text for art analysis of the film process.

References

- Anninsky, L.A. (1977). An apocryphal. *Cinema Art*, № 3, pp. 131-139.
- Baskakov, V.E. (1977). Cinematography of socialist realism, and the falsification of "sovietologists". *Cinema Art*, № 11. C. 38-52.
- Bauman, E.V. (1977). Retrogression? *Cinema Art*, № 1, pp. 52-61.
- Chirkov, V. (1977). After a night - always the dawn. *Cinema Art*, № 7, pp. 69-75.
- Criticism over new boundaries (1977). *Cinema Art*, № 2, pp. 3-8.
- Dmitriev, V. (1977). The humanism of the socialist revolution and cinema. *Cinema Art*, № 11, pp. 6-25. N 12, pp. 67-74.
- Dmitriev, V. (1977). Weapon theory. *Cinema Art*, № 5, pp. 114-122.
- Dondurei, D.B. (1977). Film - "Napoleon". *Cinema Art*, № 8, pp. 58-61.
- Donets, L.S. (1977). Eternal Flame. *Cinema Art*, № 2, pp. 78-87.
- Dubrovina, I. (1977). Moral Potential of ordinary character. *Cinema Art*, № 2, pp. 118-134.
- Eventov, I. (1977). The synthesis of Arts. *Cinema Art*, № 2, pp. 135-138.
- Film Critics answer questions (1977). *Cinema Art*, № 2, pp. 9-28.
- Freilich, S.I. (1976). Golden Screen section. Moscow: Art, 360 p.
- Ignatieva, N.A. (1977). Life wiser ... *Cinema Art*, № 2, pp. 47-57.
- Inspiring care Party (1977). *Cinema Art*, № 9, pp. 3-8.
- Ishimov, V.N. (1977). At the root of trust. *Cinema Art*, № 6, pp. 54-65.
- Javoronkov, G. (1977). I, you, we ... *Cinema Art*, № 9, pp. 41-52.
- Jensen, T.S. (1977). Memory soul. *Cinema Art*, № 7, pp. 75-86.
- Kichin, V.S. (1977). Confrontation. *Cinema Art*, № 1, pp. 41-52.
- Khanyutin, Y.M. (1977). The return time. *Cinema Art*, № 7, pp. 86-97.
- Kutorga, Z., Gorchakov, O. (1977). Returned past. *Cinema Art*, № 5, pp. 55-59.
- Lipkov, A.I. (1977). Elizaveta Uvarova today and tomorrow. *Cinema Art*, № 2, pp. 55-72.
- Lipkov, A.I. (1977). Merry cunning mind. *Cinema Art*, № 3, pp. 65-72.
- Macheret, A.V. (1975). Feature film. Moscow: Arts, 256 p.
- Mamaladze, T. (1977). Empty Soul. *Cinema Art*, № 8, pp. 16-26.
- Mamaladze, T. (1977). Writing on an unexpected topic. *Cinema Art*, № 4, pp. 75-84.
- Maryamov, A. (1977). Tangent to the plan. *Cinema Art*, № 8, pp. 27-37.
- Medvedev, A.N. (1977). In nameless heights. *Cinema Art*, № 2, pp. 44-55.
- Medvedev, A.N. (1977). Humanity in the offensive. *Cinema Art*, № 5. C. 36-54.
- Modernity and the screen (1977). *Cinema Art*, № 2, pp. 3-8.

- Moldavsky, D. (1975). *Mayakovsky in theater and cinema. A book about Sergei Yutkevich*. Moscow.
- Onyshko, L. (1977). In my opinion, the film lacks nationality. *Cinema Art*, № 12, pp. 49-50.
- Pavlenok, B.V. (1977). Entering the jubilee year. *Cinema Art*, № 1, pp. 6-14.
- Rosenfeld, I. (1977). Topics Development. *Cinema Art*, № 12, pp. 45-49.
- Rudnicki, K.L. (1977). Prose and screen. *Cinema Art*, № 3, pp. 96-125.
- Search and discovery (1977). *Cinema Art*, № 2, pp. 9-28.
- Seleznev, Y. (1977). What is a dispute? *Cinema Art*, № 6, pp. 85-92.
- Selezneva, T. (1977). Notes about cinema memories. *Cinema Art*, № 3, pp. 140-149.
- Semanov, S.N. (2006). Brezhnev: the ruler of the "golden age." Moscow: Veche, 320 p.
<https://www.litmir.co/br/?b=222362&p=46>
- Silunas, V. (1977). Poetry and Truth. *Cinema Art*, № 1, pp. 15-40.
- Shklovsky, V.B. (1977). Thorny let the sun. *Cinema Art*, № 1, pp. 155-156.
- Sholokhov, M.A. (1978). Letter to the General Secretary of Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party Leonid Brezhnev. 14.03.1978. In: Semanov, S.N. Brezhnev: the ruler of the "golden age." Moscow: Veche, 2006. 320 p.
<https://www.litmir.co/br/?b=222362&p=46>
- Stishova, E.M. (1977). Chronicle and Legend. *Cinema Art*, № 9, pp. 30-41.
- Stishova, E.M. (1977). To make a film ... *Cinema Art*, № 4, pp. 94-103.
- Svobodin, A.P. (1977). Freestyle Chekhov. *Cinema Art*, № 10, pp. 121-136.
- Tolchenova, N.P. (1977). It's time to Chekhov. *Cinema Art*, № 7, pp. 86-97.
- Tolchenova, N.P. (1977). Happiness total, total mount ... *Cinema Art*, № 12, pp. 31-41.
- Troshin, A.S. (1977). Between the earth and the sky. *Cinema Art*, № 12, pp. 21-31.
- Turovsky, V.S. (1977). The boys went to the front. *Cinema Art*, № 10, pp. 114-120.
- Unfading light October (1977). *Cinema Art*, № 11, pp. 1-5.
- Vartanov, A.S. (1977). Film Studies and filmmaking. *Cinema Art*, № 8, pp. 101-108.
- Vartanov, A.S. (1977). New and old Turkmen cinema. *Cinema Art*, № 6, pp. 65-77.
- Vlasov, M.P. (1977). Scientist and Communist. *Cinema Art*, № 10, pp. 171-172.
- Warsawsky, Y.L. (1977). Sverdlin's principle. *Cinema Art*, № 11, pp. 172-187.
- Yagunkova, L.D. (1977). The fate of the actor - The fate of generations. *Cinema Art*, № 7, pp. 119-136.
- Yurenev, R.N. (1977). He was young. *Cinema Art*, № 1, pp. 92-124.
- Yurenev, R.N. (1977). Under alien sky. *Cinema Art*, № 6, pp. 37-53. N 8, pp. 62-87.
- Zak, M.E. (1977). The frame and the floor to protect. *Cinema Art*, № 4, pp. 84-94.
- Zemlyak, V. (1977). Feat. *Cinema Art*, № 5, pp. 23-36.
- Zolotussky, I.P. (1977). "Were carried out with the kings of Pushkin ..." *Cinema Art*, № 3, pp. 58-64.

Western cinema in the mirror of the Soviet film criticism

Status of Soviet critics who wrote about the western movies

Film criticism was prestigious job in the USSR. At that time there was no Internet and critic can be published only on paper. And this was due to: 1) a professional status of the author (in this case it had to be, as a rule, a graduate film critic, art historian, journalist, or have higher education in the humanitarian field); 2) with a rigid selection and censorship of texts and themes.

But if even all journalists (including from regional newspapers) could write (and willingly wrote) about the western movies on the Soviet screen, only the selected Russian film critics could write about western films not purchased for the Soviet film distribution. Here criteria are much stricter because before the era of video (i.e., almost to 1980) only very few Soviet film critics could watch USA or French films not purchased for the Soviet film distribution, for example, at foreign film festivals. And these were those few Soviet film critics who belonged to a particular elite caste: government film officials, as a rule, members of the Communist Party, "morally and ideologically stable persons."

From this point of view is very significant architectural structure of Soviet film critics, for nearly a quarter of a century (1966 to 1989) to publish their articles in the special subject books' collection about western movie called *Myths and Realities* (11 issues: 1966; 1971; 1972; 1974; 1976; 1978; 1981; 1983; 1985; 1988; 1989). The main materials for this research were the books, articles of Russian film critics about Western cinema. The methods of theoretical research: classification, comparison, analogy, induction and deduction, abstraction and concretization, theoretical analysis and synthesis; methods of empirical research: collecting information related to the research subjects. The effectiveness of such methods has been proven as the Western (R. Taylor, D. Youngblood, A. Lawton et al.), and Russian (N. Zorkaya, A. Kolesnikova, M. Turovskaya) researchers. I used also the method of hermeneutic analysis of the cultural context of media texts (Eco, 1976; Silverblatt, 2001).

'Myths and Reality': Issue 1 (1966, put in a set in October 1965)

The first issue of *Myths and Reality* collection has been put in a set in October 1965 (already in power times of Leonid Brezhnev). The appearance of this collection seems to have been the result of not only the regular sharpening confrontation between the USSR and the West (the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War), and the current regulations of the

Communist Party Central Committee "On measures to improve the management of the development of artistic cinema" (July 1962) and "Immediate Tasks of party's ideological work" (June 1963). It was clearly stated that "the party will continue to wage an uncompromising struggle against any ideological vacillation, preaching peaceful coexistence of ideologies, anti-formalist trickery, dullness and craftsmanship in art, for the Party and the People's Soviet art - the art of socialist realism" (Immediate..., 1963).

Table 6. Main political events in the world (1961-1965 years), important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West, including cinema

1961

USSR sent a note of protest related to the anti-Castro landing in Cuba: 8th of April.
USSR successfully launched the world's first spacecraft with a man on board: on 12 April.

The construction of the Berlin Wall - on 13 August.

XXII Congress of the Soviet Communist Party: 17-31 of October.

1962

Resolution of the Communist Party Central Committee "On measures to improve the management of the development of artistic cinema": July 19th.

Cuban Missile Crisis ended with evacuation of Soviet missiles from Cuba in exchange for a US promise to abandon its occupation: October-November.

1963

Treaty between the USSR and the USA on the establishment of a "hot" telephone line between Moscow and Washington on 20 June.

Resolution of the Plenum of the Communist Party Central Committee "Immediate Tasks in Party's ideological work": June.

USSR temporarily (1963-1968) weakened jamming broadcasts *Voice of America*, *BBC* and *Deutsche Welle* in Russia.

The murder of US President John F. Kennedy in Dallas November 24.

1964

US entry into the war in Vietnam - August 2nd.

N. Khrushchev lost of power at the plenum of the Communist Party Central Committee.

L. Brezhnev elected (on the same plenum) the first secretary of the Soviet Communist Party: 14 October.

1965

Soviet Union in the framework of a confrontation with the United States put North Vietnam Missiles: 5 April.

The first issue of *Myths and Reality* was a response to the appeals of the Communist Party for "uncompromising fight against any ideological vacillation, preaching peaceful coexistence of ideologies" and "corrupting influence of the bourgeois cinema". The article by the then first deputy chairman of USSR State Committee for Cinematography V. Baskakov had the eloquent title "Battle of ideas". The text of this article gives many

quotations from the works of Western film critics and directors, but without reference to the source. And further (already without any quotes) quite radically stated that "bourgeois theorists put equal signs between cowardice and heroism, between truth and falsehood, between revolutionary activity and philistinism, between nobility and baseness. No one can prove the absoluteness of moral criteria: everything is relative, everything is conditional, all unstable and shaky, they claim, denying, in essence, humanism art. Many films are made in accordance with the views of these theorists. ... We can see an interesting cinematic solutions, achieve virtuosity in the shooting, the depth and subtlety of acting performance. But the search itself, the purpose of it, the true content of the film is very far from the serious social and purely human problems that exist in everyday life, in reality. ... It's a shame that the great potential of artists aimed primarily at autopsy and investigation of the strange particulars of human anomalies and psychological abysses, not social and moral conflicts of the society in which the characters live. ... That's the idea of running these movies: "Every evil brings a new evil, and in vain to deal with it." "Human nature is flawed, is low-lying and is incurable." "Progress and civilization bring people only suffering. Any public act of senseless" (Baskakov, 1966, pp. 17-18).

Accused Western cinema on the "theoretical level", V. Baskakov have tried to confirm the analysis of his reflections on examples of movies such masters as M. Antonioni, I. Bergman, J.-L. Godard, C. Chabrol, A. Varda. And here he has not stinted on the critical charge: "Antonioni fails to understand phenomena and social contradictions of life, which he is likely to see. Fragmentation of vital relationships, rigorous analysis and gravitas in the depiction of small, minor, and maintenance of an important, significant - that is, perhaps, more characteristic for the entire work of this talented director"(Baskakov, 1966, p.21).

"Carefully, with cruel naturalistic pressure Bergman depicts sex scenes, and seeking to link with the overall mood of the film - everything is bad in this life, all the ugly, and above all the ugly and disgusting man himself, his nature. Bergman uses the whole arsenal of graphic tools of cinema, which he owns, for purposes not great. To illustrate the idea of leading the modern decadence of baseness, vulgarity and insignificance of human nature, this is hardly needed such a thin and highly professional agents"(Baskakov, 1966, p.25).

Reserved praised *Umbrellas of Cherbourg* by Jacques Demy, *Married Life* by André Cayatte, *Tom Jones* by Tony Richardson, *Room at the Top* by Jack Clayton, films of Stanley Kramer (Baskakov, 1966, pp. 9-11, 29), Baskakov found the Western countries, where it was possible to detect not only the bourgeois but also a progressive movie: "The progressive Italian art still lives and develops, although some of the artists who put

movies about Italian people living in the surroundings of the boycott of progressive art in an atmosphere of hype about "economic miracle" has moved to the rails of bourgeois cinematography (with its pseudo-historical movies, dramas and contemporary sex films). The most fundamental artists associated with the life and struggle of the people, continue to strengthen the tradition of realistic cinema. Best picture "old men": Zavattini and De Sica, Visconti and De Santis, Castellani and Rossellini, Germi and Comencini; young directors: Rosi and Loy are vivid evidence. ... And if the pictures of decadent directors raised by bourgeois criticism on a pedestal as the prophets and new roads in art, permeates the thought of the futility of any action, any manifestation of activity, the futility of the struggle for the happiness of man, the beating pulse of life in the films of progressive directors and in some cases, the pulse of the struggle for a better future of man and society" (Baskakov, 1966, pp. 5-6).

This reliance on the "progressive cinema in Italy" let V. Baskakov do quite standard for the Soviet press of that time concluded that "the development of world cinema still more clearly confirms the decisive role for the prospects for its art of socialist as well as art of the artists of the capitalist countries, who cast their lot with the most advanced ideas of the century, involved in the struggle for social transformation of the world, believe in the person who let another do not always consistently and consciously, but claim the ideals of peace and humanity and denounce the morality of a society based on oppression and suppression of human" (Baskakov, 1966, p.31).

Being on the top leadership of the Soviet cinema, V. Baskakov, undeniably brilliant oriented in the ideological conjuncture of time. His article can probably be regarded as a reference for understanding the official Soviet cinema studies, facing the material foreign cinema: 1) sharp criticism of "bourgeois tendencies and perversions" 2) sympathetic support "progressive western filmmakers," that is, those in whose work can be it was observed that the criticism of bourgeois society, which does not contain at the same time anti-Soviet, naturalism, sex and "formalist trickery."

In a similar vein, an article written of the Secretary of the Board of the Soviet Union of Cinematographers A. Karaganov, who condemning western movies with scenes of violence and sex (Karaganov, 1966, pp. 32-33), criticizing the complexity of shapes and pessimism *Last year at Marienbad* by Alain Robbe-Grillet and Alain Resnais (Karaganov, 1966, pp. 46-47), supporting Italian neorealism (Karaganov, 1966, p. 49) and Stanley Kramer movies *On the Beach* and *Judgment at Nuremberg* (Karaganov, 1966, pp. 70-72).

Here are concrete examples of the ideological position of A. Karaganov: "In contrast to the neo-realists Antonioni withdraws person

from the historical flow of the real social environment. Movies of Antonioni *Scream, Adventure, Night or Eclipse*, made expertly, is the product of a strong and soulful talent. But their life is narrowed to study the content of the soul from the disunion of human society. Fellini ... is more social in *Dolce Vita* and *Nights of Cabiria*" (Karaganov, 1966, pp. 50, 60).

A similar opinion is held the other author of the first issue of *Myths and Reality* - philosopher E. Weizmann (1918-1977). Accusing bourgeois cinema in repelling harmful ideas of existentialism, Freudianism and surrealism, he argued that "the myth of the miserable human nature obscured reality" (Weitzman 1966, p. 88).

A recognized expert in the field of French cinema A. Braginsky very strongly presented to Soviet readers the results of the French "new wave" cinema, exposing a particularly severe criticism movies of J.-L. Godard and C. Chabrol. So, in the paragraph dedicated to *Cousins*, stated that "ambiguity, inaccuracy of the author's position, manifested in this Chabrol's film" is general characteristic of the directors of "new wave" (Braginsky, 1966, p.129) and "sadism and cruelty which allegedly wants to condemn Chabrol, the truth of life, which he allegedly looking through subjects of his movies, it turns against Chabrol. ... Chabrol's "true" private observation becomes a lie due to lack of a clear attitude towards life. The credibility of the individual parts and the initial position replaced of pseudo-philosophers and anarchic attitude to reality"(Braginsky, 1966, p.130).

Since thousands of Soviet readers of the book *Myths and Reality*, as a rule, had no chance to see the movies of "new wave", many of them were probably quite easy to convince that "characters of Godard's film are only obedient puppets in the hands of its creator. They are infected with the same nihilism and anarchism, as their creator, and "new wave" is in a severe ideological crisis network" (Braginsky, 1966, pp.131, 133)

R. Sobolev wrote about the fashionable in the West *cinéma vérité* movement more critical. Based on the analysis of the films "fascist and cynic Gualtiero Jacopetti", he argued that it was *cinéma vérité* is a mask for liars, as a sort of sabotage against realism under the guise of realism"(Sobolev, 1966, p.143).

Against the backdrop of all these revelations and accusations of bourgeois cinema article of V. Nedelin entirely dedicated to the analysis of "complex and contradictory" Fellini *8 1/2* looked serious and contrast (Nedelin, 1966, pp. 205-226).

In the era of socialism, there are not only approved the scheme of ideological approaches to Western cinema as a whole, but also to write finals relevant books and articles. The degree of ideological accusations of Western film production can be arbitrarily high, but the ending was sure to contain at least a paragraph optimistic pathos reminds the reader of the

"progressive trends in world cinema": "Hopefully, the democratic traditions of the French cinematography will prevail, and we will see films in which the young masters of French cinema truly reflect the lives, hopes, anxieties, dreams of the people of France" (Braginsky, 1966, p.133). "A progressive cinema bourgeois states has a vivid example of service to high humanistic ideals, the realistic traditions and needs of our time" (Parsadanov 1966, p.124).

'Myths and Reality': Issue 2 (1971, put in a set in September 1970)

Between the output of the first and second editions of *Myths and Reality* collection took five long years. During this time there have been many important political events in the world (the war in Vietnam and the Middle East, May Revolution in France, the suppression of the "Prague Spring", the landing Americans on the moon and so forth.).

Table 7. Key political events in the world of 1966-1970, important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West. Events in the USSR, which had relevance to the cinema

1966

France's withdrawal from NATO's military organization: on 21 February.

XXIII Congress of the Soviet Communist Party: March 29 - April 8.

French President Charles de Gaulle's visit to the USSR 20 June - 1 July.

Start of the "cultural revolution" (1966-1976) in China: August 8.

1967

War in the Middle East, the Soviet Union break diplomatic relations with Israel: July 5-10.

Soviet Communist Party Central Committee resolution "On measures for further development of the social sciences and enhance their role in the building of communism": on 14 August.

1968

Mass unrest in France (the reason: the dismissal of the director of the Paris Cinematheque) - May.

Renewed Soviet jamming broadcasts *Voice of America* and other Western radio stations in Russian on its territory: August 20.

The Soviet invasion in Czechoslovakia, August 21st.

1969

Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio and television, film, culture and art institutions for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire": 7 January.

The armed conflict between the Soviet Union and China on the Sino-Soviet border: March.

The landing of American astronauts on the moon July 20.

Start of the Soviet-American talks on limiting strategic nuclear weapons: 17 November.
1970
Solemnly-pathetic celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of V.Lenin on 22 April.
The signing of the Treaties of the USSR and Germany, Germany and Poland on the recognition of post-war borders in Europe, August.
Distribution of the Vietnam War on the territory of Cambodia.
Dissident A. Solzhenitsyn was awarded of the Nobel Prize for Literature

As for the movie, here a significant impact on the development of Soviet critics had a Soviet Communist Party Central Committee resolution "On measures for further development of the social sciences and enhance their role in the building of communism" (August 14, 1967).

However, I believe that Czechoslovakia's events of 1968-1969 were the most serious impacts on the situation in the film and film studies in the Soviet Union. The attempt of democratization of social life, the abolition of censorship taken by the Czechoslovak leadership in 1968, representing a serious danger to the ideological foundations of the Soviet Union and established strict canons of "socialist realism", in particular.

Of course, the introduction of Soviet troops (or rather, the Warsaw Pact troops) on the territory of Czechoslovakia and its subsequent "Brezhnevization" socialism seems to be stabilized in this small country. However, the ideological leadership of the USSR are well aware that "Prague Spring" - a kind of "thaw", passed in this spring, which with great difficulty managed to freeze. That is why the events of the "Prague Spring" brought an end to the flow of thaw in the USSR: the censorship has become even more severe, and the fight against "bourgeois ideology" even more intensively.

Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee (January 7, 1969) "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio and television, film, culture and art institutions for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire" was another step of censorship. If figuratively keep this resolution in one sentence, you get something like this: "Now none of the bourgeois mouse does not slip past the implacable Soviet censorship." A movie where "embellished orders in the modern capitalist world, idealized capitalist way of life preached by the bourgeois idea of class peace" (Resolution ... 1969) have been entirely banned in the Soviet Union. Interestingly enough, this embellishment was not just the direct promotion of the "bourgeois lifestyle", but any artistic liberties, including experiments with cinematic form (see more info: Fedorov, 2012), nudity or coarse mot. The Resolution wrote also about the activities of "wrong" Soviet artists who "depart from the class criteria in assessing and highlighting the complex social and political problems, facts and events, and sometimes become carriers of the views that are alien to the ideology of socialist society" (Resolution... 1969).

The Resolution says that it is necessary "more acute, with the class and party positions to oppose all manifestations of bourgeois ideology to actively and efficiently promote communist ideals, the advantages of socialism, the Soviet way of life, deeply analyze and expose the different kind of petty and revisionist currents." (Resolution ... 1969).

So, the ideological leaders of Soviet cinema decided that the second issue of *Myths and reality* must have more harsh criticism of the bourgeois cinema, and in opposition to - the active support of the foreign progressive films.

The article of V. Baskakov in this case can be considered as the answer for the Resolution. He argued that "true art does not compromise with decadence, does not avoid direct and clear judgments about the phenomena of reality, does not go away from the problems of its people living in the mystical world of signs, premonitions and associations. ... And if the picture directors-decadents raised by bourgeois criticism on the podium as models and examples of "innovation", filled with doubts in favor of any action, any manifestation of activity and preach the futility of the struggle for the happiness of man, the beating pulse of life in the films of progressive directors and in some cases, the pulse of the struggle for a better future of man and society" (Baskakov, 1971, pp. 9-10).

And V. Baskakov gave the examples of "socially clear positions" in the western movies: social drama *Battle of Algiers* G. Pontecorvo and *Sitting Right* V. Dzurlini (Baskakov, 1971, pp. 29-31).

However, despite the support of a progressive cinema (i.e, close to the Socialist Realism), the main content of the article was, of course, passages criticizing the bourgeois cinema. First, V. Baskakov sincerely regretted that "the whole picture of European Screen has transformed in recent years. Films, which put the real social problems, it becomes smaller. But there were an abundance of pseudo-realistic movies - they present the appearance of life surroundings, ... but not in these films authentic truth" (Baskakov, 1971, p. 6).

Then film critic gave more specific examples, and even the theoretical generalizations. Thus he rightly pointed out that "the on-screen world occurred a phenomenon that can be simplistically be called diffusion. This interpenetration of different stylistic techniques, thematic and ideological and philosophical currents. Diffusion phenomenon takes many different shades: modernist techniques of cinema penetrate the style of entertainment, the so-called commercial cinema" (Baskakov, 1971, pp. 17-18).

But then he unleashes his anger on the western masters of the first row, accusing them of compromises for the sake of the needs and interests of the bourgeois public (Baskakov, 1971, p.18), illustrating this thesis is the

analysis of films of L. Buñuel, P.-P. Pasolini, F. Fellini, M. Antonioni (Baskakov, 1971, pp. 18-28).

V. Baskakov sought to convince readers that "capitalism rots, the whole system is built on lies and oppression, and the artist, with his microscope, the lens of which fall into a stirring ciliates, it seems that mankind is rotting" (Baskakov, 1971, p. 16).

As always V. Baskakov strongly criticized J.-L. Godard - one of the most politicized Western directors of those years: "In a society that draws Godard, no classes, no social contradictions. There is a mad world, consisting of patients, distraught individuals. ... Picture deformities, abnormalities impressive bourgeois world, but Godard as crazy gunner, shooting in all directions, without looking into the essence of phenomena that affect his bullet" (Baskakov, 1971, pp. 12-13).

Of course, many Western authors were accused in "ideological sabotage": "Along with the boom of sex can be observed unique phenomenon of politicization of cinema. ... It is true that many of these films are made from the standpoint of the bourgeois. ... Many of the so-called "political" films contain direct or indirect criticism of socialism from the "right" and sometimes from the the "left" (Baskakov, 1971, p. 8). That is the worst in the Western political cinema was seen just a tail (or targeted: in the *Confessions* by Costa-Gavras) criticism of the communist foundations...

G. Kapralov accused M. Antonioni, R. Bresson, M. Bellocchio and S. Samperi in the absence of social analysis. For example: *Blow Up* "Antonioni consistently asocial. But precisely because of its asocial it turns into an image of a certain universal absurdity of human existence in general, reflected a certain mystification of a comprehensive law on which supposedly lives a modern world" (Kapralov 1971, p. 44). "Real, with such ruthlessness and accurate depiction of reality is declared Bresson ghostly, immaterial as casual clothes, thrown to the eternal soul. A surreal world declared authentic" (Kapralov 1971, p. 59).

G. Kapralov arguing, however, without any citation of primary sources, that "the invasion of schizophrenic characters - a consequence of the objective conditions of life of the modern bourgeois world, where, according to medical statistics, almost every second or third suffers from a serious mental disorder" (Kapralov 1971, p. 55).

G. Kapralov accused of ambiguity and the loss of the social significance of the drama *Fists in the Pocket* by M. Bellocchio and *Thank You, Aunt* by S. Samperi (Kapralov, 1971, pp. 51-56), and further noted with regret of I. Bergman "complexity of the construction of *Persona*, deliberate obscurity, encoding its language" (Kapralov 1971, p. 68).

Another well-known Soviet film critic – G. Bohemsky wrote more rigid definitions about many Italian movies: sadism and pathology

(Bohemsky, 1971, pp. 87-90). And therefore "the urgent task of Marxist criticism - to repulse this wave of Italian screen: pathological cruelty, sadism, penetration of commercial cinema in the "ideology" (Bohemsky, 1971, p. 91).

Of course, along the way G. Bohemsky did not forget to praise the "progressive Italian cinema" for example, *Battle of Algiers* by G. Pontecorvo *Sitting Right* by V. Dzurlini and *Martyrs of the Earth* by V. Orsini (Bohemsky, 1971, pp. 82). However, the main thesis of his article was the statement that "one of the most obvious new trends in Italian cinema - occurring within its polarization. Striking a sharp division in the frankly commercial, primitive and thoughtless film production, designed for the most undemanding audience, and on the other hand - the so-called "biased" or "recruited", cinema, i.e. films that serve certain ideas that carry a certain charge and now have a predominantly political overtones" (Bohemsky, 1971, p. 71).

After articles of general film critics the book *Myths and Reality* gave the place for the article of another film critic (and co-author of M. Turovskaya and M. Romm in the documentary script "Ordinary Fascism") Y. Khanutin (1929-1978). As if responding to V. Baskakov and G. Kapralova, Y. Khanutin boldly expressed his opinion about the "asocial Swedish cinema": "Yes, it records more often than analyze, yes, its artists just do not see the positive social decision-making, as well as their characters; a criticism limited in scope, does not rise to the radical revolutionary conclusions. But this criticism, this revelation is the truth" (Khanutin 1971, p.149).

The article of film critic V. Turitsyn also was without soviet ideological stereotypes, this is very positively analysis of the works of British director T. Richardson (Turitsyn 1971, pp.175-198).

But really very stranger in this book (as a kingdom of "celebration of the ideological struggle") was the text of I. Janushevskaya and V. Demin called "Formula adventure" (Janushevskaya, Demin, 1971, pp. 199-228), mainly devoted to French actor Alain Delon. This was brilliantly written article which is palpable vivid imagery style of one of the most prominent soviet film critic Victor Demin (1937-1993). No words about "Resolutions" and "Ideology"... That is why there is nothing surprising in the fact that this Demin's publication was only one in the all 11 issues of *Myths and Reality* ...

'Myths and Reality': Issue 3 (1972, put in a set in February 1972)

The third issue was released about a year after the second. However, during that time, there were two important events for the Soviet Union in the political life: the XXIV Congress of the Soviet Communist Party and

the Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On Literary Criticism", directly related to the film criticism.

Table 8. The main political events of 1971-1972 years in the world that are important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West. Events in the USSR, which had relevance to the cinema

1971

105 Soviet diplomats accused of spying in United Kingdom.

XXIV Congress of the Soviet Communist Party March 30 - April 9.

1972

Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On Literary Criticism": 21 January.

The Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On Literary Criticism" (January 21, 1972) stated that "the state of the criticism is not fully meet the requirements, which are determined by the increasing role of artistic culture in communist construction. ... Criticism debt - depth analysis of the phenomenon, trends and patterns of contemporary art process in every possible way promote the strengthening of Leninist principles of nationality and party membership, to fight for the highest ideological and art levels of Soviet art, consistently oppose bourgeois ideologies"(Resolution ..., 1972).

Even the appearance of such Resolution indirectly talked about the fact that the effects of previous Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, relating to culture and ideology, were not recognized by the authorities fully effective. It took more time to indicate the professional critics (including film critics), they are still not sufficiently follow the "party line" strictly criticized inadequate cinema "decadent West."

Well, the Communist party said: "You must!" And Soviet film criticism official leaders said: "Yes, We will do!" In most texts of the third issue of *Myths and Reality* were about the ideological struggles with Western cinema. No texts V. Demin and Y. Khanutin in the book. The main authors were the old, proven in the ideological battles, film critics.

A. Karaganov with directness of ideological front soldier claimed that "now there literature and press is not a single policy, a single front of the ideological struggle: American bourgeois cinema directly serving the foreign policy and the US propaganda department. ... Hollywood is working on a well-defined theses of anti-Soviet propaganda: *President* by Lee Thompson, *Topaz* by A. Hitchcock, *The Kremlin Letter* by J. Huston. The "characteristic of modern art of the American bourgeoisie is commercially fair and salon-use entertainment cruelty motives. ... In both cases - and when cruelty becomes a game, bait, and when dramatically portrayed as cancer mad world - the artist is not aware of the real sound it creates works" (Karaganov, 1972, pp. 6-7, 15).

A. Karaganov made it clear that not everything is so simple even authorized to the Moscow Film Festival fiction movie *2001: A Space Odyssey*, "Kubrick created a work fancifully combines features of Hollywood commercial thriller and philosophical works, in which the criticism of bourgeois reality becomes decadent character" (Karaganov, 1972, p. 21). In my opinion, this Karaganov's phrase gave a clear answer to the puzzled questions of some naive viewers do not understand why the film adaptation of the novel of A. Clark never reached the Soviet-rolled ...

However, A. Karaganov did not forget to praise the progressive realistic film *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?* by S. Pollack and *The Liberation of L.B. Jones* by W. Wyler (Karaganov, 1972, p. 7).

From the American movie A. Karaganov, went to the French cinema. First, according to the established in the Soviet elite film studies tradition, he sharply reminded that "schismatic position, throwing Godard from one position to another, the substitution of revolutionary consciousness conglomerate anarchist, Maoist and Trotskyist ideas lead to the devaluation of the opposition to the bourgeois system, which proclaims Godard, to the emasculation of the revolutionary content arguments about "proletarian cinema" (Karaganov, 1972, p. 25). And then moved on to a much more dangerous trend of open and consistent anti-communism, which became the core of the famous film *Confession* (1970) by Costa Gavras, because it "helps bourgeois slander communism. It should be added that the main role in the *Confession* play Yves Montand and Simone Signoret, has recently come to the Moscow film festivals with words of friendship and love for the Soviet Union, and now carefully trampling his past statements" (Karaganov, 1972, p. 30).

Moreover, when in 1984 Moscow publishing house "Rainbow" released a translation of the book by J.-P. Jancolas *French Cinema. Fifth Republic (1958-1978)*, which contained an impressive volume of the filmography of famous French film directors (1950s - 1970s), the names of Yves Montand and Simone Signoret were simply blacked out of the lists of films, where they played (as a rule, the main role). It is clear that the *Confession* was not in the filmography also.

A. Karaganov made far-reaching conclusions that the "bourgeois propaganda in every way diminishes the accomplishments and inflates shortcomings in practical builders of socialism - it tends to deprive the workers of hope and faith, to make their growing disillusionment with the bourgeois lifestyle disappointing total, turn it into a disbelief in the position drooping hands" (Karaganov, 1972, p. 29). And if the "sexual revolution" of the bourgeoisie is in its aspirations and attempts to "underclass" the consciousness of the working people, to devalue human" (Karaganov, 1972, p. 27), the "mass culture in the hands of bourgeois businessmen often, very often turns out to be a dangerous and dark force. It shapes man model

bourgeois philistine - it makes being spiritless, obedient slave of capital. ... And if some of its customers still protesting, rebelling against proprietary beastliness, it tends to clip the wings of turkeys revolt about the fatal human depravity and the indestructible evil in modern industrial society. In this sense, cinema pinned hopes" (Karaganov, 1972, p. 4).

And V. Baskakov wrote: "On the white canvas of the silver screen, as elsewhere in the world, facing opposing forces and trends. The best films of the socialist countries, marked a vital truth, a high and effective humanism, product of progressive artists of the capitalist West, scourging capitalism ugliness and full of sympathy for the working people, their needs and aspirations of the young cinematography developing countries confront a wide and muddy stream of bourgeois film production, poison the minds of the masses the poison of disbelief in man and his future. ... With regard to the western cinematography would be more correct to speak not of "commercial" and "non-commercial" cinema, and about the different types of the same bourgeois cinematography, which is opposed to the art of democratic, progressive, gravitating toward realism" (Baskakov, 1972, pp. 75, 81).

As A. Karaganov, V. Baskakov devoted several paragraphs of his article, the anti-Soviet subject, arguing that the "anti-Soviet films produced more than before. ... It should be noted here that influential directors and actors of the bourgeois cinema trapped in the anti-Soviet orbit, ... reactionary, anti-communist content" (Baskakov, 1972, pp. 76-77).

Next V. Baskakov in his typical manner wrote that "the departure of many artists of the bourgeois world of the urgent problems of public life, the subordination of the political and commercial interests of the propertied classes have not been to the Western Film Arts in vain: he began to turn away from the mass audience. The crisis in the Western cinema recently acquired a wide swing" (Baskakov, 1972, p.78).

And here the desired explicitly passed for real: the causes of falling box-office in the West in 1970s, of course, were different: not "waste of many artists of the bourgeois world from the pressing social problems of life" and their commercialization, but the rapid development of multi-channel color television and the entertainment industry generally have reduced cinema attendance. A high films' box-office in the USSR in 1960s – 1970s was caused by precisely the relative underdevelopment of both entertainment, and television (the maximum number of Soviet television channels in 1970s was three, and Western films were shown there extremely rare). And that shortage of fun directs the flow of Soviet viewers in cinemas. As soon as the second half of the 1980s, video has come to the USSR, and expanded opportunities for recreation, cinema attendance began to fall...

V. Baskakov turned to his usual business: he accused eminent foreign cinema masters (Fellini, Pasolini, Bergman, etc.) of "biologism" and detachment from social problems: "Seeing in the surrounding life moral ugliness, vulgarity, hypocrisy, senseless cruelty, but without being able to see the social roots of all evil, they begin to ascribe to vices inherent in bourgeois society, the biological nature of man, thus declaring them unavoidable, eternal. ... Of course, Bergman's work reflects some real processes occurring in the modern bourgeois world. But his cinematic gaze turned to the man of estrangement, break away from the world in which he lives. Vicious, unconscious, strange - that becomes the main and for this director with a great artistic potentialities. A similar fate befell many other figures of the western movie, began his artistic life with severe, progressive films, but found themselves captive to bourgeois ideas"(Baskakov, 1972, pp. 82, 84).

V. Baskakov was unhappy with the interpretation of anti-Nazi themes proposed in the films *The Damned* by L. Visconti and *The Conformist* by B. Bertolucci as "brutality and arbitrariness of Nazi leaders, or submission to the ordinary person of the state machine are supplied in terms of research subconscious complexes, overwhelmed by individuals belonging to a particular situation. It is often a pretext for actions and deeds (murder, betrayal, blackmail) are traumatized, homosexuality, schizophrenia, masochism. There is a substitution of concepts and objects. There is a consistent care from attempts to stigmatize Fascism past and present as a degradation product of the capitalist system" (Baskakov, 1972, p. 88).

In fact, careful handling of Western filmmakers to "personal and physiological factors" in social and political processes, as a rule, met a sharp rebuff from the official Soviet cinema studies. Although, again, not always. For example, the sarcastic Italian detective *Investigation of a Citizen Above Suspicion* not only received a positive assessment from V. Baskakov, but also came out (albeit in a cropped version) on the Soviet screens. Although, if desired, *Investigation...* could be accused of "substitution of concepts", as the main hero of the film inherent in schizophrenia, and masochism, and "sexual licentiousness".

The line between permissible and impermissible was with nuances in the Soviet screens. For example (particularly in relation to the Italian filmmakers) Soviet censorship considered the authors' affiliation with the Communist Party, their attitude toward the Soviet Union, critical thinking about the state system of Western countries, etc. Thus, the lead actor in the movie *Investigation of a Citizen Above Suspicion* Volonte was a member of the Communist Party of Italy, he had anti-bourgeois attitudes, etc. And Soviet censorship encouraged many of his films for distribution on Soviet screens.

Praising the "progressive works by Italian filmmakers" (*Investigation of a Citizen Above Suspicion, Metello, People Against*) V. Baskakov in search of "progress" appealed to the American cinema, noting that "the movie Arthur Penn (*The Chase, Bonnie and Clyde*) and John Schlesinger (*Midnight Cowboy*) not very deep, but still quite clearly reflected the crisis of the social system that spawned the cult of violence, mass crime, militant racism, arbitrariness of the authorities and the indifference of the inhabitants" (Baskakov, 1972, pp. 92-93, 95).

In the end of his article V. Baskakov came to triumphantly optimistic conclusions, worthy to be a part of any Resolution of the Communist Party Central Committee: "The crisis, which is going through western cinema - is ultimately a crisis of bourgeois ideology, evidence of its bankruptcy, failure to nurture the development of a genuine, realistic art - art great truth of life. ... On all continents are sharp class battles. All the more clearly reveals the historical doom of capitalism with its inevitable companions - exploitation of workers, national oppression, wars of conquest. Everything becomes clearer perspective of the social and spiritual renewal of the world, which will bring him a victory of communism" (Baskakov, 1972, pp.102, 108).

The article of G. Kapralov was concentrated around "progressive tendencies" of the Western screen. He sincerely praised films *Sacco and Vanzetti* and *God with Us* by G. Montaldo, *Keymada* by G. Pontecorvo (1919-2006), *People Against* by F. Rosie (1922-2015), *Recognition of police Commissioner to the prosecutor of the republic* by D. Damiani (1922-2013), *Investigation of a Citizen Above Suspicion* by E. Petri (1929-1982), *Joe Hill* by B. Widerberg, *Bless the Beasts & Children* by S. Kramer (1913-2001), *Little Big Man* by A. Penn (1922-2010) (Kapralov, 1972, p.174-200): "If not all the films, which were discussed above, can be attributed to the elements of socialist culture, they are all, of course, are the elements of a democratic culture" (Kapralov, 1972, p. 201).

The final of Kapralov's article was no less pathetic than that the Baskakov's article: "In recent years, the progressive democratic cinema from capitalist countries intensified, gained new strength, expanded its front. He's resolutely denounces dilapidated bourgeois myths and everything closer to the truth that in this age, all roads lead to communism" (Kapralov, 1972, p. 201).

Yes, A. Karaganov, V. Baskakov and G. Kapralov were masters of ideological fight! Their articles were perhaps the best practical implementation of the urgent recommendations of the Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On Literary Criticism".

That is why the article of E. Gromov (1931-2005) seems to be less ideological. On the one hand, he wrote that "the western screens leads and dominates the cinema of mass culture, the upper floors which fill pseudo philosophical speculative movies. The aesthetics of these films has a

corrupting effect on both mind wide audience, and, alas, bourgeois cinema crisis continues unabated on the work of other great artists" (Gromov, 1972, p. 74). A "Godard's characters can talk on any topic, to listen to all sorts of philosophical speech, but in reality they are interested in the life of one thing: at the maximum or minimum comfort sex with a pathology or a pathology. For these ideas - religious, Marxist, Maoist, Gaullist - just phantoms allusion. And Godard, sneering at their characters, shared many of their position" (Gromov, 1972, p. 37).

But on the other hand, "even the highly educated, intelligent, but brought up in the spirit of classical art traditions of the audience is sometimes difficult to deeply understand the aesthetics of Antonioni because of its inner secret, the mediation complex philosophical categories and concepts" (Gromov, 1972, p. 46). A *Zabriskie Point* is a fundamental phenomenon in the work of Michelangelo Antonioni. His film is sharp social character; in their aesthetics, he focused not on a narrow elite, and the masses of people - the language of on-screen images of Antonioni has now become more clear, simple and accessible, it images acquired in a weird expression. Along with *Satyricon* by F. Fellini, *Zabriskie Point* is the biggest film internally significant western cinematography late 60's - early 70's" (Gromov, 1972, p. 52).

On the one hand, E. Gromov habitually claimed that "Hitchcock, as well as other authors pseudo psychoanalytic films simplifies and vulgarized Freud" (Gromov, 1972, p. 62), and "Tarzan movies, *Fantômas*, even James Bond are drug although strong action"(Gromov, 1972, p. 63).

But on the other hand, not without reason he reminded that "we have often written about the cult of violence, which is preached bourgeois cinema, primarily American. This cult is evident. However, it is not always expressed in roughly a straight line. Moreover, practically difficult, if not impossible, to name a relatively significant film, which openly called for burning, torture, kill. The directors do not forget to punish the criminals and condemn their evil deeds, even in those gangster movies where blood flows like a river and almost every frame shot or cut" (Gromov, 1972, p. 64).

The rest of the article collection "fought with a bad bourgeois ideology" with "local sections of the front." G. Bohemsky, for example, thinking about the Italian commercial cinema, arguing that "if we analyze with a pencil in the hands of the film for a film Italian cinema production for the past year or two, you see that the 90 % are just pictures of mass consumption ... Neorealism managed for some time to expel from Italian cinema falsity, vulgarity, rhetoric, banal ready samples and phrases, but in less than ten years, as they are, taking revenge with a vengeance climbed back to the screen" (Bohemsky, 1972, pp. 108-111).

Next G. Bohemsky sharply criticized the films erotic genre, the movies "about rogues and thugs" and "homegrown westerns". At the same

time readers receive a warning: "Italian Westerns are dangerous for the audience. ... cruelty and violence ... In addition to the inhumanity also obvious taint of racism. And plenty of naturalistic detail" (Bohemsky, 1972, pp. 114-122).

O. Teneyshvili wrote about French cinema, unsubstantiated arguing that "sexuality and pathology prevails in recent films Chabrol and Truffaut" (Teneyshvili, 1972, p. 146), and that *Second Wind* by J.-P. Melville is "a magnificent example of excellence, aimed at the end just to satisfy the most questionable instincts and tastes" (Teneyshvili, 1972, p.151).

O. Teneyshvili also scolded film *Rider on the Rain* by R. Clément: "It is clear that this is a product not only free from bad influences, but also deliberately inhumane or degrading" (Teneyshvili, 1972, p.152) .

Thus, instead of analyzing the flow of ordinary French commercial cinema, O. Teneyshvili somehow chose the main target of his critical arrows the talented works of classics of French screen ...

J. Markulan (1920-1978) criticized another famous French film director - Claude Lelouch. In the second half of 1960s C. Lelouch, director of melodrama *Man and Woman*, crowned Palme d'Or at Cannes and Oscar, was known as the undisputed favorite of the Soviet audience and film critics. But in 1970s the Soviet press began to reconsider their attitude to Lelouch. And J. Markulan hurried to convince the Soviet readers that the *Man and Woman* "is not a work of art, namely the mechanism - a cunning, clever, well made up as an art form. This is a typical product of modern bourgeois mass culture, with its extensive system of moral speculation, the ideological effects of emotional stimulus. ... Creativity of Claude Lelouch, especially the on-screen trilogy is a dangerous phenomenon, because it contains not only the aesthetic demagoguery, but also simplified, conformist view of life. It is an art reduced to a product, commerce" (Markulan, 1972, pp. 218, 233).

Thank God, Claude Lelouch not able to read these angry lines...

Only V. Dmitriev (1940-2013) and V. Mikhalkovich (1937-2006) wrote their article on B. Bardot early career without any heavy critical artillery (Dmitriev, Mikhalkovich 1972, pp. 234-249).

And very friendly articles about progressive cinema from "developing countries": Africa (Chertok, 1972, pp. 278-299), India (Sobolev, 1972, pp. 300-324) and Latin America (Melamed, 1972, pp. 325-342) were at the end of the third issue of *Myths and Reality*...

'Myths and Reality': Issue 4 (1974, put in a set in February 1973)

The next issue of *Myths and Reality* was published in 1974: during this time there was a significant improvement in relations between the USSR and the United States, gave rise to the so-called "discharge" that

lasted until the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the Resolutions of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On the Literary-artistic Criticism" (01.21.1972) and "On measures for further development of Soviet cinema" (08.02.1972).

Communist Party once again reminds that "cinema is expected to actively contribute to the formation in the broadest masses of the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the education of people in the spirit of selfless dedication of our multinational socialist motherland, the Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, the approval of the Communist moral principles, uncompromising attitude to bourgeois ideology and morality, petty-bourgeois remnants, everything that hinders our progress" (Resolution... On measures..., 1972).

Of course, the Soviet film studies was obliged to respond to these two Resolutions. And the complete removal of images (frames from foreign films) in the books *Myths and Reality* № 4 (1974) and № 5 (1976) was the simplest and most intuitive reaction to them.

Table 9: Key political events 1972 in the world, important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West. Events in the USSR, which had relevance to the cinema

1972

Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On Literary Criticism": 21 January.

US President Richard Nixon's visit to the USSR. An agreement between the USSR and the United States on the limitation of anti-missile defense and joint space program "Soyuz" - "Apollo": May 22-30.

Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On measures for further development of Soviet cinema": 2 August.

The trade agreement between the USSR and the US: 18 October.

The fact that Soviet readers are no longer able to see not only "harmful" Western movies, and even shots of them was, of course, from the point of view of increased censorship, is commendable, but it was necessary to show also has more gain "uncompromising attitude" to the bourgeois screen. That is why (sincere or not) V. Baskakov decided to condemn in the strongest not secondary figure of world cinema, but Federico Fellini. According to V. Baskakov, Fellini "deprives viewers of any hope for the possibility of any radical decisions" (Baskakov, 1974, p. 113).

Further, he certainly kept for the "progressive balance" and gave the compliments to the films *Sacco and Vanzetti*, *Keymada*, *Recognition of police Commissioner to the prosecutor of the republic* (Baskakov, 1974, pp. 115-118), since "these films are openly opposed not only" commercial cinema, mass bourgeois culture. They oppose decadence, for offering a very different conception of man: the man is not a grain of sand in the whirl of

life, not being possessed by a subconscious complexes; man is social, it can and must fight for their future, for the future of mankind"(Baskakov, 1974, p. 115).

And then followed the stereotypes V. Baskakov wrote the article's final: "The facts say that in the world cinema will inevitably strengthen the progressive tendencies will become effective progressive realist art that can truthfully and clearly reflect the ongoing processes in the world, and many talented artists who are still looking for a way out of the spiritual the crisis finally freed from the captivity of the reactionary bourgeois ideas that come out of the shadows of decadence and individualism. And in this new proof of the inexhaustible strength and energy realism" (Baskakov, 1974, p.118).

However, I would like to draw readers' attention that the pathos of this final was not so bravura and super optimistic as in the book in 1972. In any case, "the prospect of social and spiritual renewal of the world, which will bring him a victory of communism", apparently lost for V. Baskakov clarity, and he decided not to mention it...

But G. Kapralov in his article about the future of communism was clearly set majeure seriously arguing that "in today's world have answered the question of how the working class can liberate itself, to gain power, he become the master of their own destiny. On the possibility of release, at which point the Communists, the experience of the socialist countries, in the film (*The Working Class Goes to Heaven* - A.F.) does not say a word "(Kapralov 1974, p.188).

Deeply confident that "a truly progressive democratic filmmakers oppose anarchic" and "Gauchists and snobbery intellectual modernism" (Kapralov, 1974, p.206) Kapralov praised the political drama *The Mattei Affair* by F. Rosie, however, adding that "the class nature of the activities of Mattei remains as it braces for the film, and the fore its alleged common humanistic character" (Kapralov 1974, p.187).

But he obviously did not like bitingly satirical *A Clockwork Orange* by S. Kubrick. According to the critic, "the author of this film exposes satirically modern bourgeois civilization, its manners, morals, and at the same time leaning helplessly before her passing lunging against the whole of humanity" (Kapralov, 1974, p. 200).

The article of E. Kartseva (1928-2002) also was in the concept of "ideological struggle": "Many researchers wrote about mass culture as preaches complex ideological and moral values inherent townsfolk. Thus, for example, I noticed that her characters are, as a rule, belong to the middle class. Workers, the poor, ethnic minorities and other "unpleasant" man of social groups there is almost does not happen, and if they appear, in the roles of negative characters. ... Mass culture also produces ideological and artistic stereotypes dulls spoils the taste, it eliminates human experiences. All this taken together does not contribute to the development

of bourgeois society as the human personality" (Kartseva 1974, pp. 81, 99). However, E. Kartseva while rightly emphasized that popular culture often serves as a guide not only to "low-brow art crafts, and original works of art" (Kartseva, 1974, p.72).

Another Soviet film critic of those years – V. Golovanov also contributed to the fight against "the corrupting influence of the West": "A massive invasion of pornography in the modern bourgeois cinema is not accidental. Sex has become a social special effects tool" (Golovanov, 1974, p. 32).

On the other hand, analyzing the political cinema of Italy, G. Bohemsky - surprisingly - has entered into an explicit discussion with V. Baskakov and G. Kapralov, as with many times already proven positive "progressive films" *Sacco and Vanzetti*, *Recognition of the Police Commissioner to the prosecutor of the Republic*, *People Against*, *Investigation of a Citizen Above Suspicion*, praised *Zabriskie Point* by M. Antonioni and even (!) *The Conformist* by B. Bertolucci (Bohemsky, 1974, pp. 254-270).

G. Bohemsky analyzed a bright bouquet of Italian political films, and came to the brisk conclusion that "new political films are evidence that luxuriantly overgrown weeds commercial cinema could not drown out the germination of those seeds that were once thrown to the ground of the Italian cinematography neorealism ... In place of the passive character of neo-realist films, where the rebel ... brooked quite natural defeat, gradually comes the active character linked with the masses, more or less conscious fighter who wants to build a new, just society" (Bohemsky, 1974, p. 270).

Film critic S. Chertok (1931-2006) also wrote with great sympathy to all progressive French films with a strong social issues and characters of working professions (*Time to Live*, *Beau masque*, *Elise*, or *Real Life*).

Interesting, that R. Sobolev avoided the sharp ideological overrun. For example, he wrote about D. Hoffmann that his screen image is "character of middle America", and this is perhaps the most simple explanation for his acting successes" (Sobolev, 1974, p. 56). And R. Sobolev wrote about Jane Fonda: "I want to say only one thing: she became after the film *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?* one of the greatest actresses of the American Psychological movie" (Sobolev, 1974, p.69). An about Faye Dunaway: "She is the actress; perhaps one of the most outstanding actresses of the history of Hollywood" (Sobolev, 1974, p. 64).

Apparently, this article of R. Sobolev became evident reactions to the official Soviet cinema criticism reaction to "detente" between USA and USSR.

'Myths and Reality': Issue 5 (1976, put in set in December 1975)

Next - the fifth book of *Myths and Reality* was released in 1976. The political "detente" between the West and the Soviet Union is still going on. Moreover, in August 1975, the Soviet Union, along with 35 other countries, signed Helsinki Agreements. However, the ideological front has not been canceled (this is evidenced, for example, Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Andrei Sakharov is widely supported by West).

Table 10. Major political events in 1973 - 1975 years in the world that are important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West. Events in the USSR, which had relevance to the cinema

1973

Armed revolt in Chile. Chilean President Salvador Allende was killed. General A. Pinochet came to power in Chile: September.

The war in the Middle East: October.

Increase in world oil prices.

Paris edition house published the first volume of the anti-Soviet / anti-communist books of A. Solzhenitsyn - *The Gulag Archipelago*: December.

1974

A. Solzhenitsyn expelled from the USSR on 13 February.

US President Richard Nixon's visit to the USSR. He signed an agreement on the limitation of underground nuclear tests: 3 July.

The impeachment of US president Richard Nixon: August 8th.

The visit of new US President Ford in the USSR: November, 23-24.

1975

USSR renounced trade agreement with the United States in protest against the statements of the American Congress about Jewish emigration: January, 15.

The end of the Vietnam War: April, 30.

USSR, together with 35 countries signed the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe: August, 1.

USSR again stop jamming Western radio stations (except for *Radio Liberty*): this is a result of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act.

The joint Soviet-American space flight: July.

Academician A. Sakharov was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize: October, 9.

So the elite of the Soviet cinema criticism, although with undoubted into account the "detente", continued the ideological fight.

G. Kapralov scolded for pessimism and gloom punctuated by show of aggression and violence in *Leo the Lasts*, *Deliverance*, *Zardoz* by J. Boorman and *Straw Dogs* by S. Peckinpah (Kapralov, 1976, pp. 9-16). Once again he reproached the author of the drama *Cries and Whispers* I. Bergman because he "does not come from the social characteristics, but from the biological or psychological essence of person" (Kapralov, 1976, p. 22).

But the most difficult critical Kapralov's hit reserved for the sensational melodrama *The Night Porter* by L. Cavani. He accused Cavani of consideration "the history of the Nazi criminals and murderers and their sacrifices in the light of "erotic impulses" and "research hangman-sacrificial systems"(Kapralov, 1976, p. 28).

Traditionally praised for a "democratic and progressive social orientation" movies (*We loved Each Other, The Mattei Affair, Giordano Bruno, Beau masque*) (Kapralov, 1976, pp. 30-32), film critic passed to the final pathos: "Social film is increasingly attracting the attention of leading Western film artists today. It is expanding and its viewership. Historical optimism that distinguishes these works, finds its support in the actual development of the world revolutionary process, unbeatable driving forward the progressive forces of the world, which characterizes the last quarter of this century" (Kapralov, 1976, p. 32).

V. Baskakov was in full agreement with the categorical opinion of G. Kapralov about *The Night Porter*: "The philosophical message of this film ... leads to a strain in the eyes of the people, and the very essence of the concept of fascism. Because the phenomenon of social class and it turns into a psychological phenomenon" (Baskakov, 1976, p. 89).

Scolded for mysticism *The Exorcist* by William Friedkin (Baskakov, 1976, pp. 70-71), Baskakov criticized and *The Godfather* by F.F. Coppola, insisting that in this saga "intricately intertwined different streams: the naturalistic image of cruelty and violence, and poetic image for mafia and at the same criticism of a society based on corruption and blackmail" (Baskakov, 1976, p. 82).

But V. Baskakov praised another film of F.F. Coppola – *Conversation*. He implicitly acknowledged "progressive phenomenon of American Art. ... Films like *Conversation*, is now being done in Hollywood are not so many, but they are: *The Last Detail*, with his relentless criticism of militarism, and *Alice Does not Live Here Anymore*, realistically showing the life of the American province" (Baskakov, 1976, pp. 82-83).

Not only *The Night Porter* by L. Cavani, but the *Last Tango in Paris* by B. Bertolucci was at that time at the center of discussions of world film criticism.

This explains why A. Karaganov has given a special place in his article for Bertolucci's movie. He believed that "by the author's intention, *Last Tango in Paris* is a fight & rebellious film, designed to ensure that shock the bourgeois audience, expose bourgeois morality, to show that the putrefaction of capitalist society and its immorality manifested primarily in the rot and immorality of human generated by this society. But the actual content of the film, so to speak, "texture" screen action can not withstand such a load of ideological and philosophical. It comes down to showing the sexual life of the hero and heroine. The sex scenes are extraordinarily

detailed, show the variety of techniques, some of them are playful, while others - just disgusting, and everything is very naturalistic. In the film there is a certain thrill of sex, frankness, which is characteristic of pornographic films bourgeois "commercial cinema" (Karaganov, 1976, p. 51).

It is clear that such "ideological machinations" had necessarily to oppose something "progressive." And here again the title of "progressive" foreign films: *Sacco and Vanzetti*, *Recognition of the Police Commissioner to the prosecutor of the Republic*, *People Against*, *Investigation of a Citizen Above Suspicion*, *The Mattei Affair*, *Tverico-Torino*, *We want the colonels* (Karaganov 1976, pp. 42-48).

Moreover, the earlier some Soviet film critics scolded of film *The Working Class Goes to Heaven*, but A. Karaganov found positive significance in this film, noting that there is a "dramatic tension, the sharpness, is the image and narrative motifs, very succinct in its life content and social meaning. This film has a lot of truth, and the Italian working life is shown in real difficulties, unvarnished" (Karaganov 1976, p. 40).

And therefore the end of this article was quite logical: "The progressive cinema in Italy is gaining momentum, despite the harassment by the authorities... And a very important part of this process is the development of modern neo-realism tradition" (Karaganov, 1976, p. 66).

By a similar scheme was built and the article A. Braginsky about political cinema in France. It was again anti-Godard: "Deeply flawed the tactics of struggle against the bourgeoisie, the criticism of the Communist Party, the General Confederation of Labour... The political chatter and juggling "Marxist-Leninist" phraseology is only the cover" (Braginsky 1976, p. 96).

It has been argued that "among this kind of speculation on the political issue concerns the film *Stavisky* by Alain Resnais. This film shows that what is the political immaturity of the director, be influenced by a writer (in this case, Jorge Semprun) whose Trotskyist beliefs and rather arbitrary view of the identity of Stavisky and his era affected most adversely in the picture as a whole" (Braginsky, 1976, p.107).

After that A. Braginsky highlighted "realistic progressiveness" of movies *The most tender confessions*, *Crime in the name of order*, *Assassination*, *Elise, or Real Life*, *Time to live*, *Beau masque* (Braginsky 1976, pp. 101, 111-112).

G. Bohemsky built his article in a similar spirit: "Despite the fact that the Italian screen is still more sweeping avalanche of vulgar and empty shows constituting 90% of the Italian film production, another films have the general shift to the left in the political and cultural life of the country" (Bohemsky, 1976, p. 151). These findings were supported by favorable analysis of films *Sacco and Vanzetti*, *Metello*, *Tverico-Torino*, *Short Breaks*, *Bread and Chocolate* (Bohemsky, 1976, pp. 114, 133, 139-150).

"*Metello* is a broad canvas of national life the beginning of our century, which bears many specific features of the Italian. This film, like the novel, lyrical, permeated with the spirit of a kind of populism, the naive and sentimental. Unusual for a film on the "working" the theme of its own style: the film is very picturesque, paint it a soft and tender"(Bohemsky, 1976, p. 133). "Most important of all Italian films about workers represented film directed by Giuliano Montaldo, *Sacco and Vanzetti*. Firstly, it is one of the few films in the world from the history of the international labor movement; Secondly (and this is important), this film is deeply internationalist in spirit, with real image of the worker leader, conscious revolutionary. Sacco and Vanzetti are the characters, which has long experienced a need for progressive Italian cinema"(Bohemsky, 1976, p. 144).

I. Belenky, once again returning to the analysis of the acclaimed of S. Kubrick's *A Clockwork Orange*, remained dissatisfied with the theme of violence (Belenky, 1976, p. 186).

Reflecting on the metamorphosis of Swedish cinema, O. Surkova also did not give a glowing assessment of creativity had already recognized classic I. Bergman: "That is why his best films, no matter how they were burdened by lack of faith in the person and the hyper individualism... Of course, this opposition to mass culture is not productive because, although on a different level altogether, Bergman's cinema also suppresses the desire in people to see something approaching its real problems, something which helps to understand and overcome the structure of the consumer society" (Surkova, 1976, p.168).

Discord with respect to all articles of the fifth edition of the book *Myths and Reality* was the academic text of V. Mikhalkovich *What is a thriller?*, where a thoughtful film critic, contrary to stamps well-established in the Soviet film criticism, argued that "if the director or the writer uses the thriller is not just, and not exclusively to shake the nerves or to promote to the masses next bourgeois myth, and for conscious suggestion socially meaningful thought, this genre can be (and is in some cases) a progressive phenomenon" (Mikhalkovich, 1976, p.214).

'Myths and Reality': Issue 6 (1978, put in a set in March 1978)

Table 11. Major political events in 1976 - 1977 years in the world that are important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West. Events in the USSR, which had relevance to the cinema

1976

XXV Congress of the Soviet Communist Party: February, 24 – March, 5.
The USSR and the United States signed a treaty banning underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes capacity of over 150 kilotons: May, 28.

1977

Opening of the Belgrade Conference to monitor the implementation of decisions of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe: October, 4.

Over the past between the fifth and sixth editions of collection of *Myths and Reality* did not go any special Resolutions of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee about the cinema and (film) criticism. The detente process continue in the international arena. However, the ideological confrontation, of course, has not been canceled. Therefore, V. Nesterov & A. Kamshalov quite reasonably wrote: "Western films dedicated to European battles, silenced the heroic struggle of the Soviet Army. It seems that Europe was liberated only by American and British troops" (Kamshalov, Nesterov, 1978, p.7).

Curiously, berated the previous decade, F. Fellini unexpectedly received good evaluation from V. Nesterov & A. Kamshalovs: *Amarcord* was included in the list of "progressive democracy" films, like *Sacco and Vanzetti*, *The Mattei Affair*, *Murder of Matteotti* (Kamshalov, Nesterov, 1978, pp.16-17).

But R. Yurenev, alas, could not see the talent and irony of Woody Allen, and (in my opinion, unjustly) accused parody comedy *Love and Death* in all conceivable sins: "It was unbearable to hear patriotic music by Prokofiev for *Alexander Nevsky* superimposed on pornographic scenes. And in some scenes ... I can see not just anti-Russian, but also anti-Soviet notes" (Yurenev, 1978, p. 35).

He also sharply criticized the film *Marriage* by Claude Lelouch, "which seemed a mockery of criticism by the French anti-Nazi resistance movement" (Yurenev, 1978, p. 41).

G. Bohemsky was very critical to the current western cinematic process (for example, Italy). In particular, they talked about the wrong political orientation of Paolo and Vittorio Taviani: "Ambivalence past Taviani brothers' film, in particular its results leftist and ideological impasse". *Alonsanfan* "back to the vagueness of the general philosophical position of generously gifted film directors" (Bohemsky, 1978, p. 88).

But we must pay tribute to Bohemsky's film studies instinct: he noticed that "It exists the danger of mystification spectators in the Italian cinema, when some movies do not help to understand the political issues, but falsifying it and misinformed under the guise of political cinema" (Bohemsky, 1978, p. 69).

V. Shestakov wrote rather not film studies, but sociological article about Hollywood. He praised such outstanding films as *Three Days of the Condor*, *The Way We Were*, *Network*, *The Last Detail*, *Shampoo*, *Day of the Locust*, *Alice does not live here anymore*, *Taxi Driver*, *Badlands*, *MASH*, *The Long Goodbye*, *Thieves Like Us*, *Nashville*, *Conversation* (Shestakov, 1978, pp. 104, 110-111, 115-121). In particular, V. Shestakov

rightly pointed out that *Taxi Driver* is "sad and tragic film about violence in America and on the consequences that has left in the life and psychology of the Americans during the Vietnam War" (Shestakov, 1978, p. 116) .

It is clear that, despite some "easing", the article by V. Shestakov could not be composed of only one positive in relation to the American cinematography. Therefore, it was noted that "modern Hollywood movies attempting to adapt and use, mainly for commercial purposes, a number of ideas borrowed from fashionable currents of Western philosophy. A particularly strong influence on American cinema has Freudianism, which serves as a ground for his suggestion the audience the most gloomy, pessimistic view of the world and of the human person" (Shestakov, 1978, p.105), and the "New Hollywood" is nothing more than a common term, a kind of metaphor, does not reflect reality, as the ideological nature and social role of Hollywood are still the same: regardless of the changes occurring in it Hollywood, as before, is a phenomenon of bourgeois culture" (Shestakov, 1978, p.132).

V. Kolodyazhnaya (1911-2003) wrote more tightly about American cinema, focusing on themes of occultism. After analyzing the *Rosemary's Baby* by R. Polanski and *Exorcist* by William Friedkin, she concluded that "the devil was never shown on the screen in such a formidable and powerful, as in modern films. Current trends is a special phenomenon, reflecting the growing interest in the occult and turned inside out religion - Satanism" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1978, p.172).

G. Kapralov, in keeping the spirit of the "detente", refused inherent passages previously optimistic about the inevitable collapse of the bourgeois system soon and the triumph of communist ideas. But a detailed analysis of the *Jaws* by S. Spielberg became occasion for a conclusion that "it is reasonable to assert once again that the film itself without the whole system more impact on the Western audience ... might not be such a total resounding" (Kapralov, 1978, p. 51).

The rest of the collection of articles were dedicated to the works of great masters of Western screen: Volonte (1933-1994) (E. Victorova wrote about this actor-communist in a very positive way) and P.-P. Pasolini (1922-1975).

V. Baskakov wrote about the famous film director, screenwriter and writer P.-P. Pasolini (who was killed November 1, 1975): "The Italian cinema has lost a great artist, whose work is inconsistent reflect and burning rejection of the bourgeois way of life, bourgeois morality, and the search for alternatives to this bourgeois... Pasolini was an analyst, accuser, and at the same time a victim of bourgeois consciousness" (Baskakov, 1978, p.152).

'Myths and Reality': Issue 7 (1981, put in a set in August 1980)

International events 1979-1980, preceding the birth of the seventh edition of *Myths and Reality* collection were turbulent: the "detente" died after the intervention of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, the confrontation between the USSR and the West back on the rails "cold" peak war. And then there's added fuel to the fire of the Polish anti-Communist rebellion movement "Solidarity"...

Table 12: Key political events 1978 - 1980 in the world that are important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West. Events in the USSR, which had relevance to the cinema

1978

The coup d'etat in 1978 in Afghanistan, supported by the Soviet Union: April, 17.

1979

Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On further improve the ideological and political education work": April, 26.

Conclusion of the agreement between the USSR and the USA on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms: June, 18.

The second coup in Afghanistan, again supported by the Soviet Union: September, 16.

Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the beginning of the Afghan war - December.

1980

In response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the United States suspended the ratification of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty have declared a boycott of the Olympic Games in Moscow and an embargo on the Soviet Union in modern technologies and grains: January, 4.

Academician Sakharov was exiled to Gorky. Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the USSR Council of Ministers he was deprived of the title three times Hero of Socialist Labor, and Stalin (1953) and Lenin (1956) Awards: January, 22.

The Olympic Games in Moscow on July, 19 – August, 3.

USSR resumed jamming broadcasts "Voice of America" and other Western radio stations in Russian in the Soviet Union: from August, 20-21.

"Solidarity" movement in Poland was gaining strength.

Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On further improve the ideological and political education work" (April, 1979) was before the start of a new phase of the "cold war". As in similar documents of previous years, Resolution was emphasized that "imperialist propaganda ... continuously conducts a fierce attack on the minds of the Soviet people, it is committed to using the most sophisticated techniques and advanced technical means to poison the minds of their slander Soviet reality, denigrate socialism, embellish imperialism and its predatory, inhuman policies and practices. Perverted information and biased coverage of the facts, silence, half-truths and lies just shameless - all set in motion. Therefore, one of the most important tasks of ideological education and

outreach is to help the Soviet people to recognize the utter falsity of the defamatory propaganda, in a clear, specific and convincing manner to expose its devious methods, to give people the ground truth about the world's first country of victorious socialism. This should always be remembered that the weakening of attention to the coverage of the actual problems, lack of efficiency, the questions left unanswered, the only benefit our class enemy" (Resolution ..., 1979).

K. Razlogov's article "New" conservatism and cinema of the West" in this context was a natural reaction to the worsening of the "cold war": "In 70s years ... came the era of "Counter-Reformation", ... "counterculture." This ideological trend - the so-called "new" conservatism - was a product of the ideological and political crisis of capitalism. ... "New conservatism" to some extent paved the way for the deployment of another anti-communist and anti-Soviet companies and return the forces of imperialism to a policy of "cold war". ... It was the result of the desire of the bourgeois ideologists turn back the course of history, to set new obstacles in the way of socialism, the national liberation movement, the workers' struggle for their rights in the capitalist countries. But the positive developments in the international arena, the struggle for peace, social progress and freedom of the peoples continue to define the forward movement of history" (Razlogov, 1981, pp. 41-42).

K. Razlogov argued that "the problem of violence is certainly one of the most pressing in the bourgeois world. In contrast to the typical trend of the previous period to identify the social roots of crime "new" conservatives consider crime as an anomaly of inferiority of individuals or of human nature in general. The only reason for the spread of the crimes declared so conniving and inaction of the authorities, a necessary method to combat them - all violence" (Razlogov, 1981, p. 49-50). As an example, to use the film *Death Wish* (Razlogov, 1981, p. 55).

However, the final article was more optimistic: *Julia, The China Syndrome*, "as well as a number of other films, shows the constancy of democratic tradition in the US film industry, successfully resisting the "new conservative wave" (Razlogov, 1981, p. 61).

M. Shaternikova in search of positive developments in the American cinema, wrote that "a certain part of the Afro-American filmmakers chose a path of truth and realism, all the way to a deeper and more accurate picture of life, suffering and hopes of its people" (Shaternikova, 1981, p.161).

But G. Kapralov focused on the negative examples of Western film production, noting that although the number of films (*Sacco and Vanzetti*, *Recognition of the Police Commissioner to the prosecutor of the republic*, *Investigation of a Citizen Above Suspicion*, *Zabriskie Point*, *Keymada*, *Little Big Man*, *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?*, *Easy Rider* and others) criticized the wars of conquest, colonial expansion and extermination of

Native Americans, the persecution of trade unionists, racist intolerance, anti-labor policy lies justice, ... and police terror" (Kapralov, 1981, p. 25). G. Kapralov also had a further retreat from the optimistic positions: "It can be expected that the coming years will give a new rise and further development of this critical combat cinema. However, the collapse of a 'lefts' illusions of '68 ... led to the spread among the intelligentsia of the decadent moods and even in the United States to strengthen the conservative or, as they call them, the "new" conservative tendencies. This affected the cinema. His political activity, though, and continued for some time to be quite high, soon began to wane" (Kapralov, 1981, p. 25).

G. Kapralov was convinced that Hollywood began to appear such "vicious anti-Soviet" films as *The Deer Hunter*, whose "imaginative, emotional structure ... expresses extreme dislike to Vietnamese. All of them are represented as well as once in the most vicious racist artefacts Hollywood portrayed negroes"(Kapralov, 1981, p. 37). Moreover, *The Deer Hunter*, "not only slandered the heroic people of Vietnam, but also trying to revive the very same illusions about US exceptionalism" (Kapralov, 1981, p. 40).

As always, G. Kapralov did not forget to criticize and European masters of the screen. He wrote About *Casanova* that "undoubtedly the critical charge of the film can not hide the fact that the new work of Fellini bears the imprint of painful fatigue, some psychological collapse, whose vice spectacle of decay, rotting and disgusting and the same time has a certain charisma" (Kapralov, 1981, p. 9). The films *Bye Bye Monkey* by M. Ferreri and *Truck* by M. Duras were rated more strictly: "the characters of Ferreri's film have flesh and blood, while the characters of Duras's film are the phantoms" (Kapralov, 1981, p.19).

Two articles were devoted in the book to French cinema. The leading Soviet specialist in the field of French cinematography – A. Braginsky, began his article with the condemnation of sexual and porn cinema revolution (Braginsky, 1981, p.180-183), the transition to a more detailed analysis (with a conviction for commercially oriented) films of C. Lelouch, C. Zidi, J. Derey, J. Jaekin, F. Labro, A. Verneuil, A. Corneau (Braginsky, 1981, p.183-191).

Some Braginsky's estimates from today's point of view, appear manifestly unreasonable: "Zidi is a reliable bulwark of commercial cinema "digestive-wing" ... "Zidizm" as a specific phenomenon is a direct threat to French cinema comedy, reducing its level, its credibility "(Braginsky, 1981, p.186).

A. Braginsky retain and his strict attitude to creativity F. Truffaut and C. Chabrol: "Truffaut's recently films, unwittingly reflect the mood of the French artistic intelligentsia, more precisely, the part that often looks back and rarely looks forward" (Braginsky, 1981, p.193); "Chabrol's films ...

deeply pessimistic, with efforts to disclose only the dark side of the human soul" (Braginsky, 1981, p.193-194).

The article was written by N. Dyachenko in a similar vein. She criticized for the wrong political stance *The Chinese in Paris* by Jean Yann, *Nada* by C. Chabrol, *Lacombe Lucien* by L. Malle, *Good and Evil* by C. Lelouch. For example, the film *Good and Evil* was accused of mixing "actions of the Resistance fighters and collaborators, traitors and honest people" (Dyachenko, 1981, p. 69).

The finals of both articles was, however, optimistic. A. Braginsky praised for the acute social films of A. Cayatte, I. Boisset, B. Tavernier (Braginsky, 1981, pp. 195-199) was confident that "the dialectic of social development is relentless. The future of French cinema, where are taken into account the interests of the nation and the people, for those filmmakers who put their art at the service of the people" (Braginsky, 1981, p. 203).

N. Dyachenko's conclusions was a little less pretentious: "We can watch ... in the French cinema the phenomenon of commercialization, speculative use of political themes. At the same time, a similar trend is clearly opposed to the cinema, expressing a critical attitude toward capitalist reality, an attempt to expose the bourgeois apparatus of power" (Dyachenko, 1981, p. 68).

G. Bohemsky, responsible for the Italian screen reflection in the Soviet press, dedicated his article to political detectives and thrillers. He reviewed the films of D. Damiani, E. Petri, F. Rosi in a positive context, pointing out that "the very notion of "political film" should be considered differentiated. On the one hand, it means the really progressive trend in bourgeois cinema today; on the other hand - in the form of political film sometimes clothed and ribbons on their opposite trends against targets that are set for a cutting-edge artists, seeking to make a movie weapon in the fight against the Left" (Bohemsky, 1981, p.115).

The article of G. Krasnova about German cinema was in the "detente" key. She very friendly analyzed the movies of Fassbinder, Schlöndorff and Herzog. Article's conclusion was also major: "Youth cinema in West Germany had known dark days, periods of frustration, depression and decline. However, recent work of these filmmakers give reason to hope that the "young cinema" will continue to be the main bulwark of progressive cinematography"(Krasnova, 1981, p.114).

Entertainment mission (unless of course, this phrase is appropriate in this film studies collection) got the paper of R. Sobolev *Cinema and Comics*. And here ardent fans of comics culture certainly can not agree with the abrupt withdrawal of a film critic that "comics are the production not for the man with intelligence, but a baby" (Sobolev, 1981, p.178).

'Myths and Reality': Issue 8 (1983, put in a set in September 1982)

Events 1981-1982 years preceding the publication of the eighth book *Myths and Reality* in general (despite the economic cooperation between the USSR and the Federal Republic of Germany and France, connected with gas supply) developed at the height of the "cold war."

Table 13. The main political events of 1981 - 1982 period in the world that are important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West. Events in the USSR, which had relevance to the cinema

1981

XXVI Congress of the Soviet Communist Party: February, 23 – March, 3.

Cancel the US embargo on grain shipments to the Soviet Union: April, 24.

Start of production of neutron weapons in the United States.

The signing of the contract between the USSR and the Federal Republic of Germany to supply Siberian gas to West Germany: November, 20.

The introduction of martial law in Poland: December, 13.

Statement by US President Ronald Reagan against the USSR interference in the affairs of Poland, new sanctions against the USSR: December, 29.

1982

Signing of the contract between the USSR and France to supply Siberian gas: January, 23.

British-Argentine armed conflict in the Falklands: March-April.

Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On the creative connections literary magazines with the practice of communist construction": July, 30.

So it is not surprising that the last year of the L. Brezhnev power was marked by the release of the Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On the creative connections literary magazines with the practice of communist construction" (1982). In it, in particular, stated that "appear on the pages of magazines of literary history and literary-critical work, the authors of which ... show ideological confusion, inability to consider social phenomena historically, with a clear class positions" (Resolution ..., 1982).

I do not think that this criticism directly was to the author's collections of *Myths and Reality* (although the lack of "clear class positions" can be detected, if desired, for example, in the "free" articles of V. Demin and Y. Khanutin). But the conclusions were made: ideologically outdated "detente" approaches were rejected. And V. Baskakov wrote "Anti-humanism of bourgeois culture and art, and an attack on humanity, leading and the right and left - all these shows the urgent need to create a united front of Marxist real humanism with all representatives of the humanist belief in the West for the purpose of criticism and the exposure of anti-humanist tendencies of capitalism" (Baskakov, 1983, pp. 36-37).

Such a flow of "real humanism" V. Baskakov attributed movie "*Man on his Knees*" by D. Damiani, *Christ stopped at Eboli* and *Three Brothers* by F. Rosi, *Seven Days in January* by H.A. Bardem (Baskakov, 1983, pp. 12-19). Moreover, he claimed: "Movies *Christ stopped at Eboli* and *Three Brothers* proves a mighty force and the prospects of social art, exploring issues of national life, the arts great truth. Mighty power of realism"(Baskakov, 1983, p. 17).

G. Kapralov echoed of V. Baskakov, assuring his readers that "we cannot see in the frames of bourgeois consciousness the road in the real future, which has been fighting for progressive mankind" (Kapralov, 1983, p. 64).

G. Kapralov analyzed such outstanding films as *Leap into the Void*, *Terrace*, *Please Asylum*, *My American Uncle*, *All That Jazz*, *City of Women* and regretted that the main motive of most of them is "fatigue, bewilderment, frustration, despair" (Kapralov, 1983, p.38). Kapralov saw in the *City of Women* "traditionally bourgeois approach ... and again, with a noticeable shade of biologism, which in this case takes the form of sexual complexes and phantasmagoria" (Kapralov, 1983, pp. 54). He had mixed feelings about *All That Jazz*: "On the one hand, the director makes admire Gideon's irrepressible, violent fantasy, feel it as a strong, powerful creative personality. And on the other hand - the creative act is reduced to a simple physiological origin" (Kapralov, 1983, p.63).

E. Victorova wrote that "Ferreri is not so much as a critic of modern bourgeois vices of civilization, but as a man who does not bear responsibility for the fate of the world. He does not believe in the possibility of change in the possibility of a better, more just order of society" (Victorova, 1983, p.167).

The same film criticism melody towards western cinema sounded in the E. Kartseva's article, which stated that "the 1970s are characterized by not only the continuity of anti-bourgeois ideals and values of 1960s, but also strengthening of conservative sentiment. ... And myths manufacturers, sensing the growing discontent, seeking to convince people mythological, not based on the analysis of the social interpretation of the events. The growing politicization of social consciousness leads to the politicization of the mythology" (Kartseva, 1983, p.86).

In this context, she scolded American films *Rocky*, *Telephone* and praised *China Syndrome*, *Three Days of the Condor* and *Network* (Kartseva, 1983, pp. 90-101).

Noting that "actually increased role of women in bourgeois society is in sharp contradiction with the various forms of discrimination and oppression faced by the West today a woman" (Melville, 1983, p.136), film critic L. Melville suggested that "feminism is (on the screen and in the life of the modern West) a phenomenon very difficult, ambiguous. ...

Tomorrow we will see what will happen to this remarkable phenomenon of Western political and cultural life. One thing is clear: the prospects for it are associated with the opening of a socialist alternative, with the rejection of the excesses of the feminist ideology and appeal to a realistic understanding of women's issues. Meeting with the political and cultural experience of real socialism can play a crucial role" (Melville, 1983, p.159).

In the first part of this thesis (about the complexity and ambiguity film feminism), as they say, will not argue, but with a "socialist alternative", as time has shown, L. Melville (perhaps sincerely) made a mistake ...

M. Shaternikova, as film critic fighter for the rights of the working class of America, pleased the movie "*Norma Rae*" M. Ritt because this film returned to the US shield forgotten "character - a man of labor, collectivist, in the fight against defending themselves and others their human rights. It proves its viability progressive tradition of cinematography USA. ... The true meaning of the word "humanism" return the honest artist, who in his work expresses the aspirations of the working class, who takes his side in the fight. These artists were in the American movie ever. They will come with each new generation" (Shaternikova, 1983, p.134).

For the first time in *Myths and reality* one article is entirely dedicated to the Spanish cinema: O. Reisen rightly praised *End Time* and *Seven Days in January*, *National Gun* and *Trout* (Reisen, 1983, pp.186-192), although she noted that the cinema of C. Saura, such as "inherent diversity, even some confusion of images. Mixing fantasy, dreams and reality, endless flipped in time and space, repetition, associative montage are methods by which he reproduces a stream of consciousness" (Reisen, 1983, p.195).

"Myths and Reality": Issue 9 (1985, put in a set in May 1984)

World events that occurred between the release of the publication of the eighth and the ninth series, *Myths and Reality* were stormy. L. Brezhnev's death did not impact on the degree of boiling the "cold war." Moreover, with the advent of the Y. Andropov (1914-1984) attention to the issues of ideological struggle only intensified. Y. Andropov's death and the equally short power of K. Chernenko (1911-1985) not made the significant changes in the situation.

Table 14. The main political events of 1982 - 1984 years in the world that are important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West. Events in the USSR, which had relevance to the cinema

1982

Death of Leonid Brezhnev: November, 10

The coming to power of Yuri Andropov (1914-1984).

US lifting of sanctions imposed against the Soviet Union in connection with the events in Poland: November, 13.

1983

France expelling 47 Soviet diplomats accused of spying: April, 5.

Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "Topical issues of ideological and mass political work of the Party": June.

German Chancellor Helmut Kohl visited Soviet Union: July, 4-6.

Soviet Union shot down a South Korean civilian aircraft: September, 1.

Y. Andropov made a statement directed against the deployment of missiles "Pershing-2" in Europe, and lifted a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles: November, 24.

1984

The opening of the Stockholm Conference on Disarmament in Europe: January, 17.

The death of Yuri Andropov, Konstantin Chernenko's rise to power: February, 9.

Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On measures to further improve the ideological and artistic quality of films and strengthen the material and technical basis of cinematography": April, 19.

Statement by the Soviet Union to boycott the Olympic Games in Los Angeles: May, 8.

Y. Andropov, speaking at the plenary session of the Soviet communist Party Central Committee (dedicated to topical issues of ideological and mass political work), stressed that "there is a struggle for the hearts and minds of billions of people on the planet. And the future depends largely on the outcome of this ideological struggle. This explains how it is vital to be able to communicate in a simple and convincing manner the truth about socialist society, its advantages, its peaceful politics to the broad masses of the people all over the world. Equally important skill to expose the false, subversive imperialist propaganda" (Andropov, 1983).

The resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "Topical issues of ideological and mass political work of the Party" (1983) signaled that, in the opinion of the Soviet leadership, the previous decisions of a similar nature have been found to be ineffective in the new "cold war" acute outbreak between the USSR and the West.

This is also evidenced by the Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On measures to further improve the ideological and artistic quality of films and strengthen the material and technical basis of cinematography" (1984). In 1983-1984 the Soviet press are increasingly began to use the word "counter-propaganda" took it on board and official film critics.

Flag bearer of ideological struggle with bourgeois cinema V. Baskakov answered for political party calls in the article "Screen aggression" (Baskakov, 1985, p.3-26). He expressed his indignation at the fact that the West "seeks to instill an audience of millions of television movies and cult of violence, cruelty, sophisticated sensuality. The strategic direction setting of this screen aggression is an effort to impress the mass consciousness of irresponsibility for the fate of humanity and a sense of

apathy in the face of actions of the imperialist circles. Publishers, writers, film makers and television, using a variety of, often masking agents, readers and viewers impose the cult of force, romanticizing of cruelty, perverse amorality. Militant anti-humanism has become the heart of the vast majority of films produced by the capitalist movie monopoly from US and several European countries" (Baskakov, 1985, p.18).

As always this kind of theses supported by V. Baskakov striking examples: from the movies *The Night Porter* and *Skin* by L. Cavani, *Nicholas and Alexandra* by F. Schaffner, *The Deer Hunter* by M. Cimino, *Fire Fox* by C. Eastwood (Baskakov, 1985, pp. 20-24). He said the most negative about S. Peckinpah's film *Cross of Iron*, "openly celebrating the Wehrmacht. In the center of the plot is charming, "humane" and fearless Nazi"(Baskakov, 1985, p. 22).

However, contrary to all previous negativity, V. Baskakov found the strength to make a radically positive conclusion: "Anti-communism and anti-Sovietism on the screen are feverish, hysterical and hopeless attempts to slow down the steady process of development of the revolutionary forces, oppose the realization of the masses (including the intelligentsia) the futility of the capitalist system" (Baskakov, 1985, p. 23).

The article of G. Kapralov has been sustained around the same spirit. He accused for the promotion of violence and the anti-Soviet many movies: *Class of 1984* by M. Lester, *Conan the Barbarian* by J. Milius, *The Deer Hunter* by M. Cimino, *Fire Fox* by C. Eastwood, *Superman* by R. Donner (Kapralov, 1985, pp. 30-44) and made a sad conclusion that "the desire to psychologically and ideologically as to influence the masses to their could move to madness, crime and wildest violence" (Kapralov, 1985, p. 44).

And L. Melville, noting that "the bourgeois media, deciding under obvious pressure from the Reagan administration to divert the attention of the Western public from the real causes of the rampant terrorism, unleashed an anti-Soviet group about the "involvement" of the Soviet Union to "international terrorism" (Melville, 1985, p.70).

The young (at that time) film critic A. Plakhov warning readers that "the movie and television can ... go on about the most primitive tastes cultivated reactionary ideas, amorality, sow harmful illusions and destroy the person, as it often happens in practice bourgeois mass communications" (Plakhov, 1985, p. 135).

Turning to the analysis of German cinema, G. Krasnova expressed something similar to the recommendations of the "progressive German filmmakers", "the struggle against the expansion of Hollywood should be done from the standpoint of humanity, acute social criticism. Otherwise it loses its high ideological and artistic meaning and the place of the American

commercial cinema takes more conformist, more miserable products West cultural industries"(Krasnova, 1985, p.180).

The article of G. Bohemsky was also in the sad tone. He wrote about Italian cinema, for example, "red-light movie", horrors and comedies and gave angry passage: *Caligula* is a typical product of "supranational" commercial cinema, "mass culture" in a consumer society. The film is inextricably merged unheard of cruelty and unbridled sex" (Bohemsky, 1985, p.92).

However, as noted film critic, "the impression that the recession, stagnation, the crisis in Italian cinema in general, are universal, would be incorrect. ... Let a few, but bright and bold works strongly suggest that as the commercialization of Italian cinema and the mood of despair and escapism covered not all" (Bohemsky, 1985, p. 111).

Articles of E. Kartseva (Kartseva, 1985, pp. 46-66) and K. Razlogov (Razlogov 1985, pp. 181-202) were written in a neutral and academic manner. E. Kartseva, for example, is quite appreciated *Cabaret* by B. Fosse, *Julia* by F. Zinnemann, *Parallax* by A. Pakula, and *Domino Principle* by S. Kramer (Kartseva, 1985, pp. 50-65).

T. Tsarapkina quite in the spirit of the recent "detente" gave a very positive assessment of the development of cinema in Canada, because "unlike the dream world the Canadian screen appeared the real life, sometimes full of drama, despair, inhabited by people who are generally unhappy that rarely overcome depressing their circumstances, but find the strength to defy destiny" (Tsarapkina, 1985, p. 229).

A. Braginsky's article about French cinema was also quite low-key tone. Analyzing films of B. Blier, A. Téchiné, K. Miller and other directors, Braginsky (Braginsky, 1985, pp. 137-156) came to the conclusion that "the general Western crisis (ideological, economic) is reflected in the current film industry all the major capitalist countries. French filmmakers find him in these circumstances, turn the power wheel, to change the course of events to remember the glorious tradition - time will tell... " (Braginsky, 1985, p.160).

Well, time really showed, and A. Braginsky in the 1990s has published a series of remarkable books about the masters of French cinema, where already was not "ideologically" lines ...

"Myths and Reality": Issue 10 (1988, put in a set in November 1987)

The tenth edition of the book *Myths and Reality* was put into the set and went out of print in a very substantially changed the world and intra situation. The coming to power of M. Gorbachev in 1985 and soon declaration of new Soviet policy of "perestroika and glasnost", the subsequent rapid warming of relations between the USSR and the West, led

to a significant revision of the existing over decades of "ideological struggle."

Table 15. The main political events of 1984 - 1987 years in the world that are important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West. Events in the USSR, which had relevance to the cinema

1984

The visit to the Soviet Union of French President Francois Mitterrand: June, 21-23.
USSR expressed protest against the American military program "Star Wars": June, 29.
Gorbachev's visited in the UK and met with UK Prime Minister M. Techer: December, 15-21.

1985

The death of Konstantin Chernenko, Mikhail Gorbachev's rise to power: March.
The resumption of negotiations on arms limitation in Geneva: March, 12.
Meeting of M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in Geneva: November, 19-21.

1986

XXVII Congress of the Soviet Communist Party: February, 25 – March, 6.
The accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant: April-May.
Film director E. Klimov elected the leader of the Union of Cinematographers: May.
Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee. "On the shortcomings in the practice of the acquisition or rental of foreign films": June, 4.
Three-fold drop in world oil prices (from 29 to 10 dollars per barrel), increased sharply the economic crisis in the USSR: June.
M. Gorbachev began of "perestroika" in the Soviet Union: June.
Visit to the USSR of French President Francois Mitterrand: July, 7-10.
Meeting of M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in Reykjavik: October, 11-12.
Opening of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Vienna: November, 4.
Return of Academician A. Sakharov from exile to Moscow: December.

1987

M. Thatcher's visit to the USSR: March, 28 - April, 1.
Cancel Soviet jamming of most Western radio stations on its territory: May, 23.
German amateur pilot M. Rust committed illegal flight from Hamburg (via Helsinki) to Moscow (with landing almost on Red Square): May, 27.
Low world oil prices, contributing to a further decline of the Soviet economy and the living standards of its population.

The analysis of the content of the tenth issue of *Myths and Reality* collection (1988) shows that the Soviet film criticism was the example of the ideological inertia: the texts were without real responds to the radical changes occurring in the world and in the USSR...

Here are just some of the final conclusions from the articles of leading Soviet film critics in the tenth edition of the collection:

- "Illusory nature of attempts to restore justice in the framework of an antagonistic society... They do not open before the audience really revolutionary perspective of overthrowing the system of exploitation - the historical mission of the proletariat" (Razlogov, 1988, p. 93)

- "Different incarnation of the bourgeois intellectual consciousness, dwelling in a state of deep internal crisis. Ways out of it are outside of this consciousness: they are actively participating in the actual social processes on the side of democratic forces of progress" (Melville, 1988, p. 38).

The article of L. Mamatova (Mamatova 1988, pp. 94-121) and N. Savitsky (Savitsky, 1988, pp. 122-142) are quite traditional for the Soviet cinema studies 1970s – 1980s reviews of the films festivals 1983. But the mere fact that the collection, released in print in 1988, included articles written in 1983, spoke not only about the slowness of the publishing house "Art", but also the sheer inertia of the official film criticism.

So do not be surprised that the rest of the article at this tenth collection of ideological pathos is not so very different from the ninth collection.

V. Baskakov habitually abused anti-Soviet Hollywood films *Fire Fox*, *Red Dawn*, *Gorky Park* and others (Baskakov, 1988, pp. 7-9). He was also very unhappy with the fact that L. Cavani in the *The Berlin Affair* "pathology, sexy and outrageous policies, even signs of anti-fascist themes are connected in a complex knot" (Baskakov, 1988, p.16).

G. Bohemsky again regretted that Italian political cinema "failed the test, fell under the blows of the crisis" (Bohemsky, 1988, p. 61), and L. Cavani's *Skin*, "might have sounded condemnation of the war, but has become a series of scary rides; show the horrors of war became an end in itself" (Bohemsky, 1988, p. 67).

N. Dyachenko once again reminded that "the notorious commercial boom of French cinema and its current focus on traditional forms of cinema show deal a blow to the progressive, social-critical towards cinema. The most actively operating force of the national film industry remains entertaining pseudo-realistic cinema, which is trying to attract viewers to take subjects and topical phenomena of social and political life" (Dyachenko, 1988, p.145).

Analyzing the movie *Moon*, *Twentieth Century*, *The Conformist* by B. Bertolucci and *The Damned* by L. Visconti, A. Plakhov (Plakhov, 1988, pp. 162-168) melancholy stated that "Freudianism captures in various modifications of the first finder of its apologist in cinematic surrealism, ... sometimes unexpectedly, artists in general realistic warehouse, but with tending to naturalistic excesses" (Plakhov, 1988, p. 168).

Referring to the plot of the film A. Verneuil *Thousand billion dollars*, K. Razlogov quite in the spirit of "stagnation era" claimed that "in this and other similar films, there is no word about the class forces do oppose the bourgeoisie, and journalists covering current events in terms of the conditions of life and struggle of the proletariat" (Razlogov, 1988, p.85).

And here's another Razlogov's phrase, unless, of course, for greater generality and universality remove from it the word "imperialism" and

"bourgeois", in my opinion, is still very relevant: "No doubt, the independence of the media under imperialism is illusory and relative, and this is also evidenced by cinema screens. ... Magic irrational belief in "free speech", daily and hourly refuted the practice of the bourgeois media, is especially weighty support a unilateral interpretation of events" (Razlogov, 1988, p. 82).

The only article of E. Kartseva about American cinema looked quite "perestroika." She wrote that S. Lumet's *Serpico*, "demanded by their creators a huge civic courage. To its credit, it should be noted: in this highly realistic narrative they allowed themselves to any action to diversify fights or chases, usually inherent police movie, no hitting in the obvious melodrama" (Kartseva, 1988, p. 46). A *French Connection* by William Friedkin was ranked as "semi-documentary story told by the director with a great sense of humor, and the dynamics of the art", although it "skillfully avoided or veil the fundamental shortcomings of the work of the American police," (Kartseva, 1988, p. 53).

'Myths and Reality': Issue 11 (1989, put in set in December 1988)

The eleventh book *Myths and Reality*, which was released in print in 1989, alas, was the last. Restructuring at this time reached its peak, the Soviet Union and the West's relations continued to improve, and low world oil prices continue to quenched the Soviet economy, which inevitably resulted in a drop in the standard of living of the population and the desire of the most active part of it is now permitted to emigrate to the West...

Table 16. The main political events of 1987 - 1988 in the world that are important for the development of relations between the USSR and the West. Events in the USSR, which had relevance to the cinema

1987

Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Washington. Signing the agreement on the elimination of intermediate-range nuclear missiles: December, 1-10.

Gorbachev declared in the West Man of the Year.

Low world oil prices, contributing to a further decline of the Soviet economy and the living standards of its population.

1988

Start of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan: May, 15.

Meeting M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in Moscow: May, 29 – June, 2.

Visit to the USSR October, 24-27.

German Chancellor Helmut Kohl visited to the USSR: November, 25-26.

Cancel Soviet jamming of radio station "Free Europe" on its territory: November, 30.

M. Gorbachev visited New York (United Nations). His statement on the reduction of the Soviet armed forces and the beginning of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe December, 6-8.

Low world oil prices, contributing to a further decline of the Soviet economy and the living standards of the population and the desire of the most active part of it is now permitted to emigrate to the West.

And in fact only now, in the year of preparation of last issue of the collection *Myths and Reality* (in December 1988) the Soviet elite film critics decided to join perestroika trends.

G. Kapralov rightly scolded the artistic qualities and ideology of American Adventure *Rambo 2, Fire Fox, Red Dawn, Invasion U.S.A.* (Kapralov, 1989, p.4-14) admitted that "already after this article was written, from the Soviet country sounded a bold voice, proclaimed the new thinking. And no matter how difficult it is the development of modern social and political situation, encouraging occur, sometimes almost fantastic changes in the world. The sense of the new reality take on not only the president but also entire nations. As with all democratic forces, US filmmakers, and other capitalist countries destroy "karma" of false images and encourage people to take action in defense of human rights in a peaceful future for the preservation of peace in the unique planet called Earth" (Kapralov, 1989, p.27).

Saving the world in a situation of "new thinking" was the key topic of the L. Melville's article. She wrote that "the images of scary and "unthinkable" that threatens humanity, appears in different ways on modern screens. But more often than not here sound sincere concern for the fate of the world" (Melville, 1989, p. 46).

Solid analysis of film history without ideological pinch contained in the articles by L. Alova (Alova, 1989, pp. 110-129), E. Gromov (Gromov 1989, pp. 130-147) and N. Nusinova (Nusinova, 1989, pp. 263-282) and E. Kartseva.

E. Kartseva reasonably recalling that "American cinema has many faces ... Throughout the history of its development appeared and continue to appear ... great critical works using Hollywood theme for serious reflection" (Kartseva, 1989, p. 65). G. Krasnova wrote in a similar vein about the female subject in American cinema (Krasnov, 1989, p. 86). The article of G. Bohemsky was also away from exposing pathos: "The creative treatment of the classics, to the great literature and its national traditions gives Italian cinema the new forces, reveals yet unused opportunities" (Bohemsky, 1989, p. 262). And A. Braginsky correctly observed that in the French films "on the one hand there are entertainment. On the other - the cinema of thought and heart, which meets great difficulties" (Braginsky, 1989, p. 108).

Thus N. Sawicki, in my opinion, is absolutely true reminded readers of the collection that "commercial cinema" is generally not a synonym for film production of the lower class and the epithet of "entertainment" is not an exhaustive description of the picture, and stereotypes definitions such as

"entertaining commercial movie" are a substantially zero information" (Savitsky, 1989, pp.148-149).

A. Plakhov made a deep analysis of the art of L. Visconti, noting that "the mythological beginning, increases in the work of Visconti ... and sometimes comes into very conflicting relationship with the realistic direction of his art, reaches its climax in *The Damned*, and in this film the history of interaction and the myth is the most productive. Later mythology continues to function in the structure of Visconti's movies, identifying some of their formal features. However, the nature of the life of the material, and a method of treatment of late Visconti suggest above all the profound and all strengthens the sense of history" (Plakhov, 1989, p. 213).

Contrary to previous reproaches addressed to Federico Fellini, printed in *Myths and Reality*, E. Victorova wrote that "today it is so important for us and for Fellini, that this artist is still true to himself: true humanistic pathos of his work, his transforming power that can change a lot in our complex than ever the world" (Victorova, 1989, p. 233).

M. Yampolsky wrote about the phenomenon of video: "The main feature of this new media can be considered unstable, unformed bodies, tending to constant change and renewal. For artists who are concerned with the fate of the world, it would be an unforgivable mistake to stand aside, arrogantly ignoring the complex processes taking place in this area. Stop video development is impossible. That's why you should take an active part in the unfolding struggle for its destiny" (Yampolsky, 1989, p.187).

The main authores of the Myths and Reality

So, 125 articles (an average of 11 articles in each of the 11 books) published in these books from 1966 to 1989. The authors of these texts (in most cases) were film critics relating to the above-mentioned elite category:

1. Prof. Dr. Vladimir Baskakov (1921-1999) was a member of the Communist party. In 1963-1973 he held the post of first deputy chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Cinematography, and in the years 1973-1987 he was the director of the Research Institute for History and Theory of Cinema. This high status enabled V.E. Baskakov regularly travel to the largest film festivals in the world. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, became the basis of his books: *Dispute Continues* (1968), *Cinema and Time* (1974), *The struggle of ideas in world cinema* (1974), *The contradictory screen* (1980), *In the rhythm of time* (1983), *Aggressive screen of the West* (1986).

2. Dr. Georgy Bohemsky (1920-1995) was a member of the Communist party. He was in the staff of Institute of History and Theory of Cinema. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, became the basis of his book *Cinema of Italy today* (1977).

3. Dr. Georgy Kapralov (1921-2010) was a member of the Communist party. He held the prestigious post of deputy head of Department of Literature and Art in the main Soviet newspaper *Pravda*. As the correspondent of *Pravda*, he also regularly visited the major international film festivals. In addition, G.A. Kapralov from 1962 to 1986 headed the Moscow section of the film critics of the Soviet Union of Cinematographers, and in 1967-1974 he held the post of vice-president International Federation of Film Critics (FIPRESCI). Plus, from 1976 to 1979 he was the anchorman of the popular soviet TV show *Cinema Panorama*. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, became the basis of his books: *The game with the devil and the dawn at the appointed hour* (1975), *The Man and the Myth. The evolution of the hero of the Western movie* (1984), *Western cinema: supermen and People* (1987). He was editor of the books' collection *Myths and Reality* from the first to the fifth edition (1966-1976).

4. Dr. Romil Sobolev (1926-1991) was a member of the Communist party. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, became the basis of his books: *The West. Cinema and Youth* (1971), *Hollywood. 60s* (1975).

5. Alexander Braginsky (1920-2016) was a member of the Communist party. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, partly formed the basis of his series of books about the French cinema. Laureate of the Prize of Russian Film Critics Guild (for a series of books about the masters of French cinema) (1999).

6. Dr. Elena Kartseva (1928-2002) was a member of the Communist party. She worked in the State Film Fund, the Institute of Philosophy. From 1979 to 2002, he was a research fellow and head of Department of Film Art Research Institute. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, became the basis of her books: *Popular culture in the United States and the problem of identity* (1974), *The ideological and aesthetic foundations of bourgeois 'mass culture'* (1976), *Kitsch, or celebration vulgarity* (1977), *Hollywood: contrast 70s* (1987).

7. Dr. Ludmila Melville (born in 1948) was a member of the Communist party. She worked at the Institute of cinematography. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, became the basis of her monograph *Cinema and the aesthetics of destruction* (1984).

8. Dr. Marianna Shaternikova (1934-2018) was a member of the Communist party. She worked at the Institute of Art History, Film Art Research Institute and the Institute of Cinematography. Articles published in the book *Myths and Reality*, became the basis of her monograph *Blue Collar on US screens (Working man in American cinema)* (1985). She was the editor of *Myths and Reality* collection from 5 to 11 issue (1976-1989). M.S. Shaternikova emigrated to the United States in 1990, a year after the publication of the last book *Myths and Reality*.

9. Elena Victorova worked at the Film Art Research Institute. Articles published in the books "*Myths and Reality*", became the basis of her book *Gian Maria Volonte. Love and Fury* (1990).

10. Prof. Dr. Alexander Karaganov (1915-2007) was a member of the Communist party. From 1965 to 1986 he was secretary of the Soviet Union of Cinematographers. He was the professor at the Academy of Social Sciences. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, became the basis of his monograph *Cinematography in the struggle of ideas* (1974).

11. Dr. Garena Krasnova (born in 1945) worked at the Film Art Research Institute. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, became the basis of her monograph *German Cinema* (1987).

12. Dr. Andrei Plakhov (born 1950) was a member of the Communist party. He was a journalist in *Pravda* newspaper in the years 1977-1988. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, partly included in his book *The struggle of ideas in modern Western cinema* (1984) and *Northwest screen: the destruction of the personality. Characters and concepts of Western art* (1985).

13. Prof. Dr. Kirill Razlogov (born in 1946) was a member of the Communist party. From 1969 to 1976 he worked in the State Film Fund. From 1977 to 1988 he was the adviser to the Chairman of State Committee for Soviet Cinematography. Since 1972 he taught at the Higher Courses for Scriptwriters and directors, from 1988 - in the film studies faculty of Institute of Cinematography. Articles published in the books *Myths and Reality*, partly included in his book *The conveyor of dreams and psychological war: the cinema and the social and political struggle in the West, 70s-80s* (1986).

14. Dr. Nikolay Savitsky (born in 1939) was a member of the Communist party. He worked as a head of department in the journal *Cinema Art*.

Initially, some foreign film critics (K.T. Toeplitz, E. Plazewski, A. Werner, et al.), mostly from socialist countries, published from the first to the fourth books' collection. But since the fifth edition (1976) publication of the articles of foreign authors stopped once and for all. Apparently, the Soviet censors decided to completely protect readers from foreign opinions...

Table 17. The main authors of thematic books' collection 'Myths and Reality' (1966-1989)

№	Names of film critics, most often published in books' collection 'Myths and	The number of articles published by these film critics in books'	The number of articles published by these film critics, film	Frequency of presence of articles of these film critics in each of the

	Reality'	collection 'Myths and Reality'	critics in books' collection 'Myths and reality' (in %)	books in collection 'Myths and Reality' (in %)
1	V. Baskakov	9	7.2	81.8
2	G. Bohemsky	9	7.2	81.8
3	G. Kapralov	9	7.2	81.8
4	R. Sobolev	6	4.8	54.5
5	A. Braginsky	5	4.0	45.4
6	E. Kartseva	5	4.0	45.4
7	L. Melville	4	3.2	45.4
8	M. Shaternikova	4	3.2	45.4
9	E. Victorova	3	2.4	27.3
10	A. Karaganov	3	2.4	27.3
11	G. Krasnova	3	2.4	27.3
12	A. Plakhov	3	2.4	27.3
13	K. Razlogov	3	2.4	27.3
14	N. Savitsky	3	2.4	27.3

Circulation and photos in 'Myths and Reality' collection

In the Soviet era of the books' deficit even film critics' books had large circulations: a collection of *Myths and Reality* was launched in 1966 with a circulation of 10 thousand copies. From 1971 to 1974 printed edition of this collection had 30 thousand, and from 1976 to 1988 - 25 thousand copies. Copies of the last book, released in 1989, had 28 thousand copies.

The illustrations (they were mainly shots from foreign films in black and white) did the articles more interesting for readers. The first issue of the collection, which had the full name of *Myths and reality: the bourgeois cinema today* (1966) had 47 photos, 11 (23.4%) of them – with the frivolous for the Soviet-Puritan times scenes (kisses, half-dressed women) from films *Seduced and Abandoned, Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow, Divorce Italian, Dolce vita, Tom Jones, Rocco and his brothers, Night*. Plus two frames (4.2%), depicting scenes of violence (*Hands over the City, Rocco and his Brothers*).

However, such freedom is apparently not passed censorship and vigilant citizens (including the top of the Communist party apparatus). The editor of the collection G. Kapralov could not ignore the directives contained in the resolution of the Communist Party Central Committee "On measures for further development of the social sciences and enhance their role in the building of communism" (14.08.1967) and "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio and television, film, culture and art institutions for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire" (07.01.1969), as well as the struggle of the USSR leadership with liberalism of "Prague spring".

Hence it is clear that in the second issue of *Myths and reality: the bourgeois cinema today* (1971) had 38 pictures, and frivolous (kisses, half-dressed heroine) photos could be considered already only 6 (15.8%): from the films *Blow up*, *Thank you, Auntie*, *Oh, damn watermelon!*, *Masculine, feminine*, *Belle de Jour* and *Satyricon*. Three photos (7.9%) were the illustrations of footage from the film depicting scenes of violence (*Salvatore Giuliano*, *Bonnie and Clyde*, *Weekend*).

In this five-year interval between the release of the first and the second issue of the collection eloquently that the respective governing authorities felt the need to clear doubts about the release of such publications, telling Soviet readers about the bourgeois films, not purchased to showcase in the USSR.

It seems that everything has been taken into account: the level of frivolous illustrations in 1971 was significantly reduced in 1971. But strict tone Resolution of the Communist Party Central Committee "On Literary Criticism" (21.01.1972), calling for even greater vigilance in relation to the capitalist West, led to a radical change in the situation illustrated in further editions of collection: in the issue 3 (1972) was only 19 pictures (with zero of frivolous pictures and only one frame (5.3%) depicting scenes of violence (*Weekend*). And the issues 4 (1974) and 5 (1976) have been printed without any illustrations...

In the third edition of the collection was another significant change: the word "bourgeois" was replaced with "foreign". This is explained by the fact that it is now part of the collection were included articles about cinema of "developing countries" (in Africa, Asia and Latin America), of course, not revelatory, but sympathetically and approving. This name has remained unchanged until the end of completion in 1989.

M. Shaternikova became co-editor of G. Kapralov in 1976. And since 1978 she edited *Myths and Reality* until his last, 11th edition. She re-emerged the illustrations. But everything was under control: up to the beginning of perestroika (1985) was not any pictures a frivolous frame, and each of the 9, 10 and 11 issues had only a couple of such illustrations (*The Taming of the Shrew*, *Saxophone*, *The Marriage of Maria Braun*, *Love in Germany*, *The Name is Carmen*, *An Unmarried woman*). Photos, which contain scenes of violence, distributed as follows: in the sixth issue were four of them, ie 6.2% (*Taxi Driver*, *Chinatown*, *Investigation of a Citizen Above Suspicion*, *Oedipus Rex*). In the seventh - one, that is, 1.7% (*Investigator Nicknamed Sheriff*), in the eighth - three, ie 5.4% (*Canoe*, *Get out of Here*, *Telephone*), in the ninth - five, 9.8% (*Zombie Horror*, *The King of Comedy*, *Investigator Nicknamed Sheriff*, *Nosferatu the Vampire*, *Knife in the Head*), in the tenth - three, 3.9% (*Gandhi*, *Dirty Harry*, *Gunfire*), in the eleventh - zero.

Table 18. Distribution of illustrations with frivolous content and scenes of violence in thematic collection of 'Myths and Reality' (1966-1989)

<i>Collection's issue</i>	<i>Year of issue</i>	<i>Number of photos in the issue (total)</i>	<i>Number of photos with frivolous content (%)</i>	<i>Number of pictures with scenes of violence (%)</i>
1	1966	47	23.4	4.2
2	1971	38	15.8	7.9
3	1972	19	0.0	5.3
4	1974	0	0.0	0.0
5	1976	0	0.0	0.0
6	1978	64	0.0	6.2
7	1981	60	0.0	1.7
8	1983	55	0.0	5.4
9	1985	51	3.9	9.8
10	1988	76	2.6	3.9
11	1989	59	3.4	0.0

Conclusions

Problems of ideological struggle, and the political censorship in the socio-cultural context of the 1960s - 1980s and on how Soviet critics, specializing in foreign films, to respond to many factors. The characteristic of the official Soviet cinema studies, facing the material foreign movie: 1) sympathetic support "progressive western filmmakers", 2) sharp criticism of "bourgeois tendencies and perversions", 3) criticism of bourgeois society.

The eleventh edition of the collection *Myths and Reality* showed, finally, that the Soviet film studies of the late 1980s was ready for deprived ideological bias in analysis of foreign cinema. This line was continued in the post-Soviet years, no longer in the *Myths and Reality*, but on the pages of scientific journals *Film Criticism Notes* and *Cinema Art*, in the film encyclopedia devoted to the western screen, in numerous monographs, the authors of which have become and authors of *Myths and Reality* (A. Braginsky, E. Kartseva, A. Plakhov, K. Razlogov, and other well-known Russian film critics).

References

- Alova, L. (1989). The image of Sicily in contemporary Italian cinema. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 110-129.
- Baskakov, V. (1966). The battle of ideas. *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Art, pp. 3-31.
- Baskakov, V. (1971). The complex world and its commentators. *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Art, pp. 5-36.

- Baskakov, V. (1972). The crisis of bourgeois ideology and the fate of cinematography. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 75-106.
- Baskakov, V. (1974). Destiny of neorealism. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 4. Moscow: Art, pp. 100-118.
- Baskakov, V. (1976). Cinematic America. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 5. Moscow: Art, pp. 67-91.
- Baskakov, V. (1978). Exposer and sacrifice. *Myths and reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Art, pp. 152-168.
- Baskakov, V. (1983). Moscow International... *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 8. Moscow: Art, pp. 3-37.
- Baskakov, V. (1985). Screen aggression. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 3-26.
- Baskakov, V. (1988). Yesterday and today. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp. 3-22.
- Belenky, I. (1976). Violence and responsibility. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 5. Moscow: Art, pp. 169-186.
- Bohemsy, G. (1971). Italian cinema: Light and shadow. *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Art, pp. 71-91.
- Bohemsy, G. (1972). Cinema of "consumer society" (Reflections on the Italian commercial film). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 107-137.
- Bohemsy, G. (1974). A political film in Italy. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 4. Moscow: Art, pp. 252-270.
- Bohemsy, G. (1976). The working class goes on the screen. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 5. Moscow: Art, pp. 114-151.
- Bohemsy, G. (1978). Political cinema: the threat of a hoax. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Art, pp. 66-89.
- Bohemsy, G. (1981). Italian political thriller. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Art, pp. 115-139.
- Bohemsy, G. (1985). Cinema show takes revenge (Italian commercial cinema). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 87-111.
- Bohemsy, G. (1988). The most exciting theme (Italian films about the war). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp. 59-79.
- Bohemsy, G. (1989). World Pirandello in the screen mirror. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 234-262.
- Braginsky, A. (1966). Yesterday and today, the "new wave". *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Art, 1966. pp. 125-138.
- Braginsky, A. (1976). French political cinema. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 5. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-113.
- Braginsky, A. (1981). Two points of reference. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Art, pp. 179-203.
- Braginsky, A. (1985). Changing of the Guard: New names, old problems (French cinema 1970s). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 136-160.
- Braginsky, A. (1989). Two streams in a "system." Notes on the modern French cinema. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 87-109.
- Chertok, S. (1974), French cinema about working class. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 4. Moscow: Art, pp. 144-155.
- Dmitriev, V., Mikhalkovich, V. (1972). The birth of the myth. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 234-249.

- Dyachenko, N. (1981). Before choosing (Political trends in modern cinema France). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Art, pp. 62-80.
- Dyachenko, N. (1988). The police film. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp.143-161.
- Eco, U. (1976). *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). "The Little School Orchestra ":... A Sample of the Hermeneutic Analysis of Media Texts in Student Audience. *European Researcher*. 2012. Vol. 32, № 10-2, pp. 1804-1810.
- Galanov, B. (1966). What does the "cinema-eye"? *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Art, pp. 151-158.
- Galanov, B. (1972). When gods die (Note about Cannes film festival, 1971). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 202-215.
- Golovanov, V. (1974). Hollywood: Economics and Politics. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 4. Moscow: Art, pp. 5-33.
- Gromov, E. (1972). At the end of the sixties. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 36-74.
- Gromov, E. (1989). The range of possibilities. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 130-147.
- Jancolas, J.-P. (1984). *French Cinema. Fifth Republic (1958-1978)*. Moscow: Rainbow, 406 p.
- Janushevskaya, I., Demin, V. (1971). Formula of adventure. *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Art, pp. 199-228.
- Kamshalov, A., Nesterov, V. (1978). World Cinematography against fascism. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Art, pp. 3-22.
- Kapralov, G. (1971). Hoax widescreen. *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Art, pp. 37-70.
- Kapralov, G. (1972). The destruction of the myth, the truth. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 173-201.
- Kapralov, G. (1974). Screen, politics and *Clockwork Orange*. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 4. Moscow.: Art, pp. 175-206.
- Kapralov, G. (1976). Social film with variations. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 5. Moscow: Art, pp. 3-32.
- Kapralov, G. (1978). "Jaws": myth, politics, business. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Art, pp. 47-65.
- Kapralov, G. (1981). Deadlocks desperate maze of illusions and hopes of the road. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Art, pp. 3- 40.
- Kapralov, G. (1983). By spiral leading down. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 8. Moscow: Art, pp. 38-64.
- Kapralov, G. (1985). Cinema Demons of violence and virtue in American. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 27-45.
- Kapralov, G. (1989). "Loss" and the acquisition of real. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 3-27.
- Kapralov, G. (Ed.) (1966). *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Art, 228 p.
- Kapralov, G. (Ed.) (1971). *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Art, 264 p.
- Kapralov, G. (Ed.) (1972). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, 342 p.
- Kapralov, G. (Ed.) (1974). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 4. Moscow: Art, 272 p.

- Kapralov, G., Shaternikova, M. (Eds.) (1976). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 5. Moscow: Art, 232 p.
- Karaganov, A. (1966). Between truth and falsehood. *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Art, pp. 32-73.
- Karaganov, A. (1972). Commerce, politics, the arts. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 3-35.
- Karaganov, A. (1976). Italian filmmakers. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 5. Moscow: Art, pp. 33-66.
- Kartseva, E. (1974). Cinema of the "mass culture", system. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 4. Moscow: Art, pp. 71-99.
- Kartseva, E. (1983). Under the sign of the politicization. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 8. Moscow: Art, pp. 84-102.
- Kartseva, E. (1985). From Nazi to ultra. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 46-66.
- Kartseva, E. (1988). People in blue. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp. 39-58.
- Kartseva, E. (1989). Hollywood on Hollywood. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 47-65.
- Khanutin, Y. (1971). Behind the facade of the "universal well-being" (Notes of a young Swedish film). *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Art, pp. 124-149.
- Kolodyazhnaya, V. (1978). Occult, fideism and modern American cinema. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Art, pp. 169-191.
- Krasnova, G. (1985). The search for alternatives: German Cinema against the expansion of Hollywood. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 161-180.
- Krasnova, G. (1989). Challenging ... Women theme in American cinema 70s-80s. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 66-86.
- Krasnova, G. Social problems in the German "young cinema". *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Art, pp. 81-114.
- Makarov, G. (1972). Ups and downs of a musical. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 250-267.
- Mamatova, L. (1988). "Parade of Stars" in Venice. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp. 94-121.
- Markulan, J. (1972). Love, life, death for Lelouche. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 216-233.
- Materials of the Plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee*. 14-15 June 1983, Moscow, 1983, pp 7.
- Melamed, L. (1972). New Latin America cinema. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 325-342.
- Melville, L. (1983). Feminism on the screen. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 8. Moscow: Art, pp. 135-159.
- Melville, L. (1985). Terrorism in the Western screens. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 67-86.
- Melville, L. (1988). "Discreet Charm" of intellectual. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp. 23-38.
- Melville, L. (1989). Movies about the "unthinkable". *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 28-46.
- Mikhalkovich, V. (1976). What is a thriller? *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 5. Moscow: Art, pp. 187-214.

- Nedelin, V. (1966). A Confessions of an artist in a terrible world. *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Art, pp. 205-226.
- Nusinova, N. (1989). Francois Truffaut: the history of cinema as an autobiography. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 263-282.
- Parasadanov, N. (1966). Movies and bourgeois aesthetics. *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Art, pp. 104-124.
- Plakhov, A. (1985). Caution: TV! *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 112-135.
- Plakhov, A. (1989). In the side of myth and history in depth. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 188-213.
- Razlogov, K. (1981). The "new" conservatism and Western cinema. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Art, pp. 41-61.
- Razlogov, K. (1985). The Church and the cinema in the West: the conflicts and interactions. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 181-202.
- Razlogov, K. (1988). Outsider or demiurge? (The image of the journalist in modern western movie). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp. 80-93.
- Reisen, O. (1983). Light at the end of the tunnel (about some tendencies of contemporary Spanish cinema). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 8. Moscow: Art, pp. 183-203.
- Resolution of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee "On Literary Criticism" (1972). *The Soviet Communist Party in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee plenums*. Moscow: Politizdat, 1986. Vol. 12, pp. 170-173.
- Savitsky, N. (1988). Movies in the flow of time (from the program "Fest-83"). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp.122-142.
- Savitsky, N. (1989). "All genres ... except boring." On the problem of "commercial cinema". *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 148-168.
- Shaternikova, M. (1981). The black shadows on the silver screen. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Art, pp. 140-161.
- Shaternikova, M. (1983). Return of the Forgotten Hero. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 8. Moscow: Art, pp. 103-134.
- Shaternikova, M. (Ed.) (1978). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Art, 238 p.
- Shaternikova, M. (Ed.) (1981). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Art, 247 p.
- Shaternikova, M. (Ed.) (1983). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 8. Moscow: Art, 287 p.
- Shaternikova, M. (Ed.) (1985). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, 287 p.
- Shaternikova, M. (Ed.) (1988). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. Moscow: Art 10, 240 p.
- Shaternikova, M. (Ed.) (1989). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, 288 p.
- Shestakov, V. (1978). "New Hollywood": tactics and strategy. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Art, pp. 90-132.
- Silverblatt, A. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut – London: Praeger,

- Sobolev, R. (1966). Two face of "verite". *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Art, pp. 139-150.
- Sobolev, R. (1974). Metamorphoses of "star system". *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 4. Moscow: Art, pp. 34-70.
- Sobolev, R. (1981). Movies and Comics. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Art, pp. 162-178.
- Sobolev, R. (1983). In the style of "disco" (notes about the movie "B" category). *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 8. Moscow: Art, pp. 226-244.
- Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Resolution "On increasing the responsibility of the heads of the press, radio and television, film, culture and art institutions for the ideological and political level of the published materials and repertoire" (1969). Moscow, 1969.
- Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Resolution "On measures for further development of the social sciences and enhance their role in the building of communism" (1967). *The Soviet Communist Party in Resolutions*. Moscow, 1986. Vol. 11, pp. 237-251.
- Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Resolution "On measures for further development of Soviet cinema." (1972). *The Soviet Communist Party in Resolutions*. Moscow, 1986. Vol. 12, pp. 263-268.
- Surkova, O. (1976). Metamorphosis of Swedish cinema. Bergman and Wideberg. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 5. Moscow: Art, pp. 152-168.
- Teneyshvili, O. (1972). Everyday French commercial cinema. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 138-172.
- Tsarapkina, T. (1985). Canada Cinema: First Steps. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 223-240.
- Tsyrkun, N. (1988). "New Right" in Hollywood. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp. 182-200.
- Turitsyn, V. (1971). Modern England in films Tony Richardson. *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Art, pp. 175-198.
- Victorova, E. (1978). Phenomenon Volonte. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Art, pp. 133-151.
- Victorova, E. (1983). Man and civilization: two views of reality. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 8. Moscow: Art, pp. 160-182.
- Victorova, E. (1989). Memories of the Future! *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 214-233.
- Weizmann, E. (1966). The Myth of the person. *Myths and Reality. Bourgeois cinema today*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Art, pp. 74-103.
- Yampolsky, M. (1989). Video: commerce, aesthetics and ideology. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 169-187.
- Yurenev, R. (1978). The past, present and future. *Myths and Reality. Foreign cinema today*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Art, pp. 23-46.

Polish cinema in the mirror of the Soviet and Russian film criticism

The peak of the Soviet Union interest to Polish cinema took place in the 1960s. And this is understandable: in the first place, unlike the situation in the 1920s - 1930s, the friendship and cooperation between USSR and Poland actively supported at the state level in 1960s; secondly, the so-called "Polish Film School" was very famous in Europe for those years (the second half of the 1950s to mid-1960s), thirdly, Polish films had a significant share on the Soviet screens.

This explains why dozens of articles and five books about the Polish films (Chernenko, 1965; Markulan, 1967; Rubanova, 1966; Sobolev, 1965; 1967) have been published in 1960s. The emergence Polish films of the "moral anxiety" led not only to a decrease in the share of Polish films on the Soviet screens, but also to a decrease in the publications of Soviet critics about Polish cinema 1970s. For example, I. Rubanova's books about documentary filmmaking in Poland, well known Polish actor Zbigniew Cybulski (1927-1967) and film director Andrzej Wajda (1926-2016) never reached the readers due to impediments censorship (see about this: Rubanova, 2015). The situation worsened in connection with the attempt of the Polish "Solidarity" movement to oppose the communist regime: the many Polish filmmakers (including A. Wajda) became unstated corollary to the Soviet press until perestroika times ...

The short revival wave came in the end of 1980s is the beginning of the 1990s. It was a time when the Soviet press free from censorship. But ... the collapse of the Soviet Union almost immediately resulted in the liquidation of the existing system box office. Russian film / video screens were filled with American film production. The Russian cinemas 1990s had no place not only for Polish films, but also for the Russian cinema. Polish films have failed to win a place on Russian screens in the XXI century... As a result, not so many fans see Polish films in the Poland cinema weeks, on satellite television or the Internet.

R. Sobolev (1926-1991) and M. Chernenko (1931-2004) died, and Russian critics began to write about the Polish cinema less and less, although today there is a Russian film critics-polonists (including T. Eliseeva, O. Rahaeva, I. Rubanova, and D. Viren).

What was possible and what was impossible?

I. Rubanova, one of the best connoisseurs of Polish cinema, said with knowledge of the matter that Poland after 1956 was "territory allowed freedom... Censorship regulated films content very tightly, including specific topics (e.g., the relationship with the Great East Neighbor, as the

current and historical), but poetics, stylistic decisions of Polish movies were given at the discretion of the artists" (Rubanova, 2000, 2015). D. Viren (Viren, 2015, p.10) agrees with I. Rubanova. Moreover, D. Viren says (and I agree with him) that "Poland, in terms of censorship, was perhaps the most liberal (as that word is applicable in this context) the country (among socialist states – A.F.) for artists, and not only the filmmakers" (Viren, 2013, p. 98).

However, O. Rahaeva writes in this regard that the Polish authorities until 1956 "quite sharply reacted to the absence of the Soviet characters in the movies: the film *Forbidden Songs* (*Zakazane piosenki*, 1946) was adopted only after the amendments (including the show the leading role of the Soviet soldiers in Warsaw liberation). Wanda Jakubowska wanted to avoid censorship accusations of incorrect interpretation of the events in the film *The Last Stage* (*Ostatni etap*, 1947), and at once two Russian characters were in a concentration camp among the others protagonists. Another example is the movie *Unconquered City* (*Miasto nieujarzmione*, 1950), which, after long vicissitudes of the scenario, the attempts of Soviet soldiers establish contact with the insurgents in Warsaw 1944 were added to the plot. Sometimes the personal involvement of the Soviet comrades was the correct ideological guarantee: Marshal Rokossowski was the consultant of the film *Soldier of Victory* (*Żołnierz zwycięstwa*, 1953)" (Rahaeva, 2012, p. 227).

De-Stalinization and Khrushchev's Thaw have led to significant changes: "Polish cinema proved exceptionally creative semi-freedom conditions. Artificial framework imposed from above always leads to complication of the noble form, and the state censorship provides a complex shape connotation for hungry audience"(Gorelov, 2011). In particular, this "semi-freedom" is well illustrated by I. Rubanova about how Poland censorship made preventive measures in relation to *Ashes and Diamonds* (*Popiół i diament*, 1958): this film "released on the screens, but showing abroad banned. However, the then head of the cinematography Jerzy Lewinski, proud of the fact that Polish cinema has managed to create such an excellent film under his strict and flexible guidance, secretly brought it to the Venice festival... And the film began to march through the screens of the world and is now considered an ornament centennial history of world cinema" (Rubanova, 2000).

Features of Soviet cinematic censorship were different: both in movies and in film studies could not be:

- to have an alternative to official interpretation of the Polish-Russian-Soviet relations (for example, the Soviet-Polish war of 1920, the Second World War 1939-1945, the entire post-war period, including, of course, assess the "Solidarity" movement);

- a positive attitude to formal experimentation in the field of cinematic language and form;
- positive use of erotic, religious and mystical topics;
- favorably assess the creativity of Polish filmmakers who have emigrated to the West (or later: filmmakers who supported the "Solidarity").

USSR had such prohibitions until the beginning of "perestroika", but although at 1960s-1970s some Soviet film critics could barely get around (for example, they could write something positive about the mystical film *Lokis* by Janusz Majewski).

Fearing revisionism...

R. Yurenev's (1912-2002) article with the characteristic title *The influence of revisionism in the Polish cinema* (Yurenev, 1959) was perhaps the first prominent Soviet film studies work about Polish cinema. In spite of the supposed onset the political "thaw", R. Yurenev clearly manifested rigid ideological tendencies of the Stalinist era. He wrote about the key Polish films of the second half of 1950s and generally rendered them very strict sentence. For example, he rebuked Andrzej Wajda - the director of the most famous works of "Polish film school *Ashes and Diamonds* (*Popiół i diament*, 1958) – and then asked rhetorically, ideologically question: "Does Wajda read Lenin's article on party literature in which a conquering force proved that, trying to get out of the class struggle, the artist inevitably sinking into a swamp of reaction?" (Yurenev, 1959, p. 97).

R. Yurenev was slightly warmer to A. Wajda's war drama *Canal* (*Kanał*, 1957), because "young director made many of episodes talented, sincere and strong". But the film critic remarked "deliberateness, the influence of expressionism, painful attention to the suffering, to the horrors of slow deaths" (Yurenev, 1959, p.96).

R. Yurenev was very strict to ironic film *Eroica* (1957) by Andrzej Munk. Standing at that time on the solid positions of socialist realism, film critic stated: ""For me, one thing is clear: a deliberate, conscious anti-heroism in this film objectively leads to slander of the Warsaw Uprising..."(Yurenev, 1959, p. 94).

Turning to the analysis of contemporary issues in the Polish cinema, R. Yurenev was no less strict and vigilant, treating *The Eighth Day of the Week* (*Ósmy dzień tygodnia*, 1958) as "a film slanderously drawing Polish youth and Polish modernity. ... Communist Aleksander Ford, the recognized leader of the Polish cinematography, who created a series of strong and truthful films, embarked on the path of revisionism, naturally, albeit against his will, was used as a weapon in the struggle against their socialist homeland" (Yurenev, 1959, p.102).

R. Yurenev gave a poor rating for A. Munk's film *Man on the tracks* (*Człowiek na torze*, 1956), where the "international singing scene was just insulting" (Yurenev, 1959, p. 92) and for the drama *The Loop* (*Pętla*, 1957) by Wojciech Has where "modern Poland is the infinitely gloomy, sad and hopeless" (Yurenev, 1959, p. 100).

Thus, R. Yurenev's article, in fact, was a real verdict of the best movies of "Polish film school." And who knows, perhaps it is this publication and this particular opinion formed the basis for the adoption of "censorship conclusions", and *Eroica*, *The Loop* and *The Eighth Day of the Week* were not admitted to the Soviet screens at all, and *Ashes and Diamonds* although it came out, but after a long delay.

And I must say that the R. Yurenev was not alone in these charges. Well-known Soviet film critic J. Markulan (1920-1978) put it more crudely: Polish "Black Series" marked, in fact, an appeal to the aesthetics of naturalism" (Markulan 1967, p. 206).

Other prominent Soviet film critics spoke about Polish films of the second half of 1950s in a somewhat milder version, but equally ideologically loaded: "As is often the case in the dispute about the false and dogmatism of the past years, some filmmakers went to the other extreme - began to reflect only the negative side of life, and their films gave a distorted view of reality. No coincidence that many movies of that time were called "black"... Polish cinema in the late 1950s has experienced some influence of Western aesthetic concepts. We can find a number of films with motifs decadent philosophies, pessimistic view of life and human solitude"(Sobolev, 1967, pp. 17, 28).

"Many Polish features films of the second half of the 1950s were determined by direct response to the schematic and smoothing the contradictions inherent in many movies of the previous period. In the heat of polemic film masters are now concentrated attention on the negative aspects of reality. ... The tragic hopelessness and death were the main dominant in the representation of war and occupation. It should also be noted that there have been several films in which a new reality in this period was to blacken. This is explained by the fact that at some time in the theory and practice of Polish cinema was to penetrate the effect of the reaction of the bourgeois cinema ... grim, one-sided view of the world, lack of faith in man... However, the defenders of the "black series" assured that this is the atmosphere of hopelessness it encourages the viewer to active combat, but it's not true. ... In some feature films this kind of influence could be seen then part of the bourgeois cinema fashionable existentialist themes: miscommunication, the individual's helplessness before the absurdity of life, etc. ... This topic was specific: the content of the "Polish film school" was a hopeless story, the tragic fate of Poles during the war and

occupation, or depicted in exaggerated form the shortcomings of contemporary Polish reality" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, pp. 26, 45, 47).

It follows from the above quotations, the main targets of Soviet criticism of Polish films of the second half of the 1950s were "pessimistic", "hopeless," "darkness," "non-class approach", "slander," "libel", "revisionism", "exposure to Western influence" and other factors, perceived as extremely negative from the standpoint of socialistic realism. And I must say that official Soviet film critics accused in such sins and some of films created in the Soviet Union or with the participation of the USSR (*Eastern Corridor* by V. Vinogradov, *The Red and the White* by M. Jancso, et al.).

Andrzej Wajda as the central figure of Soviet and Russian Studies of Polish Films

Undoubtedly, some Soviet critics, who have devoted a considerable part of their works to the Polish film (I. Rubanova, M. Chernenko et al.), tried to protect Andrzej Wajda and his colleagues from the rough attacks. However, they were forced to act very carefully - within the framework of what is permitted by the censor.

In particular, they supported the official Soviet version of the alignment of political forces in the Poland 1939-1945 and the first post-war years:

"The falsity of the bourgeois order and official ideology, actively engrafted sanation masters of Poland discovered with the brutal certainty in 1939... Later, when it became impossible to count on the defeat of the Soviet Army, Armia Krajowa degenerated into armed gangs"(Rubanova, 1966, pp. 8-9).

"The political program put forward by the Armia Krajowa was determined in the early thirties, the slogan of "two enemies": Germany and the Soviet Union. In fact, this slogan meant a focus on German Nazism against the Soviet Union" (Chernenko, 1965a).

"The war, heroism, duty and patriotism - these topics have become dominant in the Polish cinema. And most powerfully embodied in *Ashes and Diamonds*. This film tells on the tragedy of Polish young men, deceived reactionary underground, turning weapons against the Polish Communists and Soviet soldiers, their senseless deaths"(Chernenko, 1965b). "The reactionary leadership of the Armia Krajowa, Polish government in exile in London sent hundreds of thousands of young men to a senseless death "(Chernenko, 1965a).

"Not without reason, "Ashes and Diamonds" is the highest achievement of Polish cinematography, the most complete expression of the Polish Film School. This talented product with extraordinary artistic

power and integrity disclosed the basic conflict of so-called "Polish drama": doom, sacrifice in the name of false ideals of witnesses. ... The reason for the success was in the fact that the relentless and sincere Wajda's film said the first time the truth about those that had caused the death of these young character from Armia Krajowa, this film opened the anti-popular nature of the Polish government in exile, was selling the interests of Poland, made a deal with the Nazis and provoking fratricidal struggle" (Markulan, 1967, pp. 80, 91-92).

"Actor (Zbigniew Cybulski – A.F.) tried to translate the emotional biography of the generation to which he belongs, and of which he, with extraordinary clarity and completeness played in his best film - *Ashes and Diamonds*. ... The actor plays both guilty and innocent of his hero. This character is guilty, because it missed the story, because he was blind and deaf to it. But he is innocent, because using patriotic feeling, he had been deceived and betrayed by the bourgeois leaders of the movement" (Rubanova, 1965, pp. 136, 140).

In search of analogies, understandable and acceptable to the Soviet regime, M. Chernenko and V. Kolodyazhnaya tried to lean on the novel *And Quiet Flows the Don* by M. Sholokhov: "Maciek Chelmicki tragedy very close to the fate of Gregory Melekhov. Let the different circumstances of time and place, and different biographies of the characters, but they are united by the guilt in front of his people, which can only redeem death" (Chernenko, 1964).

"Maciek confused as Gregory Melikhov, turned out to be a victim of circumstances and people around him, vaguely feel their mistake and paid for it with life. However, Maciek is national Polish hero type, ready to do adventurous things without thinking about their practicality and their ideological meaning" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, p.34).

R. Sobolev arose the same analogy: "The tragedy of death Maciek is the same obvious truth that he dies deceived and confused, although his true place is in the ranks of the builders of the new Poland. If we look for parallels, then the same tragic fate of Gregory Melikhov" (Sobolev, 1967, pp. 40, 43).

Disagreeing with their conservative opponents, the author of a monograph on the military theme in the Polish Film I. Rubanova rightly wrote that "*Ashes and Diamonds* is the film is not only a political one. Its content is broader than just the specific analysis of the political situation. And this situation, and its interpretation away from history. ... And *Ashes and Diamonds* is historic film in the same extent that the modern" (Rubanova, 1966, p.112).

In the post-Soviet 1990s, M. Chernenko returned to the analysis of the most famous film by Andrzej Wajda: "*Ashes and Diamonds* immediately became a part of our cinematic culture in the late 1950s - early

1960s, and probably we cannot find a Soviet film director who would not see this movie in State Film Fund. And today many years later, we can see *Ashes and Diamonds*' quotations in many of Soviet and Russian films... We remember this wonderful plastic, the general atmosphere of the film, a striking mixture of sadness and hopelessness, despair and joy of biological life, inexorable historical destiny and chance of human choices..." (Chernenko, 1992).

T. Eliseeva appreciated *Ashes and Diamonds* with modern look, free of censorship "The main character, a brave young Pole, ready to sacrifice themselves "for the cause", who fought during the Nazi occupation for the liberation of his country, is faced with the fact that his homeland liberated people an alien ideology. Maciek belonged to the army, which was fighting for other Poland, ... He wants to live in the best Poland, and it's his right"(Eliseeva, 2009, p. 99).

As mentioned above, the *Canal* by A. Wajda generally been met Soviet criticism positively (Rubanova, 1966, pp. 89-99). For example, it was noted that this work is "about people who were doomed from the first frame of the film, and the film did not cheat, he warned about it at once, in the credits, people who have lost everything except the human dignity that could not win and we knew it, but went to their death, because death was the only that he belonged in life that they can choose on their own, on my own. And they made this choice in the name of freedom, in the name of independence, in the name of the victory of those who survive" (Chernenko, 1974).

Soviet film critics paid attention to the figurative language of this outstanding work: Soviet film critics paid attention to the figurative language of this outstanding work: "*Canal* is tough and courageous film. Many scenes are solved here with the ascetic rigor, their strength - in the expression. There is no trace of admiration... Light, noise, mobility nervous camera, density and sharpness of darkness light accents, dissection of our attention, ... creation of emotional intensity of our feelings, a sense of extraordinary poetic power of the climate pattern. Screen image gives us not only the state of mind of the people of the doomed unit, but also as it materializes stuffy smelly canals, instability of each step on the slippery rocks, and infinite despair of this tragic labyrinth" (Markulan, 1967, pp. 77-78).

V. Kolodyazhnaya rightly wrote that *Canal's* acting was very low-key and subtle in expression brought to the extreme feelings. Plastic mode of action, documentary and sharp accuracy. Laconic and unusual expression of composition, angles, beams of light aimed into the darkness, emphasized the tragedy of action, always reliable and often metaphorical" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, p.33).

However, this positive assessment of *Canal* was sometimes with a spoon of ideological tar: "The Warsaw Uprising was adventurous action government in exile, which had the aim to return the power of the bourgeois-landlord circles" (Sobolev, 1967, p. 31). Although the *Canal* and *Ashes and Diamonds* were delivered with talent, but "both films did not contain deep philosophical understanding of history, they have given more emotional reflection of the tragic fate of ordinary soldiers of Armia Krajowa. Political, economic and social aspects of the processes were without the object of analysis. Wajda touched these problems in passing" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, p. 37).

Bright, emotional *Lotna* was met with a Soviet film studies even more critical: this Wajda's film was accused of formalism (Markulan 1967, pp. 102-110). And even such a fan of A. Wajda, like M. Chernenko, wrote that "referring to Eisenstein, Wajda repeat the mistakes of this master, and, realizing this, he rushed to other side – to Luis Bunuel, saturating the film with bloody and violent images that lie on the edge of surreal nightmares. ... As a result, the movie was supercharged autonomous characters, stylistically fragmented, difficult to understand. (Chernenko, 1965a).

M. Chernenko not spared and Wajda's film on a contemporary topic, arguing that the "characters of *Innocent Sorcerers* (Niewinni Czarodzieje, 1960) are antipodes trilogy heroes. It is significant that Wajda in his first film about the present refers to characters that lie on the periphery of reality. It's clear. Wajda not comprehended artistically main problems of modern time, he was afraid to be false in the main. The falsity in the periphery it seemed less risky. For the first time Wajda afraid of risk. And inevitably loses. The character of *Innocent Sorcerers* for internal disorder, shutting among snobbish attitudes, could not be a hero of truly dramatic conflict" (Chernenko, 1965a).

But Soviet film criticism has positive reaction to the confessional Wajda's film *Everything for Sale* (*Wszystko na sprzedaż*, 1968): "Wajda, the most romantic Polish director, seemingly, forever doomed to search and find just the tragedy and defeat in the last of his people, even Wajda shoots in the late sixties the amazing self-criticism, ironically to himself film *Everything for Sale*, which exposes the ruthless revision of everything that was done to them for fifteen years in the movie, which brought worldwide fame: and he himself and the Polish cinema"(Chernenko, 1974). *Everything for Sale* "became a film not only about Cybulski, but became a film about the cost of human individuality, gives himself to others, profess to people and for the people" (Chernenko, 1970).

And I agree with M. Chernenko: it is difficult for the artist "to overcome itself (success, style, drama, mental stereotypes)" To do this, Andrzej Wajda "had to turn himself inside out, to endure the death of Cybulski, to experience it as their own, to "pushed" by the tragic death of

the co-author of his masterpiece, ... to make a ruthless assessment of own temperament and intelligence, a brutal revision of ethics and aesthetics, emotional and artistic services" (Chernenko, 1971).

In this context, elegiac *The Birch Wood* (*Brzezina*, 1970) was perceived by the Soviet film studies as a kind of respite wizard: "*The Birch Wood* completely lost everything that made the strength and nerve of Wajda's movies: fierce, non-cancellable ownership painful problems of human history, its neuralgic points and nodes"(Chernenko, 1972). "Private family history becomes for him a new occasion for reflection on the inseparable, inevitable, the absolute connection between man and his country" (Rubanova, 1972, p. 151).

It is worth noting that *Landscape after battle* (*Krajobraz po bitwie*, 1970) received also positively opinions from the Soviet film critics (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, pp. 51-55; Chernenko, 1971; 1972 1978).

Of course, Soviet censorship was hostile to the anti-stalinist social drama *Man of Marble* (*Człowiek z marmuru*, 1976) by A. Wajda, but soviet film critics could to write about the movies of Andrzej Wajda until the era of "Solidarity". For example, a large-scale drama *Promised Land* (*Ziemia obiecana*,1974) by A. Wajda received a wide positive response in the Soviet press (Chernenko, 1977; Rubanova, 1977, p. 176).

But Andrzej Wajda actively supported the "Solidarity" movement, and the Soviet journal *Cinema Art* published an editorial under the characteristic title *Andrzej Wajda: what's next?* (Surkov, 1981). And soon the name of Wajda was struck off for several years of the Soviet press.

I. Rubanova very precisely wrote about: "Andrzej Wajda was deleted away from the Soviet screen, it was forbidden to use his printed name of last ten years. And these events gave the myths. Two versions of the legend was most widely used: a popular and official. The first is that the creator of *Ashes and Diamonds* is poet of the generation historical tragedy... Version two: he is a demagogue, instigator, opportunistic, having exchanged his poetic talent at a flat politicking (see anonymous article *Andrzej Wajda: What Next?*, placed – alas, alas - in the pages of *Cinema Art*, 1981, n 10!)" (Rubanova, 1989, p.155).

Film critic S. Lavrentiev reminded of further developments: "The USSR had the revolution in cinema. Incendiary bold speech pronounced and the forbidden films one by one came out on the screens. The very dense reactionaries realized that Buñuel and Bergman, Coppola and Foreman were great masters. The debate about erotica on the screen already inflamed... But Wajda's question is not even raised for discussion. Wajda was guarded as the last besieged fortress... Many of his fans refused to believe in what he set foot on Moscow earth and November, 1, on the eve of the Master arrived" (Lavrenov, 1989). But Wajda came, spoke in the debate, gave an interview. Thus began his return...

However, the films of the late Wajda called opposition not only from the Soviet officialdom. Even in the XXI century there are Russian critics who believe that "Wajda's speculative use stories from the recent tragic Polish past (*Korczak* and *Katyn*) were doomed to failure" (Kirillov, 2011). As you can see from the above text, M. Kirillov speaks sharply, categorically, however, not backing up (to my opinion) at least some convincing arguments...

D. Gorelov write more radically: "All Polish directors dived into the proletarian environment in the period of "Solidarity", and it was a massive betrayal of the idea of Polish cinema. ... Wajda, who is filming about the impact construction and shipyard, there are muddy prostitution matter, for people's power to do it, or against it" (Gorelov, 2011).

But maybe it is worth to listen to S. Lavrentiev: "After all, what is a *Man of Marble*? Equally masterful as it film research of detailed mechanism of infernal machine actions to transform the human person in the "cog". The more valuable that the object of diabolical experiments presented here as a worker" (Lavrentiev, 1989). ... Mirrored the situation *Man of Marble*, *Man of Iron* told that at the present stage of development of society a person can to resist the diabolical mechanism, but also to survive in this struggle. People here believe that the direction of history may depend on their actions. ... No major and minor characters, famous historical figures and unknown citizens. Everything is important. At any moment the balance of power may change... Maybe I'm wrong, but the creation of such a film-image seems to me a manifestation of the highest skill of directing"(Lavrentiev, 1989).

Of course, after the "rehabilitation" of Wajda's film Soviet/Russian critics began to reflect without any censorship restrictions: "What does the *Man of Marble*? ... This film the opened space for the activities of Wajda's younger colleagues, and *Man of Iron* exhausted motives, character, style of "cinema of moral anxiety". Refusal of pathos, metaphorical peaks from multiple layers and multiple meanings of cinematic image, the rate on its direct sound direct manifestation of reality, which itself raised to the reality of the rank of historical..." (Rubanova 1989, pp. 158-159, 163).

M. Chernenko succinctly expressed the significance of the great Polish director for the Soviet audience: Wajda was alive, inflexible, intractable ... indication that somewhere very near, almost in the same conditions in the same suffocating atmosphere, there is the art of cinema, which is not simply engaged in a dialogue on an equal footing with the surrounding reality, as elusive as the opportunity to dream our filmmakers, but this reality imposes its own language, his manner of speaking, its own system of values. In other words, this is a dialogue with the past and present, with national myths and illusions, with lies and slander as a way of thought and life. And wins a victory, though not always those who seek to

directly, but always making the next required, the next step is to target the ultimate and only to the freedom of every human person, because without it, as it is known, cannot be freedom for all the other" (Chernenko, 2001).

Russian film studies (and I think rightly) highlights the *Katyń* (2007) from all of post-Soviet Wajda's films: "One way or another, but we can admit that the 87-year-old patriarch of Polish cinema is the only one in the world cinema master who feels true the scale of the tragedy and has the gift to convey it to the audience" (Rubanova 2013).

Thus, despite all the inconsistencies, Andrzej Wajda has been and remains a major Polish Cinema figure for the Russian film criticism.

Wanda Jakubowska: Critical Consensus

Soviet film critic did not have any disagreements about movies of Wanda Jakubowska (1907-1998). W. Jakubowska was a member of the Communist Party, a former prisoner of Nazi concentration camp. Her drama *The Last Stage* (*Ostatni etap*, 1947) about the horrors of Auschwitz. Soviet film critics evaluated this film immediately and permanently positive (Sobolev, 1967, pp.10-11; Markulan, 1967, pp. 25-38; Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, pp. 6-7).

And while the rest of Jakubowska's films was without special films criticism interest, *The Last Stage* began in the Soviet Union as a benchmark of the Polish anti-Nazi film: "Jakubowska has the purpose: to show how people sneaking hope, retained the ability to fight through violence and abuse. Chronicle cannot afford to show the will of the people, their ability to resist non-decreasing. It could only make a feature film" (Rubanova 1966, p. 63).

Aleksander Ford: with a fair wind to the West ...

The situation with the work of another famous Polish director - Aleksander Ford (1908-1980) - was much more difficult. While he was a communist and was shooting *Boundary Street* (*Ulica Graniczna*, 1948), Soviet film critics praised him (Markulan, 1967, pp. 38-49). On the other hand, A. Ford significantly tarnished its reputation in the eyes of official Soviet film criticism with "revisionist" film *The Eighth Day of the Week* (*Ósmy dzień tygodnia*, 1958). However, R. Yurenev's article containing harsh accusations against this film, has been published in highly specialized publications (Yurenev, 1959, p. 102) and, consequently, was available mainly to specialists. And most importantly: the next Ford's work - a large-scale color historical epic *Crusaders* (*Krzyżacy*, 1960) he returned to acceptable Soviet context.

This explains why J. Markulan, not even including the *Eighth Day of the Week* in her book *Cinema of Poland*, but noted with satisfaction that "at a time when there were anti-heroism trends was in the Polish art, Ford made the movie, frankly extols the heroism as an eternal category, enduring the most powerful" (Markulan, 1967, p.49).

Even a polemical sharp war drama *First Day of Freedom* (Pierwszy dzien wolnosc, 1964) by A. Ford received almost ecstatically evaluation: "Finally, one more victory. More than once we heard the voice of the end of the Polish school of full inflation of military themes. But A. Ford makes the film *First Day of Freedom* and turns the course of debate. Even ardent opponents recognize not only the legitimacy of recourse to "waste" the topic, but also an extraordinary freshness and modernity solutions military theme. Furthermore, even ardent opponents recognize the philosophical and aesthetic kinship latest of this movie with the best creations of the Polish Film School" (Markulan 1967, p. 49).

R. Sobolev wrote about *First Day of Freedom* also in the positive context, noting the brilliant play of the Polish star Beata Tyszkiewicz: "Watch Beata game it is enjoy what you always get when meeting with genuine art" (Sobolev, 1966, p. 168).

But... J. Markulan and R. Sobolev published their opinions until 1969, when Aleksander Ford decided to emigrate to the West. But after 1969, according to the censorship tradition, Soviet film critics almost did not mention about A. Ford...

The discussion about the work of Andrzej Munk

Andrzej Munk (1921-1961) died in a car accident in early 1960s, so, unlike Aleksander Ford, he was persona grata for Soviet censorship. although, of course, the official Soviet criticism had the negative attitude to many of his films (Yurenev, 1959, p. 94).

But R. Sobolev, for example, liking all the movies of A. Munch (Sobolev, 1967). M. Chernenko reacted positively to the *Bad Luck* (*Zezowate szczęście*, 1959): "Polish filmmakers are able to look at the tragic past of the other eye, ruthless, not only the enemy, but also to their own weaknesses, absurdities, disadvantages" (Chernenko, 1974). Soviet film critics wrote very positive and about last Munk's film *The Passenger* (*Pasazerka*, 1963) (Rubanova, 1966, pp. 165-178; Kolodyazhnaya, 1974).

The polemical A. Munk's film *Eroica* was the main point of contention in the Soviet film studies about Polish movies:

"*Eroica* is built in the image of the war and the not typical events and characters, or rather paradoxes on heroism" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, p. 39). "*Eroica* has not protest, not struggle, there is only a religious fanatic faith in a miracle, a legend, a myth, as the only deliverance" (Markulan

1967, p. 119). I. Rubanova noted that the main miscalculation of the authors of the film "is not to rethink the historical realities. It is a complex phenomenon that history consciously them only in part, without taking into account connections and weaves disparate laws" (Rubanova 1966, p. 119).

And here is the opinion of the Russian film criticism of the post-Soviet era: "Munk raises questions that many times were set in the history of Poland: how to survive in captivity, how to cope with the humiliation, how to keep hope alive. ... And although Munk's film is the voice against mythologizing the heroism, it is not directed against the very heroism" (Eliseeva, 2009, p. 25).

Wojciech Has: disappeared from sight...

Soviet film criticism as a whole negatively (Yurenev, 1959, p. 100) met W. Has' grim drama *Loop (Pętla, 1957)*, critics indicated relations to the so-called "black series" of Polish cinema: "deeply flawed movie", "aggressive nihilism" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, p.27). A positive attitude to the *Loop* (Rubanova, 1966, pp. 146-148) seemed discordant in this background. However, the yield on Soviet screens W. Has' films *How to be loved (Jak być kochaną, 1962)* and *The Manuscript Found in Saragossa (Rekopis znaleziony w Saragossie, 1964)* did his work in the USSR is quite legitimate, therefore, Soviet film critics could write about this director with open sympathy.

Tragicomedy *How to be loved* was rated by the Soviet film studies particularly warm (Rubanova, 1966, pp. 148-151). M. Chernenko wrote about this sad and ironic film like this: "If I were a historian, I would have to say that Zbigniew Cybulski played his role in this film as distinct parody of his role in *Ashes and Diamonds*. And the whole drama did not hide his parody in relation to the "Polish Film School". But then, after seeing the film, I remained a striking actress Barbara Krafftówna, poignant story of her heroine, sacrificed himself for the sake of love, she led survive in spite of all disappointments" (Chernenko, 1974).

A film critic J. Markulan summarized film director's artistic signature: "W. Has, perhaps, the most difficult director of Polish cinema. Not so easy at times to get through to the essence of his creatures, to understand the hidden meaning. Sometimes it seems that he mystifies the audience and issues of ambiguity, if not empty, then something is very elementary. And then comes the suspicion that he was just having fun form, with virtuoso dexterity builds stunning designs of cinematic construction materials. But it is difficult, sometimes impossible to understand what will be the structure. Consistently, a human stubbornness, knowing the truth, it creates a bizarre world, a little similar to the one in which we live and inhabit his people too strange, manic obsessed with one passion (no idea,

namely passion). His characters are always put in the position of exclusive, most often they are isolated from the environment, they are deprived of the case and feel minimal communication with the public. W. Has' camera is like a microscope, a magnifying observation object to epic proportions, as if it is moving away from everything that does not belong to the lens" (Markulan, 1967, p. 208).

However, after the release of the *Doll* (Lalka, 1968), his subsequent works have disappeared from sight Soviet critics. The reason for this is well noted by D. Viren: "Surreal imagery grew from film to film in the works of Wojciech Jerzy Has" (Viren, 2015, p. 16), which was absolutely unacceptable to the Soviet censorship of the 1970s - the first half of 1980s. Only in post-Soviet times, after W. Has (1925-2000) death, T. Eliseeva published the first in the Russian film criticism review about Has' surrealist masterpiece - *Sanatorium under the Hourglass* (*Sanatorium pod Klepsydrą*, 1973): "It's a beautiful, elegant and picturesque ribbon, the protagonist of which is nostalgia for the departing time, outgoing and a vanished culture of the eastern regions of Poland, where it was already a strong Jewish element, but as a presentiment of impending terror era concentration camp crematoria..." (Eliseeva 2009, p. 123).

Jerzy Kawalerowicz (initially) the darling of the Soviet Box Office

In the Soviet films box office of the 1960s, Jerzy Kawalerowicz (1922-2007) occupied a special place: almost all of his work, set them up to 1966, were successfully shown in the USSR. Colored historical drama *Pharaoh* (*Faraon*, 1965) had the particular success with Soviet audiences.

However, not all Soviet critics treated with reverence to the films E. Kawalerowicz. So J. Markulan claimed that "*Train* (*Pociąg*, 1959) just a wonderful sketch. Poverty cannot be overcome by anything dramatic, and all the director's Herculean efforts broke on the script of emptiness, his sketchy and sometimes banal" (Markulan 1967, p. 195).

A. Sokolskaya wrote about *Mother Joanna of the Angels* (*Matka Joanna od Aniołów*, 1961) that this "film is without a doubt, is opposed to religious world. But it is not just about religion. It is all about the lack of freedom, of prohibitions, gravitating over man. About thirst of action, which is stronger than fear, on the nature of activity. One of the Polish critics called it a product of the modern Faust. About Faust, who is the devil and God in him." (Sokolskaya, 1965, p. 65).

J. Markulan supported Sokolskaya's opinion: "Ideological and aesthetic searching of Kawalerowicz led to the creation of monumental philosophical *Mother Joanna of the Angels*. In this complex film Kawalerowicz remained faithful to its basic principles: here there is "hunger feeling" that put their characters into a frenzy and rebellion, and here the

richness and complexity of psychology expressed in terms of the actor, through the plastic, the music: the harmony of all the language components" (Markulan, 1967, p. 196).

Mother Joanna of the Angels is perhaps the case that the views of the Soviet and post-Soviet critics almost coincided. So, T. Eliseeva argues that there is "love and faith have faced in conflict. Kawalerowicz primarily concerned with the eternal problem of human freedom borders, the problem of human nature to the relationship undertaken voluntarily or imposed from outside prohibitions. There are the universal problems. Duration also conditionally ... that can happen anytime, anywhere. ... Picture is perfect, mature reflection on the conflict of faith and love, the nature of man, look at the madness and demonic as an attempt to revolt against the hypocrisy of the world"(Eliseeva, 2009, p. 71).

Since 1966, only one new film by Jerzy Kawalerowicz was in the Soviet screens. The reason for this can probably be found in the fact that "Kawalerowicz has a feature: each of his new film like cross out everything that has been achieved in the previous year. He is always on the lookout, because his every film can be called experimental"(Sobolev, 1967, p. 15).

And if his experiments of the 1950s - the first half of 1960s were allowed to for the Soviet censors, the postmodernist *Game (Gra, 1968)* and *Maddalena* (Italy-Yugoslavia, 1970) already does not fit into the aesthetics socialistic realism. Soviet censorship considered *The Death of the President (Śmierć prezydenta, 1977)* and *Austeria* (1982) too politicized.

Soviet censors did not forbid for Soviet film critics write something about E. Kawalerowicz, but his films after 1966was almost unknown in the USSR...

Tadeusz Konwicki: outside the Soviet screens

None of the six movies of famous Polish writer, screenwriter and film director T. Konwicki (1926-2015) did not in the Soviet Screens. However, oddly enough, soviet film critics quite lively and in a positive context, were discussed about the first three of his films (see, for example: Markulan 1967, pp. 230-234).

The directorial debut of T. Konwicki - *The Last Day of Summer (Ostatni dzien lata, 1957)* had the special interest for Soviet film criticism. I. Rubanova wrote that "melancholy atmosphere of isolation, almost cosmic emptiness recreated in the film with great skill. The authors ascertain the alienation of characters, but they do not seek to explain it. And for this explanation they refer to the past" (Rubanova 1966, p. 137). I agree: this is "one of the most poetic and lyrical works of Polish cinema, but it is perhaps also the saddest movie, in which the topic of loneliness sounded hopeless, hysterically" (Markulan 1967, p. 223).

V. Kolodyazhnaya clarified the cause of the Soviet film critics' interest to films of T. Konwicki 1950s – 1960s: "Konwicki pioneered new content and new means of movie expression, he reflect the complex intimate, lyrical world of man, the spiritual life of those areas that were previously considered belonging to only one literature." (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, p. 63).

V. Kolodyazhnaya's article was published in 1974 when T. Konwicki has directed his chief, shrill confessional film *How far from here, how close* (Jak daleko stąd, jak blisko, 1971). However, V. Kolodyazhnaya preferred not even to mention the film. Similarly done and L. Muratov (Muratov, 1976), the author of the work of Gustaw Holoubek, did not mention *How far from here, how close* too, though this actor played a key role in this film. The reason for this, as is the case with E. Kawalerowicz's films *Game* and *Maddalena*, was also the aesthetic as "central pattern of the director." *How far from here, how close* "are fully consistent with the canons of surrealism: her action is based on the intersection of the past and present, dreams and memories, dreams and waking" (Viren, 2015, p. 17).

As a result, T. Konwicki's films of 1970s – 1980s was a phantom, not only for the Soviet public, but also for Soviet film criticism...

Jerzy Skolimowski: from criticism to taboo

No work of film director Jerzy Skolimowski was not in the Soviet screens. However, before his emigration to the West, which occurred in the late 1960s, Soviet critics eagerly wrote about his movies.

J. Markulan acknowledged that "Skolimowski is certainly a talented director. *Rysopis* is the film with amazing sincerity and accuracy of direction. ... Although *Walkover* appeared raid affectation, a sort of coquetry. ... A lot of vulnerabilities exist in Skolimowski's objectivism, in his view of character, as it were from the outside and, above all, the rejection of any kind of conclusions" (Markulan 1967, p. 235). R. Sobolev was more positive: "The sophisticated viewer may notice that ... Skolimowski style - it's something stunning, unusual. Of course, his style has been prepared with all those quests of the past decade, what happens in the movie. Of course, Skolimowski has absorbed the experience of Polish filmmakers, and the French "new wave", opening Godard and Antonioni, instructive failures "verite" and more (Sobolev, 1967, p. 98).

E. Skolimowski's departure to the West, of course, radically changed the vector of critical statements of the Soviet critics. V. Kolodyazhnaya wrote that Skolimowski "lack of faith in spiritual values, including in the spiritual values of a socialist society", she asserted that "Skolimowski's characters live by Western existentialist schemes, they are deeply alien to the contemporary Polish life. Skolimowski ... trying to get in the position

"outside observer", but there is no doubt that the spiritual poverty of characters, the lack of contacts between them and the tragic absurdity of life seem to him essential features of the universe" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, p. 77).

This film expert position in strict Soviet censorship is not surprising. More surprising that this position finds support among some Russian film critics of the XXI century. For example, M. Kirilov and now believes that "the films representing in Poland the style of "new wave", filmed just two people: Roman Polanski and Jerzy Skolimowski. Skolimowski's movies were absolutely cosmopolitan... His characters are taken out of the environment, they live by their own laws, perpendicular to society. ... Skolimowski left "socialist paradise", which he deeply despised, but as a director simply degraded, taking worthless and devoid of fancy crafts" (Kirillov, 2011).

Roman Polanski: only one film

Debuting a series of short films, Roman Polanski has put in socialist Poland, only one full-length film - *Knife in the Water* (*Nóż w wodzie*, 1962). As "the first surrealist short film *Two people with the cabinet* (*Dwaj ludzie z szafa*, 1958), his feature debut, *Knife in the Water* is psychodrama with sadomasochistic break, this film differed sharply from the Polish film production in those years and were perceived in Europe as a socio-romantic Slavic exoticism"(Plakhov, 1999, p. 31). This allowed R. Polanski after his emigration very fast (since 1963) to adapt the West ...

Hence, in general, it is clear why R. Sobolev negatively assessed the nominated for "Oscar" *Knife in the Water*: "This is not an easy film: something is undoubtedly truthful and analytic, and somewhat one-sided and narrow in thought. Some people said this is a snobbish film. Maybe. However, first of all this film is made with cold hands, a film director can be very talented, but apparently indifferent to people's joys and sorrows. I have two indisputable conclusions after viewing *Knife in the Water*: a) the author despises people and b) people are contemptible"(Sobolev, 1967, pp. 88-89).

J. Markulan wrote about *Knife in the Water* in a similar vein: "All this can be understood in two ways. Whether the filmmakers are protesting against "small stabilization", ridiculed both sides of the middle class - a frank and disguised, or seriously consider the inevitability and universality of philistine dishonesty. The film looks like an elegant paradox, designed for amusement"(Markulan, 1967, p. 244). V. Kolodyazhnaya echoed: "The main features of all the characters are selfishness, petty vanity, lack of spirituality... People were depicted insignificant in its nature and existence in general appeared as meaningless" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, pp. 76-77).

The verdict of the official Soviet cinema criticism was strict and merciless: "there was nothing surprising in the fact that Roman Polanski and Jerzy Skolimowski fled in the capitalist world. Here they began staging entertaining movies preserving the old philosophical essence. Both directors depict crime perverse biological nature of man and the tragic absurdity of the universe" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, p. 78).

But here it is worth noting that in the XXI century Russian film critic M. Kirillov, in fact, remained faithful to the traditions of Soviet film criticism about the *Knife in the Water*: "Roman Polanski, as it turned out, was basically a stranger to whatever ideology. He was a skilled and talented impersonator, instantly adapts for the style that was in vogue in this particular moment. ... *Knife in the Water* has something common with Chabrol experiments, but the Polish director lacked the Frenchman's anger and sarcasm, he had only imitated the psychological thriller" (Kirillov, 2011).

But I like T. Eliseeva's view about *Knife in the Water*: Roman Polanski "is not just opposed secured layman and a representative of the younger generation, brought up in accordance with certain moral and social principles. He sarcastically proved that these principles are worth nothing, generating only envy and greed. Although the director has created a universal situation that exists outside of time, are not connected with any country or with the era, human allusions were read and learn easy" (Eliseeva, 2009, p. 82).

Krzysztof Zanussi and film of moral anxiety

Krzysztof Zanussi is one of the few bright examples of a positive assessment of Polish cinema from both Soviet and post-Soviet times' film critics. V. Kolodyazhnaya consistently praised his works at the beginning of his career (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, pp. 79-83), noting that "Zanussi showed himself a moralist in the noblest sense of the word: it stands for good, for a deep comprehension of the meaning of life, for the ideals" (Kolodyazhnaya, 1974, p. 80).

M. Chernenko wrote about this outstanding master in a friendly manner, noting, for example, that in the *Hypothesis (Hipoteza, 1972)*, "we can see the open ironic list of possible variants of human destiny, taken at the crossroads of Europe, the fate of the beginning of this century" (Chernenko, 1978). M. Chernenko equally warm wrote about the *Khaki (Barwy ochronne, 1976)*, one of the central dramas of Polish moral anxiety cinema: "Rather austere, purely rationalistic moral incidents, ... instead of "real European" cinema ... we can see a viper satirical film with well-cut plot, unexpected sense of humor, an elegant dialogue. ... debate about the

immorality of the authorities, the hypocrisy and the arrogance of life owners, a general demoralization of society..." (Chernenko, 1990).

In fact, Krzysztof Zanussi, the physicist and philosopher, is a "rational Christian. His every utterance obviously religious and yet calibrated strict Western rationalism. Rationalist Zanussi often proving to be an idealist. ... His films have always talked about a special world. More precisely, the two worlds: the ordinary life with her sometimes unusual problems, and the questions of life and death, truth and freedom"(Rahaeva, 2007).

I totally agree with T. Eliseeva: "Zanussi thoroughly and dispassionately translates into the language of the cinema the most fundamental and complex problems of human existence, are essential for every human being: birth, life, death, intellect, conscience, soul, faith. For this director the modern world is the territory of moral conflicts and ethical dilemmas."(Eliseeva, 2002, p. 67).

In 1982, I wrote a rather voluminous article entitled *Polish cinema 1970s: "third generation" and the debut of the youth* (Fedorov, 1982) and tried to offer this text in the main Soviet cinema journals. I believe that censorship alarmed even the first line of my article begins: "In the 1960s Polish cinema has lost some of its leading artists of Polish Film School, and young film directors. Director Andrzej Munk became the victim of a car accident in 1961. Zbigniew Cybulski, Polish actor № 1, died under the wheels of the train in 1967.

Roman Polanski, "the child prodigy of the Polish screen", left to the West in 1963. Another young film director and actor Jerzy Skolimowski followed him later, in 1968. One of the best Polish cameramen Jerzy Lipman and film director Aleksander Ford, talented animators Jan Lenica and Walerian Borowczyk also moved to the West...

Films of well known directors such as Wojciech Has, Jerzy Kawalerowicz, Tadeusz Konwicki very rarely appeared on the Polish screens 1970s... It was much less discussions around the new films of Ewa & Czesław Petelski, Stanisław Lenartowicz, Stanisław Różewicz, Jan Rybkowski, and other film directors of the older generation. Only Andrzej Wajda was very active in 1970s...

So, new Polish film directors came in 1970s, many of them were born after the war, the "third Polish cinema" started" (Fedorov, 1982).

Thus, the article was, as some people say, "out of time", and has been successfully rejected...

Krzysztof Kieslowski: metamorphosis

Soviet film criticism first became interested in the work of Krzysztof Kieslowski (1941-1996) after his satirical film *Amateur* (*Amator*, 1979)

received one of the main prizes of the Moscow Film Festival. Although a little earlier I. Rubanova, trying to talk about his "moral anxiety" films in an acceptable for Soviet censorship form. She wrote that Kieslowski "endowed with an acute artistic vision, flexible mind of modern intellectual, allow little things to evaluate as part of a greater whole and does not attract attention" (Rubanova, 1978, p. 257).

As later noted A. Plakhov, "Krzysztof Kieslowski's international fame began with the Grand Prix film for *Amateur* at the Moscow Festival 1979. The prize was awarded because of the stupidity of Brezhnev's ideological censorship... It was a sharp reflection of the former documentarian for the dual role of cameras in general and in the socialist world of double standards, in particular" (Plakhov, 1999, p. 154).

The explanation of this softness of Soviet censorship can be found in E. Bauman's treatment entitled *The Story of a Hobby*. She wrote about the main character from the *Amateur*: "blows of fate rained on our simple-minded hero. And all because he, perhaps even unconsciously, felt his new occupation as a vocation in which he chose to be loyal only to his inner voice" (Bauman, 1981, p. 184).

After the *Amateur* Moscow triumph it was the time of "Solidarity", and the names of the supporters of this protest movement was in vogue in the USSR only in the "perestroika" era when "Kieslowski's triumph was the *Decalogue* (1988-1989)" (Plakhov, 1999, p. 154).

M. Chernenko wrote about *Decalogue*: "it is explosive aesthetic and ethical cocktail explains another director's properties so that it is unique in world cinema: thinking in cycles, a tendency to unusual, non-canonical epic mindset, the desire to expand their artistic world beyond the classical subjects and situations" (Chernenko, 1996). For example, in *Short Film About Killing* (*Krótki film o zabijaniu*, 1987) K. Kieslowski "opens not revenge, not punishment, but an empty ritual and conceited, stubborn indisputable dogma consecrated by centuries, but not sacred, because for the director, a man of Catholic morality, Catholic ethics murder in the name of the law are as unnatural as murder is against the law, against man and humanity" (Chernenko, 1990).

At one time (during of the Moscow Film Festival) I was able to not only see, but also to talk with K. Kieslowski. And I totally agree with A. Plakhov: "Kieslowski does not fit into the classification of André Bazin, who divides artists to those who prefer reality, and those who believe in the image. He has no contradiction between physics and metaphysics. Kieslowski as artist immersed in the mystery of life, its horrors and its wonders. ... Kieslowski was one of the last authors in a movie, who treated him not as an attraction or amusement, but as a moral message. He has overcome the cultural barrier between East and West, between Europe and

America, between classic and contemporary cinema. He made people end of the XX century listen to yourself"(Plakhov, 1999, pp. 155, 151).

Juliusz Machulski: the darling of the Soviet Screen

If Juliusz Machulski filmed their naughty comedy in 1970s, they will likely never would have got to the Soviet screens. But ... J. Machulski's erotic fiction comedy *Sexmission* (*Seksmisja*, 1983), even in a censored version and with a much more innocent title *New Amazons* triumph came in the Soviet Screens in the perestroika times. Criminal retro comedies *Va Banque* (*Vabank*, 1981) and *Va Banque – 2* (*Vabank-2*, 1984) were the champions of the Soviet box office 1980s.

M. Chernenko aptly wrote that J. Machulski is not cinematic messiah, and social analytic, "in other words, he perfectly knows exactly his place in the movie, knows that this is the place is his own"(Chernenko, 1990).

Sexmission used "a wandering story about the kingdom of women, which are transferred from the present day, laced with so many urgent political allusions and associations" (Chernenko, 1990). After the huge success of *Vabank* J. Machulski made *Vabank-2*, with "casual elegance and professionalism directing, ... the ability to build a magical adventure spectacle"(Chernenko, 1990).

Of course, the *Vabank* can be called "trifle" (Gorelov, 2011), however, this definition is probably gets most of the films of light genres. But the *Kingsajz* (1988) was the fantastic comedy with the clearly satirical components. This film was a parody of "a very familiar world in which we see things as they are: card system and the law on the prohibition of drinking alcohol in the workplace, as well as time off; session of Parliament, investigating traces of sedition in the fairy tales of the Brothers Grimm; ideological struggle against spreading liberalism, claiming that there is... And if we would think that all this is too pessimistic, we will see the local rebels under the banner of "Kingsize for everyone" (Chernenko, 1990).

Unfortunately, *Kingsajz* became the last J. Machulski's movie has attracted interest from Russian film critics. Well, maybe *Squadron* (*Szwadron*, 1992) attracted some attention because it was "an attempt to look at the uprising of 1863 through the eyes of a Russian officer, who falls in love with a beautiful Polish patriot, but being the enemy, cannot count on reciprocity. ... an echo of the old Polish stereotype: Russian as passive slaves of the king; or is violent disruptors comprising faceless, hostile Poles mass or individual conscientious people who, however, did nothing to change the situation"(Rahaeva, 2012, p. 231).

About the "white spots" of Polish cinema

Many Polish films of the socialist period were almost out the analysis of the Soviet criticism due to censorship and political reasons. That is why it is so important that in our time the Russian film studies enters into scientific names of Polish filmmakers such as Grzegorz Krulikevich. For example, D. Viren writes about key episodes (the murder of an elderly couple, in which the killers rented an apartment) of the his most famous movie *Bang Bang* (Na wylot, 1972): "Indeed, on the one hand, we are dealing with a documentary, or rather, mockumentary style, on the other hand, this episode is obvious pastiche of German expressionists' movies, which is mainly manifested in sharp contrast illumination, as well as some shots of the composition" (Viren, 2013, p.19). And then - the shocking the director position to the main characters (which, apparently, was the reason that *Bang Bang* did not overcome the Soviet censorship): "the director tries to present this case objectively, but at the same time it's hard not to feel: his sympathies clearly on the side of the murderers (otherwise he probably would not even take on this topic)" (Viren, 2013, pp. 21).

Extremely interesting D. Viren reflections about the deconstruction of socialistic realist canon in the Polish cinema 1970s -1980s, when "there was a parody direction ridiculed the characteristics of life under socialism" (Viren, 2013, p. 98): *Cruise* (*Rejs*, 1970) and *Sorry, there is someone to beat?* (*Przepraszam, czy tu biją?*, 1976) by Marek Piwowski. For example, thinking of a satirical, pseudo-detective nature of the film *Sorry, there is someone to beat?* D. Viren, in my opinion, leads a very vivid example of how the "game genre is gradually giving way to a place of social and psychological problems. At the fore as a result of out the most "moral anxiety", for example, in the episode, when one of the main characters - a policeman - utters the phrase: "Do not you understand there is no common ethics for all." The problem is very actual today, is not it?" (Viren, 2013, p. 98).

T. Eliseeva gives finally granted drama *Interrogation* (*Przesluchanie*, 1982) by Ryszard Bugajski, noting that he "broke into his belt conventional taboos: he created documented reliable, sinister and naturalistic picture of the functioning of the security forces unit and moral methods of physical and psychological destruction of people in the investigation time in Polish prisons in the late 1940s - early 1950s" (Eliseeva, 2009, p. 37).

D. Gorelov very convincingly writes about the influence of the Polish movies (even if they were a "white spot" for the ordinary Soviet spectators). For example, *Good-bye, see you tomorrow* (*Do widzenia, do jutra...*, 1960) was not in the Soviet screen, but this film show up for sure at Moscow Cinema Institute: the quotes from this movie can be seen in Soviet films *My*

Younger Brother (1962), *I Walking the Moscow Streets* (1963), *Not a Good Day* (1966) (Gorelov, 2011).

Russian-Polish relations in the Polish screen and in the mirror of the Russian film criticism

It is clear that a strict code of censorship did not allow the Soviet film critics go into a discussion of what the image of Russia and Russian created the Polish screen. Research on this topic appeared only in post-Soviet times...

Attentive researcher O. Rahaeva convincingly wrote that the Polish cinema of the 1960s as a whole had a trend of creating a positive image of Soviet / Russian, especially in movies about the war: "The most representative of the opening theme of the military fraternity was the film *Where is General?* (*Gdzie jest general?*, 1964, directed by Tadeusz Chmielewski) and serial *Four tankers and dog* (*Cztery pancerni i pies*, 1966, directed by Konrad Nalecki). The film *Where is General?* presents (for the first time in military contexts) the topic of the Polish-Russian love" (Rahaeva 2012, p. 228).

Of course, the Polish cinema trends to Russia and Russian has changed after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the liberation of Poland from the Kremlin's attitude. For example, O. Rahaeva believes that the film *Ladies and the widows* (*Panny i wdowy*, 1991) by Janusz Zaorski follows that lines: "Russian dirty, drunken, brutal and filled with one sole desire - to have polkas. ... Once again, in 1920, we see abuse of Mother-Polka" (Rahaeva, 2012, p. 230).

Post-Soviet political situation collapsed and the main socialist era ban relating to screen reflection about the Soviet-Polish war of 1920. O. Rahaeva notes that the stories about how "hordes of Bolsheviks threatened to a free Poland, (*The Gate of Europe / Wrota Europy*, 1999, directed by Jerzy Wójcik, *Horror in Wesolych Bagniskach / Horror w Wesolych Bagniskach*, 1996, directed by Andrzej Baranski) ... the principle of enemies images is not moved away from the inter-war canons: they are wild, violent, and even if individualized (officer in the *The Gate of Europe*), are all signs of hostile masses" (Rahaeva, 2012, p. 231). In fairness, I note that in the key Polish film on this subject - *Battle of Warsaw, 1920* (*Bitwa warszawska*, 2011) by Jerzy Hoffman - this scheme is not so straightforward.

Of course, new interpretations of the Polish-Russian relations in modern Polish cinema could not avoid the tragic events of 1939 and the next ten to fifteen years in the films *Scurvy* (*Cynga*, 1991, directed by Leszek Vosevich), *Ladies and the widows* (*Panny i wdowy*, by Janusz Zaorski, 1991), *The most important* (*Wszystko co najważniejsze*, 1992, Robert Glinski), *Colonel Kwiatkowski* (*Pułkownik Kwiatkowski*, 1995, directed by

Kazimierz Kutz). O. Rahaeva writes that "Soviet soldiers on the Polish screen were all the same as in the 1920s and 1930s (perhaps slightly less caricatured), but the officers are in their brutality more sophisticated (*Ladies and the widows, Scurvy*)" (Rahaeva, 2012, p. 231).

Russian military subject was also presented in the Polish-Czech *Operation Danube (Operacja Dunaj, 2009)*, "where Soviet soldiers again look like the Bolsheviks in film from 1920s. They are senseless cruel, wild and drunk. Although the Poles are not too idealized... At the same time it turns out that Poles and Czechs can perfectly agree, if they have a common enemy - Russian" (Rahaeva, 2012, p. 235).

O. Rahaeva clearly highlights the stereotypical Russian characters in Polish cinema of the 1990s - early 2000s: "the natives of Russia are a wild people from the wild country sinking in poverty; Russian are trying by hook or by crook to get to Poland - a transit point on the way to the West - and here to solve their (mostly dirty) business. The characters in the movie *Debt (Dług, 1999, directed by Krzysztof Krauze.)* are smugglers, criminals, murderers, gangsters and mafia. ... The prostitutes, pimps... In addition, the fate of Russian women in these films usually depend almost entirely on the Poles (a kind of symbolic revenge for historical grievances)" (Rahaeva 2012, p. 232). In fact, the images of Russian women are shown in Polish cinema 1990s - 2000s much softer and warmer than images of men: *Sauna (1992)*, *VIP (1991)*, *Daughters of happiness (Córy szczęścia, Poland, Hungary, Germany, 1999)*, *Love stories (Historie miłosne, 1997)*, *Little Moscow (Mała Moskwa, 2008)*...

Analyzing the films of the past 15 years, O. Rahaeva (Rahaeva 2012, p. 233-234) notices that Polish cinema has a relatively new trend in Russian image - as the brave and slightly mysterious characters: in the films *On the edge of the world (Na koniec świata, 1999)*, *Master (Mistrz, 2005)*, *Persona non grata (2005)* and others.

Polish cinema: predictions for the future

Projections, as is well known, a thankless thing: they very often do not come true. For example, V. Kolodyazhnaya wrote in 1974, that "all the best in content and form was further developed in the Polish cinema of 1960s and early 1970s. ... A new fruitful stage began when the Polish cinema in general, freed from ideological vacillation, by lack of faith in man, from the existential loneliness and omnipotence of evil" (Kolodyazhnaya 1974, p. 47). The "ideological vacillation" of Polish filmmakers not only continued, but also resulted in the late 1970s to a peak of "cinema of moral anxiety". Of course, this was a "fruitful stage" in the development of Polish film art, but I'm afraid, is not the same as V. Kolodyazhnaya had seen, standing on a clear socialistic position...

One of today's most well-known Russian film critics of the liberal wing – A. Plakhov did not become a better predictor of the trends in the Polish cinema in 1988. He wrote (just three years before the collapse of the USSR) about the generation of Polish direction, to declare itself in the period of "Solidarity": "Most of them went into the cinema in the second half of the 1970s, shortly before the Polish society has undergone an economic and political crisis. ... They have ... tones of skepticism and pessimism. At the same time, now it is possible to assert with confidence, they are for the most part did the ideological alliance with the extremist forces who wanted to orient the country to the West. The so-called films "under the sign of moral anxiety", which appeared in abundance on the Polish screens of 1970s - 80s were not aimed at the denial of socialism as such, and in its criticism really manifested distortions and deficiencies" (Plakhov, 1988, pp. 169-170).

But the connoisseur of Polish cinema M. Chernenko wrote in 1989 more accurate text: "Of course, forecasts are always uncertain, especially far from the stability of the political and economic situation in Poland, but in the normal evolutionary course of events, it can be easily assumed in future of cinema a sharp turn to the events of recent history, in the pages of military and post-war life of the people who were under the censorship ban. First of all, we can expect a cinematic biography of "Solidarity" and the prehistory of this movement: from the workers' protests in 1976 and further, deep into the decades - to the events on the Coast in 1970, to the knowledge of the tragedy in 1956, to civil war of 1944-1948 years and massive repression... In any case, whatever the particular subject is likely to Polish cinema in the coming years will again become a historic cinema, just as was the historical cinema "Polish Film School" (Chernenko, 1989).

Russian film criticism and the Polish cinema: what next?

I counted about 60 works related to Polish cinema, published in the USSR from 1959 to 1991 (Antonov, 1972; Bauman, 1981; Bereznitsky, 1971; Chernenko, 1964; 1965; 1967; 1968 1970; 1971; 1972 1974; 1975; 1976 1977; 1978; 1979; 1980; 1984; 1985; 1987; 1989; 1990; Chizhikov, 1966; Frolova, 1976; Kolodyazhnaya, 1974; Lavrentiev, 1989; Markulan, 1967; 1968; Mikhalkovich, 1977; Molchanov, 1989; Muratov, 1973; 1976; 1978; Plakhov, 1988; Rubanova, 1965; 1966; 1972 1977; 1978; 1989; Rysakova, 1960; Sobolev, 1965; 1966; 1967; 1970; 1979; Sukhin, 1975; Yurenev, 1959, and others).

In the post-Soviet period (1992 to 2016) I found about 100 publications Russian film critics a Polish movie (Chernenko, 1992; 1996; 2000; 2001; 20012; 2005; Elisseva, 1996; 2002; 2007; 2009; Filimonov, 2008; Gorelov, 2011; Kirillov, 2011; Kudryavtsev, 1995; 2003; 2014;

Palamarchuk, Zubritskaya, 2007; Plakhov, 1999; Rahaeva, 2009; 2012; Rubanova, 2000; 2013; 2015; Viren, 2013; 2015; Zadorozhna, 2006, and others). It seems to be a lot, but ... more than half of them are small encyclopedic articles belonging to the pen of S. Kudryavtsev and T. Eliseeva. More or less mainstream press articles about Polish cinema came in the last quarter century a very little...

Of course, I have been taken into account (in the Soviet and post-Soviet period), mainly publication of film critics from Moscow. But if the socialist era Soviet regional newspapers published many film reviews on the current screen repertoire (including Polish films)... So, the list of modern Russian film critics, specifically writing about Polish movie is very short: I. Rubanova, S. Kudryavtsev, T. Eliseeva, D. Viren, O. Rahaeva... Well, let's hope that is not a number, but the ability to...

References

- Antonov, O. (1972). Magdalena Zavadzka. *Actors of foreign cinema*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Art, pp. 92-101.
- Bauman, E. (1981). The Story of a hobby. *Screen 1978-1979*. Moscow: Art, pp. 184-185.
- Bereznitsky, J. (1971). Tadeusz Łomnicki. *Actors of foreign cinema*. Vol. 6. Moscow: Art, pp. 78-93.
- Chernenko, M. (1964). Andrzej Wajda. *Soviet Screen*, № 12. <http://chernenko.org/009.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1965). Andrzej Wajda. Moscow: Art.
- Chernenko, M. (1965). Zbigniew Cybulski. *Soviet Screen*, № 15. <http://chernenko.org/012.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1967). Full speed ahead. *Cinema Art*, № 12. <http://chernenko.org/035.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1967). Tenant. *Cinema Art*, № 12.
- Chernenko, M. (1968). Dancing at Hitler's headquarters. *Cinema Art*, № 10. <http://chernenko.org/043.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1970). Daniel Olbrychski. *Cinema Art*, № 3. <http://chernenko.org/059.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1971). Familiar and unfamiliar Wajda. *Cinema Art*, № 8. <http://chernenko.org/074.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1972). Bereznyak. *On the world screens*, Vol. 4. Moscow. <http://chernenko.org/088.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1974). Ten of the 430. *Soviet Screen*, № 14. <http://chernenko.org/116.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1975). The saga of "Lodzermensh". *Cinema Art*, № 6. <http://chernenko.org/126.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1976). Maya Komorowska-Tyszkiewicz: Test of loneliness. *Screen 1974-1975*. Moscow: Art, pp. 209-213.
- Chernenko, M. (1977). The Promised Land. *On the world screens*, Vol. № 7. <http://chernenko.org/r015.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). Gold Train, № 3, <http://chernenko.org/338.shtml>

- Chernenko, M. (1978). Concert on one string, or a movie Laboratory Zanussi and Żebrowski. Krzysztof Zanussi & Edward Żebrowski. *Television Films*. Moscow. <http://chernenko.org/168.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1978). The man from the ashes. *Soviet Screen*, № 5. <http://chernenko.org/171.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1979). The fatal accident, or Three films by Andrzej Kostenko. *Cinema*, № 10. <http://chernenko.org/184.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1980). The uniqueness of the national legends, or adventure in Polish and Yugoslav styles. *Adventure movie: ways and searches*. Moscow: Film Art Institute. <http://chernenko.org/186.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1984). Styling squared. *Cinema Art*, № 6. <http://chernenko.org/239.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1985). Woman in a Hat. *Cinema Art*, № 12. <http://chernenko.org/263.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1987). Who will throw a stone at him? *Cinema Art*, № 6. <http://chernenko.org/291.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1989). Poland. *Cinema panorama of socialist countries*. Moscow: Film Art Institute. <http://chernenko.org/316.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). Feliks Falk. *Objective*, № 4. <http://chernenko.org/341.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). Juliusz Machulski. *Objective*, № 1. <http://chernenko.org/334-4.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). Khaki. *Objective*, № 3. <http://chernenko.org/335.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). Kingsize. *Objective*, № 1. <http://chernenko.org/334-3.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). The Maids of Wilko. *Objective*, № 3. <http://chernenko.org/340.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). Screen Tests. *Objective*, № 1. <http://chernenko.org/334-2.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). Short Film About Killing. *Objective*, № 3. <http://chernenko.org/337.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). Stanisław Bareja. *Objective*, № 3. <http://chernenko.org/339-1.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). What is truth? *Cinema*. 1980. № 1. <http://chernenko.org/188.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). Wojciech Wójcik. *Objective*, № 1. <http://chernenko.org/334.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1990). Wunderkind. *Objective*, № 3. <http://chernenko.org/336.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1992). Ashes and Diamonds. *TV Revue*, № 13. <http://chernenko.org/380.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (1996). Sad images. *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*. 29.03.1996. <http://chernenko.org/424.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (2000). Our common Hoffman, Story or top stories. *Cinema Art*, № 4. <http://chernenko.org/469.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (2001). Wieszc - an untranslatable word. *Screen and Stage*, № 12. <http://chernenko.org/484.shtml>
- Chernenko, M. (2002). Agnieszka Holland. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema*. Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 176.
- Chernenko, M. (2005). Kazimierz Kutz. *Film Studies Notes*, № 72, pp. 313-350; № 74, pp. 206-233.
- Chizhikov, M. (1966). Tadeusz Łomnicki. *Soviet Screen*, pp. 18-19.

- Eliseeva, T. (1996). *Directors of Polish cinema. Bibliographical reference.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, 90 p.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Aleksander Ford. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 164.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Andrzej Munk. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 124.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Andrzej Wajda. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 32.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Feliks Falk. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 159.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Janusz Majewski. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, pp. 109-110.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Jerzy Hoffman. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 53.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Jerzy Kawalerowicz. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 72.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Kazimierz Kutz. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 97.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Krzysztof Zanussi. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, pp. 66-67.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Wanda Jakubowska. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 198.
- Eliseeva, T. (2002). Wojciech Has. *Encyclopedia of Film Directors. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, pp. 170-171.
- Eliseeva, T. (2007). *Directors of Polish cinema. Bibliographical reference.* Moscow: Mainland, 128 p.
- Eliseeva, T. (2009). Ashes and Diamonds. *Encyclopedia. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, pp. 99-100.
- Eliseeva, T. (2009). Illumination. *Encyclopedia. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, pp. 54-55.
- Eliseeva, T. (2009). Interrogation. *Encyclopedia. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, pp. 37-38.
- Eliseeva, T. (2009). Knife in the Water. *Encyclopedia. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 82.
- Eliseeva, T. (2009). Man of Marble. *Encyclopedia. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, pp. 153-154.
- Eliseeva, T. (2009). Mother Joanna of the Angels. *Encyclopedia. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, p. 71.
- Eliseeva, T. (2009). Sanatorium under the hourglass. *Encyclopedia. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, pp. 122-123.
- Eliseeva, T. (2009). The heroism. *Encyclopedia. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, pp. 24-25.
- Eliseeva, T. (2009). Wedding. *Encyclopedia. European Cinema.* Moscow: Film Art Institute, pp. 123-124.
- Fedorov, A. (1982). Polish cinema 1970s: "third generation" and the debut of the youth. <http://kino-teatr.ru/kino/art/kino/4083/>
- Filimonov, V. (2008). "That is not a thing – to kill the crook...". As we watched Polish movie. *Historian and artist*, № 1/2, pp. 289-308.
- Frolov, E. (1976). Pola Raksa. *Actors of foreign cinema*, Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp. 120-137.

- Gorelov, D. (2011). Sink or swim. In memory of Polish cinema. *Theatre*. № 5, pp. 136-140. <http://oteatre.info/libo-pan-libo-propal/#more-560>
- Kirillov, M. (2011). *Forgotten native Polish cinema*. <http://kinogramma.ru/polish-cinema/>
- Kolodyazhnaya, V. (1974). *Cinema of the Polish People's Republic (1945-1970)*. Moscow: Institute of Cinematography, 89 p.
- Kudryavtsev, S. (1995). Krzysztof Kieslowski. The double life between the *Decalogue* and the "Tricolor". *Video Ace Premiere*. 1995. № 28.
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2003). He does not like movies, and cinema. Andrzej Wajda - the artist, returns conscience. *The first of September*. № 30. <http://ps.1september.ru/article.php?ID=200303027>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2014). *Illumination*. <http://kinanet.livejournal.com/674748.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2014). *Knife in the Water*. <https://www.stihi.ru/2014/05/16/412>
- Lavrentiev, S. (1989). Andrzej Wajda. After forgetting. *Soviet Screen*, № 3.
- Markulan, J. (1967). *Cinema of Poland*. Leningrad-Moscow: Art, 292 p.
- Markulan, J. (1968). Aleksandra Śląska. *Actors of foreign cinema*, Vol. 4. Moscow: Art, pp. 57-69.
- Mikhalkovich, V. (1977). Stanisław Mikulski. *Actors of foreign cinema*, Vol. 11. Moscow: Art, pp. 150-167.
- Molchanov, V. (1989). *Movies of socialist Poland: creation, destiny*. Moscow.
- Muratov, L. (1973). Bogumił Kobiela. *Actors of foreign cinema*, Vol. 8. Moscow: Art, pp. 66-79.
- Muratov, L. (1976). Gustaw Holoubek. *Actors of foreign cinema*. Vol. 10. Moscow: Art, pp. 138-155.
- Muratov, L. (1978). Barbara Brylska. *Actors of foreign cinema*, Vol. 12. Moscow: Art, pp. 6-23.
- Palamarchuk, N., Zubritskaya, E. (2007). Polish cinema: history and modernity. *Studia polonica*. Kaliningrad, 2007, pp. 84-91.
- Plakhov, A. (1988). Plaine reflection and romantic note. *Screen 1988*. Moscow: Art, pp. 169-174.
- Plakhov, A. (1999). *Total 33. World Star Film Directors*. Vinnitsa: Aquilon, 464 p.
- Rahaeva, O. (2007). Krzysztof Zanussi: between "ideal" and "reality". *Films Studies Notes*, № 81, pp. 218-251.
- Rahaeva, O. (2012). Russian motifs in the Polish cinema. *Films Studies Notes*, № 100-101, pp. 222-237.
- Rubanova, I. (1965). Zbigniew Cybulski. *Actors of foreign cinema*, Vol. 1. Moscow: Art, pp. 135-149.
- Rubanova, I. (1966). *Polish cinema. Films about the war and occupation*. Moscow: Science, 212 p.
- Rubanova, I. (1972). Birch Poland. *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 151-153.
- Rubanova, I. (1972). What are we?. Notes about the films of young directors in Poland. *Soviet Screen*, № 7, pp. 14-15.
- Rubanova, I. (1977). Black and red of Andrzej Wajda. *Screen 1975-1976*. Moscow: Art, pp. 174-176.
- Rubanova, I. (1978). New names in Polish cinema. *Screen 1976-1977*. Moscow: Art, pp. 255-261.
- Rubanova, I. (1989). What about Poland? What about movie? *Cinema Art*, № 1, pp. 129-138; № 2, pp. 154-163.

- Rubanova, I. (2009). Gdynia 2009. Polish Film Festival. *Cinema Art*, № 10.
- Rubanova, I. (2013). The temptations and pitfalls. *Seance*, № 57-58.
http://seance.ru/blog/polish_film_rubanova/
- Rubanova, I. (2000). The man with the "Oscar". *Results*, № 13.
- Rubanova, I. (2015). Romance with Polish cinema (conversation with D. Viren). *Culture.pl*. <http://culture.pl/ru/article/irina-rubanova-roman-spolskim-kino>
- Rysakova, S. (1960). Art of the Polish film director Aleksander Ford. *Cinema and Time*, Vol. 1.
- Sobolev, R. (1965). Jerzy Kawalerowicz, movies, style, method. Moscow: Art.
- Sobolev, R. (1966). Beata Tyszkiewicz. *Actors of foreign cinema*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Art, pp. 155-173
- Sobolev, R. (1967). *Meeting with Polish cinema*. Moscow: Bureau of Soviet Cinema Propaganda, 104 p.
- Sobolev, R. (1970). Andrzej Łapicki. *Actors of foreign cinema*, Vol. 5. Moscow: Art, pp. 18-37.
- Sobolev, R. (1979). Ways to Polish cinema. *Our friends' cinematography*. Moscow: Knowledge, p. 78.
- Sokolskaya, A. (1965). Lucyna Winnicka. *Actors of foreign cinema*, Vol. 2. Moscow: Art, pp. 54-66.
- Sukhin, G. (1975). Barbara Krafftówna. *Actors of foreign cinema*, Vol. 9. Moscow: Art, pp. 90-103.
- Surkov, E. (1981). Andrzej Wajda: what next? *Cinema Art*, № 10.
- Viren, D. (2013). *Bang Bang* by Grzegorz Królikiewicz: experimental film language manifesto. *Herald of Chuvash State Pedagogical University*. № 4 (80). Part 3, pp. 17-22.
- Viren, D. (2015). *Experimental trends in the Polish cinema of the 1970s. Grzegorz Królikiewicz and others*. Ph.D. Dis. Moscow, 2015. 162 p.
- Yurenev, R. (1959). On the influence of revisionism in the Polish cinema. *Questions of aesthetics*, Vol. 2, pp. 83-110.
- Zadorozhnaya, E. (2006). Polish filmmakers, their heroes and antiheroes. *Culture Observatory*, № 5, pp. 46-48.

Russian film critics' discussion about *Cargo 200*

The media violence is the important problem. As an example for this kind of critical analysis I select Alexei Balabanov's film *Cargo 200* (2007), which will allow us to address the actual problem of media violence and its impact on the audience. The story of *Cargo 200*: Soviet province in 1984, the policeman maniac kidnaps the daughter of local Secretary of the Communist Party and arranges bloody show with corpses and violence ...

Materials for this research are: the media literacy education and film studies literature, periodical press, the media text with the violence content: Alexei Balabanov's film *Cargo 200* (2007). Methods: based on of Len Masterman's media education theory of critical thinking (Masterman, 2005) and following the methods of Umberto Eco (Eco, 2005, p. 209), I select the following significant items for the analysis of media texts: author's ideology; socio-cultural, market and political environment, the process of creating a media text, audience perceptions, structure and narrative techniques. I think this approach is quite corresponds to the method of media texts analysis (Bazalgette, 1995), building on media literacy education aspects such as *media agencies, media / media text categories, media technologies, media languages, media representations* and *media audiences*, because all these concepts are directly related to the ideological, socio-cultural and structural aspects.

It is known that some scholars have pointed out inconsistencies in the approaches to the problem of media violence in the circle of psychologists, politicians, teachers and parents, as complaining about the flow of aggressive character of the entertainment industry, they forget to ask why, in fact, there is a huge market of literature, films, cartoons, computer / video games, toys with the theme of violence? Politicians and others who discussed the topic of media violence have focused only on the product, ignoring its perception by the public. Psychologists, too, ignored the appeal of violence in the entertainment field, with a focus on its effects (Goldstein, 1998a; Goldstein, 1998b, p.1).

Recently have been a lot of discussion about the relationship between media violence and aggressive behavior of minors. Studies have confirmed that a permanent, frequent viewing aestheticized and "ordinary" violence that affects the attitude of children on their emotional bitterness, and sometimes – on their own aggressive behavior. The bitterness, indifference to human suffering, which cause media in children - it is a slow, hidden process (Cantor, 2000, p.69).

Meanwhile, media violence is increasingly penetrating into Russian society. In spite of all the efforts of individual teachers-enthusiasts, media literacy education in schools, colleges and universities is poorly developed.

Long-term studies of J. Cantor detail classified seven possible reasons for the appeal of violence for the audience (especially - a minor):

1) the desire to experience the excitement (a media violence raises, enhances the emotional excitement. There is evidence that watching scenes of violence or threats of violence will significantly increase empathy, increases the heart rate and the pressure, even in adults. The impact of media violence on the level of emotion was reflected in experiments in during which measures heart rate and skin temperature (Cantor, 1998, pp. 96-98);

2) the desire to experience the virtual aggression (the effect of empathy): many media recipients like virtually participate in hostile actions. For example, in one study, "48% of students said they always sympathize with the victim, and 45% said they always empathize "bad guy". 39% of students admit that they like to watch people fight on the screen, hurt each other, etc. These data suggest that the fascination with media texts with a realistic portrayal of violence is directly related to the process of obtaining pleasure from the contemplation of these scenes, uncommon to identify with the aggressor, not the victim or positive character (Cantor, 1998, pp. 98-99); According to my research, a sense of aggressiveness in connection with the viewing screen violence experienced 8.4% and a sense of exasperation - 7.8% of the 450 students surveyed;

3) disregard of restrictions (the effect of *forbidden fruit*): parents often limit the access of children to media violence, causing episodes of this kind are to a certain part of minors more desirable;

4) an attempt to see violence and aggression reflecting their own experiences. In this sense, aggressive people love to watch the program, showing their characteristic behavior. Studies show that people, who in real life are aggressive, opt for more aggressive programs (Cantor, 1998, pp. 102-103). This conclusion is supported by K. Tarasov's studies (Tarasov, 2002, pp. 154-155);

5) to study the criminal world (cognition role of violence in society and habitats of the audience); people for whom violence is an integral part of their social circle, are more interested in violence on the screen (Cantor, 1998, p.104);

6) complacency (the effect of apprehension): contact with media texts, containing scenes of violence, sometimes helping people to escape from their own fears of life and real problems, as, for example, a typical plot of the television series ends with the triumph of order and justice (Cantor, 1998, pp.105 -106);

7) the effect of gender (the role of violence in the gender component of socialization). The children's audience has a gender difference in the perception of violence. When boys and girls are watching the same TV show, the first may be more prone to "effect of aggression" and

identification with the typical aggressive male character, whereas girls are increasingly suffering from fear, because identifying with the typical female character-victim (Slaby, 2002, p. 316). My study was clearly stated that the male students among the active fans of screen violence twice as much as the female. Among the respondents (450 students from 7 to 17 years) boys were 21.0% of fans violence on the screen and girls - only 12.4%. These findings are confirmed by other Russian researchers (Sobkin, Glukhova, 2001, p. 2; Tarasov, 2002, pp. 153-154).

But in addition, the scenes of violence / aggression in media texts "psychologically prepare the person to intense emotional situations; allow to show in a symbolic form their physical activity and the ability to act in times of crisis, to carry out psychological self-regulation at the time of confusion"(Petrus, 2000).

It is clear that all of these factors in varying degrees, attracted the audience's attention to the *Cargo 200*, regardless of its artistic value (in relation to which the opinions of professional and mass audience as rigidly divided, and not on the principle of "professionals against amateurs").

Author's ideology in the social and cultural context (the dominant concept are: media agency, media representation, media audiences)

The ideological message of Alexei Balabanov, the writer-director of the film *Cargo 200*, is clear: "It's just a movie about 1984, as I remember it, as I imagine it and see. I wanted to make a film about the hard end of the Soviet Union - that I did it"(quoted from the source: Nekrasov, 2007). And this film has many fans. For example, the writer, journalist, broadcaster and film critic and winner of many awards Dmitry Bykov wrote that it is "an outstanding film: perhaps most important movie of the year"(Bykov, 2007). Another film critic – Alena Solntseva echoes: "there are many associations: and our Russian incredible tolerance for evil, to the scum who live peacefully alongside; and a surprising indifference to the surrounding landscape; and a strange attachment to metaphysical disputes against the backdrop of indifference to loved ones"(1984: critics session, 2007). Even more conceptual generalizations comes from Maria Kuvshinova: "Balabanov's film is a hard and honest response to all that is happening and will happen in our country, and in general - in the world under heaven"(1984: critics session, 2007).

It would seem that we are dealing with a consolidated opinion of professionals, art historians, who, opening the "underground corridors metaphors", found in Balabanov's media text the philosophical depth and a powerful ideological, nearly "Orwellian" message to humanity.

But equally authoritative group of professionals (Kichin, 2007; Kudryavtsev, 2007; Mathiesen, 2007; Pavluchik, 2007) analyzes *Cargo 200*

from the opposite point of view, arguing, for example, that "the whole picture of life depicted, ridiculous in terms of elementary credibility, easy to fit into tight directorial concept, the essence of which - to show the agony, insanity of the Soviet system, like decaying corpses thereby (ingenuous metaphor) that are rotting in the apartment rapist-cop... This is hand made horror film, infused with social "dill", horror and sexual violence ... Characters from *Cargo 200* (ie, the population of the country in miniature) - a gathering of some freaks, degenerates, alcoholics, and criminal elements, profoundly indifferent to all people in the world"(Pavluchik, 2007).

Valery Kichin's conclusion even tougher: "Then why is this story needed Balabanov for his version of "1984"? And it's simple: he wants to be George Orwell. The year 1984 was chosen with a clear allusion. But his talent is lean, his tasteful is bad, his fantasy is insignificant" (Kichin, 2007).

In short, on the one hand the film of A. Balabanov treated as an extreme (and even messianic) ideological message, and on the other – as the primitive "horror", bad taste and professional level or almost parodic extravaganza "trash".

In this regard, good media literacy education way - to offer methodical approach, which essentially helps ideological analysis of media text. Students must know the basic techniques of manipulative influence of media on the audience (many of which, in my point of view, significantly visible in *Cargo 200*):

- *orchestration* - the psychological pressure in the form of constant repetition of certain facts, regardless of the truth;
- *selection* - the selection of certain trends: for example, only positive or negative, distortion, exaggeration (understatement) of these trends;
- *embellishment* of facts;
- *sticking labels* (eg, guilty, insulting, etc.);
- *transfer* - the transfer of any qualities (positive, negative) to another event (or person);
- *evidence* - a reference (not necessarily correct) to authorities in order to justify an action, or that slogan;
- *folksy game*, including, for example, the most simplified form of information presentation.

On this basis I use the following methodological procedures for the analysis of media texts in the classroom:

- *sifting of information* (for example, for media texts claiming documentary students can select true and false, make the purification of the information from the *rouge* and *shortcuts*, etc.);
- *removing* information from the halo of *typical, authority*;

- *critical analysis* of the objectives and interests of *agency / media text authors*.

Market conditions that have contributed to the plan, the process of creating a media text, audience's perception (the dominant aspects: media agency, category media / media texts, media technology, audience)

The question arises: why Alexei Balabanov decided to settle with the Soviet regime in 2007, while other Russian authors made about 20 years earlier (don't forget Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who wrote and published *The Gulag Archipelago* with real risk to his life in the 1960s)?

Maybe one answer is simple: the beginning of the XXI century open more possibilities for *trash* treatment of serious social and ideological issues. Most likely, the authors of *Cargo 200* previously relied on polar interpretations of their work, because the atmosphere of scandal, confrontation in the debate about the degree of plausibility, the reality and the shock of naturalism largely helps promote the product in the media market in a modern socio-cultural context.

Of course, *Cargo 200* was marginalized in ordinary Russian cinema halls: "this film collected only 300 thousand dollars for 11 days" (Matizen, 2007). More or less notable international festivals disdained to take *Cargo 200* in the competition. However, *Cargo 200* has the success in media, intended for individual viewing (video, DVD, computer discs, files). And this demand is substantially fueled "branded" advertising for *Cargo 200* ("See the shocking film from cult director of *Brother* and *Brother-2!*) and contradictory reactions from journalists, critics and the public (thanks to Internet sites, advanced part of the mass audience is almost instantly responds to any more or less significant event in politics, economy and culture).

But do not ignore the commercial potential of media violence, which has always been a great place in Balabanov's media texts. And then, I think, K. Tarasov is right: "As part of the modern film industry, focused on extracting the maximum profit, the depiction of violence is perhaps the most cost-effective elements of the film. Creating a serious and at the same time fascinating media product, affecting important concern to many questions in relation to the creative task is very complex, requiring much time and effort. The saturations of the film fights, gunfights, chases let hide a weak story and characters, the lack of any meaningful themes, etc. and attract the viewer's attention"(Tarasov, 2003, p.123).

Considering that age limit is not adhered the *practical* sale of DVD in Russia, I can assume that a large part of *Cargo 200*'s audience was minor audience, because media violence is attractive area for teenagers.

Based on the analysis of the results of the research and study of the works of Russian and foreign scientists, I developed the following typology of audience perception of media violence:

1) active, targeted positive perception of media violence on the level of identification with the environment, the plot and / or severe / aggressive media text characters;

2) passive (no explicit relationship) perception of media violence at the level of the partial identification with the environment, the plot and / or severe / aggressive media text characters;

3) the active, purposeful negative perception of media violence on the level of identification with the environment, the plot and / or victims of violent / aggressive media text characters;

4) active, purposeful negative perception of screen violence at opposition positions / actions violent / aggressive media text characters and / or the position of the creators of media text.

Turning to the citations of the articles of professional media critics and ordinary viewers comments about *Cargo 200* it is easy to see a typology of perception of media violence (the desire to experience the excitement / arousal, empathy, fear, a premonition of a happy ending, the effect of "forbidden fruit" etc.). The more common and often underestimated are two of them - the fear and indifference to scenes of violence (Kunkel, Wilson, and others, 1998, pp. 155-156).

My research experience (Fedorov, 2000; 2001; 2004; 2007) also showed that most of these reasons are often seen in children's audience. The feeling of fear in relation to the display of violence is characteristic of 15.3% of pupils. However, the situation in the 7-8-year-olds pupils area is much higher - 20.0%. The feelings of indifference, apathy, caused scenes of media violence, admitted one in ten of those interviewed minors.

The American research team following the television preferences of minors in the group for 22 years. As a result, it was found that viewing violence on television is the factor by which to predict violent or aggressive behavior later in life, and it surpasses even such common factors, such as the behavior of parents, poverty (Cannon, 1995, p.19).

I share the view of J. Goldstein, that on appeal of violence affects not only the specific situation in which the audience, but also society as a whole (Goldstein, 1998a, p.221).

In this context, in my view, modern social and cultural situation in Russia has extreme tolerance for radical media violence. The creators of *Cargo 200*, having considered the market situation, have decided that domestic audience "is ripe" for their "radical concept" at a time when, despite the camouflage declaration, Russian media removed all the old taboos on the degree of naturalism in the portrayal of violence.

So, there are media violence's main reasons to appeal to the audience: entertainment, recreation, compensation, the desire to experience the excitement / fear; the desire to experience the virtual aggression (the effect of empathy); identification with aggressive characters or character-victim (the effect of identification), the desire of ignoring restrictions (the effect of "forbidden fruit"); attempt to see violence / aggression reflecting their own experience; studies surrounding the criminal world (cognition role of violence in society and in the habitat of the audience); the effect of complacency, ie the effect of foreboding happy ending, and the realization that "this nightmare does not happen to me"; the effect of gender, etc.).

All this fully corresponds with the basic theory of "media effects" that describe the following mechanisms of action of audiovisual works, containing scenes of violence:

- manipulation with sense of fear (for example, promoting a sense of fear of aggression and violence);
- training audiences violent / aggressive actions and their subsequent commission in real life (violence as a valid way to solve any problems);
- stimulation, agitation aggressive, imitative instincts of the audience, its appetite in relation to scenes of violence (especially in relation to the audience with mental disorders);
- "grafting" the audience's feelings of the indifference to the victims of violence, decrease the sensitivity in relation to violence in real life;
- "cathartic", a virtual and safe way for others aggressive emotions that do not lead to negative consequences in real life.

Undoubtedly, the authors of *Cargo 200* can be any number disown the fact that they deliberately counted the impact of this kind of rides media violence, but, as you know, the end result is not necessarily associated with the deliberate intent of the authors. Consciously or unconsciously, prudently and intuitively... The result is important, in this case, a media text, the main attraction of which was the "radical" and naturalistic shown violence in its various guises.

The structure and narrative techniques in the media text (the dominant aspects are: media / media texts category, "media technology, media language, media representation)

In my opinion, *Cargo 200* is built on the simple oppositions:

1) a ruthless maniac and his helpless victim (see folkloric roots of the tale of *Little Red Riding Hood* and the *Gray Wolf*);

2) the indifferent State and its "citizens-cogs", which it sends to die in the war, or doomed to a miserable stagnation in appalling living conditions;

3) naive heroine (*Red Riding Hood*) and cunning maniac (*Grey Wolf*);

4) plans (plans of the daughter of the big boss - *Little Red Riding Hood*, plans of the maniac - *Grey Wolf*, the plans of Professor-atheist) and the final results, opposite of these plans.

However, this kind of oversimplification typing has the supporters (Swinarenko, 2007; Gladilshikov, 2007, and others).

I can probably agree that the *Cargo-200* stylized under "late Soviet folk horror stories", based on which "determined here and all the rest: the schematic characters overabundance unexamined fable turns a simple bust erased images, demonstrative hopelessness is happening" (Mantsov, 2007).

However, it is difficult to agree with the enthusiasm about the "quality" images of violence in the film about the "real" life: "we finally get is not glamorous Hollywood toy, but a tape in which the reliability, blood and sweat even more than in real life. This brilliant the corpse paratrooper who lies in bed with the bride. Which is a real high-Mighty horror! ... Who would have dared to keep the dead man for so long in the frame, with all its sickening details?"(Swinarenko, 2007).

Student audiences can offer more specifically to analyze the expression of genre stereotypes in Balabanov's film with additional questions. And it seems that this kind of analysis - an important component of the development of critical thinking and media competence in the audience.

Questions for critical (ideological, philosophical, semiotic, identification, ethical, autobiographical, iconographic, aesthetic, cultural, hermeneutic and so on.) analysis

(BFI, 1990; Buckingham, 2003, pp.54-60; Semali, 2000; Silverblatt, 2001, pp.42-43; Silverblatt, 2014; Berger, 2005; Usov, 1989; Fedorov, 2004, p.43-51; Fedorov, 2006, p.175-228; Fedorov, 2007; Potter, 2014, and others.)

Media agencies:

Can the media messages contribute to the promotion of militarism and / or violence?

Who is the author of a media text?

What is the main purpose of the ideological media texts? To what extent achieved this goal? What is the reaction of the audience expect its creators?

Can you identify the moral values that are held by the authors of a media text?

What kind of event media agency / authors seek to reflect this work in the first place, which seek to eliminate?

What, in your opinion, the assumptions creators of media text about the audience?

How would you assess the target audience of the media text?

Can the media characters depend on the thematic / genre / political, etc. focus specific media agencies? If so, how?

What is the ideology of these characters express?

Media / media text categories:

What is the difference between the fiction and documentary media texts?

Can you name the genre, which are the most common characters with aggressive behavior, immoral acts?

What types of media texts and genres promote greater identification with media characters?

What are the stereotypical scenes, plot conventions characteristic of the thriller and horror genres?

Is there a predictable formula of the genre? As understanding of this formula helps your perception of a particular media text?

What are the stereotypical scenes, conventions storylines specific to the genre / the specific media text?

Can you articulate the ties to stereotypes stereotypical genres / themes related to media violence?

As a visual codes and conventions are manifested in different types of media texts (for example, in the genres of thriller and horror)?

Is there a difference in approach to the use of color and light in the media texts of different types and genres (for example, in the genres of thriller and drama)?

Media technologies:

How different media technologies used in the development of plots of the same figure of media culture (for example, in the work of the author, the specific media text which is analyzed at the moment)?

Are the results in the media text stereotype technological solutions?

Does the stereotypical media technologies by genre media text?

Media languages:

Is there a media text in the visual symbols, signs? If so, what?

What about the facial expressions and gestures of characters associated with the genres of thriller and horror?

Media representations:

Think about the various social problems, such as crime, violence, racism, etc. How the media can exacerbate these problems or, on the contrary, contribute to their resolution?

Is there a media text in this particular world view, ideology, philosophy, political values?

What are the political, ideological, philosophical, social trends are reflected in the media text (for example, the problem of deviant behavior, sexism, conformity, anxiety, stereotyped thinking, conflict of generations, arrogance, snobbery, loneliness, etc.)?

Does the media text hidden subtexts, false information?

What are the political, social and cultural sentiments are reflected in the views and actions of the characters of the media text?

Is there any scenes of violence in the media text? If so, what is the difference between the image of violence of other famous media texts?

Are the creators of media text, to portray negative characters as the embodiment of evil?

Media audiences:

Are there any media messages aimed at the manipulation of the audience? If so, in what media texts is specifically manifested?

What is the meaning of ethics in the media culture? Does the media texts in moral evaluation? If so, how to define the criteria of morality?

Can the media texts to promote racial, class, ethnic, national or religious enmity and hatred?

Can you think of media texts that you do not want to show the children aged 7-10 years? Why is that?

To what level of audience appeal moral authors of this media text?

Why did the audience takes some stereotypical media representations as true and reject others as false?

For what reasons the audience can choose the media text?

How does the audience interprets, evaluates the ideological orientation of the media text?

What is the typology of perception and evaluation of media texts the audience?

What are the reasons for the success of mass (mass lack of success) of a particular media text at a mass audience?

What is the role of gender, social class, age and ethnic origin in the media perception of the audience (including in relation to a particular media texts)?

What abilities, skills a person needs to qualify to analyze media texts?

Balabanov's media text with hard media violence has the clear connection with the traditional structure of the plot, or horror thriller stereotypes:

The structure of the story thriller genre stereotypes

- Characters: civilians and maniac;
- A significant change in the lives of the characters: a maniac commits a series of murders;
- A problem: the violation of the law, the peaceful life of each character under threat;
- Find a solution: the positive character or cop pursuit of a maniac;
- Solution / return to a stable life: destruction / arrest the maniac, the return to ordinary life.

The structure of the story of horror genre

- Characters: civilians and monster;
- significant change in the lives of the characters: the monster attacks civilian people;
- A problem: the violation of peace life;
- Search for solutions: the struggle of civilians (or nominated from among the brave hero) with a monster;
- Solution / return to a stable life: the destruction of the monster, the restoration of peaceful life
-

And the basis of analysis of this text with media violence, in my opinion, can be based on a variety of creative tasks associated with the key concepts of media literacy education (media agencies, media categories, media language, media technologies, media representations, media audiences, etc.).

References

- Bazalgette, C. (1995). *Key aspects of media education*. Moscow: Association for Film Education, 51 p.
- Berger, A.A. (2005). *Seeing is believing. Introduction to the visual communication*. Moscow: Williams, 288 p.
- BFI (1990). (British Film Institute). *Film Education*. Moscow, 124 p.
- Buckingham, D. (2003). *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 219 p.
- Bykov, D.L. (2007). Cargo 2007 // *Ogonyok*. March, 30.
- Cannon, C. (1995). Media Violence Increases Violence in Society. In: Wekesser, C. (Ed.). *Violence in the Media*. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, pp. 17-24.
- Cantor, J. (1998). Children's Attraction to Violent Television Programming. In: Goldstein, J. (Ed.). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment*. N.Y., Oxford University Press, pp. 88-115.
- Cantor, J. (2000). Mommy, I'm Scared: Protecting Children from Frightening Mass Media. In: *Media Violence Alert*. Zionsville, IN: Dream Catcher Press, Inc., pp. 69-85.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Russian Teenagers and Violence on the Screen: Social Influence of Screen Violence for the Russian Young People. *International Research Forum on Children and Media*, N 9, p. 5.
- Eco, U. *The role of the reader. Research on the semiotics of the text*. St.Petersburg: Symposium, 2005. 502 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Violence in Russian Films and Programmes. *International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen (UNESCO)*, N 2, p. 5.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2001). The violence on the screen and the Russian youth. *Bulletin of the Russian Humanitarian Foundation*. 2001. N° 1, pp.131- 145.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2004). Rights of the child and violence on the screen. *Monitoring*. 2004. N° 2, pp. 87-93.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2004). Students and computer games from the "screen violence". *Pedagogy*. 2004. N° 6, pp. 45-49.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2004). The impact of violence on television screens children's audience in the USA. *USA-Canada: Economics, Politics, Culture*. 2004. N° 1, pp. 77-93.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2004). *The Right of the Child and the problem of violence on the Russian screen*. Taganrog: Kuchma, 2004. 414 p.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2004). The specificity of media education students of pedagogical universities. *Pedagogy*. 2004. N° 4, pp. 43-51.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2004). Violence on the screen // *Chelovek*. 2004. N° 5, pp. 142-151.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2006). Media Education: creative tasks for students and schoolchildren // *Innovations in education*. 2006. N 4, pp. 175-228.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2007). *Development of media competence and critical thinking of students of pedagogical high school*. Moscow: ICOS UNESCO "Information for All".
- Fedorov, A.V. (2007). The ratio of students to violence on the screen, the causes and effects of their exposure to screen violence. *Pedagogical diagnostics*. 2007. N 2, pp. 129-139.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2007). Underage audience and violence on the screen. *Pedagogical diagnostics*. 2007. N 1, pp. 141-151.
- Gladilshikov, Y. (2007). Tin wonderful people. *Russian Newsweek*. April. 9.

- Goldstein, J. (1998a). Introduction. In: Goldstein, J. (Ed.). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment*. N.Y., Oxford University Press, pp. 1-6.
- Goldstein, J. (1998b). Why We Watch. In: Goldstein, J. (Ed.). *Why We Watch: The Attractions of Violent Entertainment*. N.Y., Oxford University Press, pp. 212-226.
- Kitchin, V.S. (2007). Time of man // *Russian Newspaper - Week*. N 4388. June 15th.
- Kunkel, D., Wilson, D.J. and others. (1998). Content Analysis of Entertainment Television: Implication for Public Policy. In Hamilton, J.T. (Ed.). *Television Violence and Public Policy*.
- Mantsov, I. (2007). 1984: Critics "session" of the film by Alexei Balabanov "Cargo 200". *Session*. April, 4.
- Matizen, V.E. (2007). *Corpses block "Cargo-200" requires a reboot*. <http://www.kinopressa.ru/>
- Nekrasov C. (2007). Alexei Balabanov: *Cargo-200* will not leave anyone indifferent. *Film Business Today*. 2007. N 2.
- Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, pp. 149-162.
- Masterman, L. (1985). *Teaching the Media*. London: Comedia Publishing Group, 341 p.
- Pavluchik, L.V. (2007). Freaks and werewolves. *Literary newspaper*. July, 18.
- Petrus, G. (2000). Aggression in computer games. <http://www.computerra.ru/offline/2000/347/2605/>
- Potter, W.J. (2014). *Media Literacy*. L.A.: Sage.
- Swinarenko, I. (2007). It - poignant artwork! *Russian Newspaper - Week*. N 4388.
- Sobkin, V.S., Glukhova, T.V. (2001). Teenager at the TV screen. *First of September*. December 15, pp. 2-3.
- Semali, L.M. (2000). *Literacy in Multimedia America*. New York – London: Falmer Press, 243 p.
- Silverblatt, A. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut – London: Praeger, 449 p.
- Silverblatt, A. (Ed.). (2014). *The Praeger Handbook of Media Literacy* (in 2 vol.). Santa Barbara, California and Oxford, England: Praeger.
- Slaby, R.G. (2002). Media Violence: Effects and Potential Remedies. Katzemann, C.S. (Ed.). *Securing Our Children's Future*. Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, pp. 305-337.
- Solntseva, A. (2007). 1984: Critics "session" of the film by Alexei Balabanov "Cargo 200". *Session*. 4 April.
- Tarasov, K.A. (2003). Globalized cinema as school violence. *Cinema in the world and the world of the movies*. Moscow: Publishing House of the Research Institute of Film Arts, pp.116-133.
- Tarasov, K.A. (2002). The violence in the film, and the predisposition of young viewers to its modeling in life. *Movies: realities and challenges of globalization*. Moscow: Research Institute of Film Arts, pp.122-164.
- Usov, Y.N. (1989). *Film education as a means of aesthetic education and artistic development of pupils*. Ph.D. Dis. Moscow, 362 p.

Russian film critics' discussion about *Leviathan* and *Sunstroke*

Modern media criticism as a whole based on the hermeneutic approach to the analysis of the media and media products (Bazalgette, 1995; Fedorov, 2010; 2012; Eco, 2005, p. 209; Silverblatt, 2001, pp. 80-81) relying on such key concepts as media agencies, media / media text categories, media technologies, media languages, media representations and media audiences, because they all have a direct bearing on the ideological market and structural and substantive aspects of the analysis of media and media texts (Eco, 2005, p. 209).

I think interesting to see how these approaches are implemented in concrete works of Russian film criticism concerning, for example, the two most controversial films of the last seasons: *Sunstroke* (2014) by Nikita Mikhalkov and *Leviathan* (2014) by Andrei Zvyagintsev.

The key questions of *Sunstroke* are: What kind of Russia we lost? How, and why it happened? And the key questions of *Leviathan* are: What kind of Russia we gained? And why is this?

I analyzed around 60 reviews of Russian critics' community (mainly of the leading, most active and visible). They were (very) roughly divided into two groups: texts from the authors of liberal wing, and texts from the authors of the conservative wing.

Opinions of critics' community about ideology in the sociocultural context (how the media text reflects, reinforces, inspire, or generates the values, behaviors, attitudes, concerns, myths). The dominant concepts are: media agency, media representation, media audience)

Most rigid Russian film critics of in the liberal wing noted with pleasure the *Leviathan's* total pessimism view of contemporary Russia (Matizen, 2015; Tyrkin, 2015). But some liberal film critics believed that, despite all pessimism, *Leviathan* gave the audience positive catharsis (Pavlyuchik, 2015; Dolin, 2014). A significant part of film critics positively celebrated the *Leviathan's* clear anticlerical pathos (Gireiev, 2015).

However, thoughtful expert opinion leads to a much more profound interpretation of *Leviathan* in the social and cultural context (Shemyakin, 2015; Solntseva, 2015; Stishova 2014). For example: "Attempts back to the late Medieval and restore the inviolable union of church and state secularism (in the name of social and political stability) inevitably revive the anticlerical of thinking part of the social organism" (Razlogov, 2014).

And from there it spreads the bridge to the main topic of *Leviathan*: personal responsibility of each of us for "what Russia we gained" (Ivanov, 2015; Plakhov, 2015).

But it would be a significant exaggeration to say that the *Leviathan* has received full and unconditional support of the Russian film criticism liberal wing. On the one hand, some critics saw (rightly, for my opinion) the *Leviathan's* overlaps (Malukova, 2014). On the other hand, the authors of *Leviathan* received the reproaches in the aesthetic varnishing of reality and the straightness of the critical promise (Zelvenskii, 2015; Maslova, 2015). M. Bezruk accused the *Leviathan* of speculation and opportunism (Bezruk, 2015). And even, perhaps, the most famous among liberal media critics' community (and not only) - Dmitry Bykov, blames the *Leviathan* in the secondary and the inner emptiness (Bykov, 2015).

Russian film criticism of the conservative wing, unlike the Liberals, could not forgive the *Leviathan* anticlerical attacks: (Yampolskaya, 2015). Sophisticated connoisseurs of world cinema does not miss an opportunity to sneer at the author's ambitions of A. Zvyagintsev (Trofimenkov, 2015). Moreover, as liberals, conservative critics, also criticized the film's political opportunism (Moskvina, 2015).

Naturally, that liberal film critics (who have long been hostile to director Nikina Mikhalkov) expressed a negative opinion about *Sunstroke*. Among the most common words used in reviews as guilty: propaganda, banality, nationalist, anti-Darwinist, monarchist, etc. (Bezruk, 2014; Gladilshchikov, 2014; Plakhov 2014; Solntseva, 2014).

One of the leading arguments against the *Sunstroke* author's concept became a liberal reproach to Nikita Mikhalkov that he supported "red communists" in his films of the 1970s, and now he supports "whites and monarchy", but always - "God-given" power (Bykov, 2014; Kichin, 2014; Matezen, 2014; Pavluchik 2014). However, some film critics wrote that they are bored to assess the ideology and philosophy of the authors of *Sunstroke*, since they do not see any artistic merit in this movie (Zelvensky, 2014).

As a result, it seems, the only discordant note has become in the consolidated opinion of the liberal film criticism: A. Dolin's replica: "Words *"Three hours of emptiness"* and *"What for?"* talk about the inability to elemental analysis, sorry. The essence of the *Sunstroke* is simple and transparent, it is stated in two words: Russian *Titanic*. Fleeting love story on a ship and shipwreck in the final, which means deluge, end of the world, and the punishment for sin. The one-piece structure and distinct idea, which is difficult to argue"(Dolin, 2014).

Admirers of N. Mikhalkov's movies from the ranks of the conservative film criticism use the complimentary words and phrases in relation to the *Sunstroke*: perfect, great, bog cinema event, talent, artist, etc. (Danilova, 2014; Moskvina, 2014; Omecinskaya 2014; Surikov, 2014; Vladimirov, 2014; Yampolskaya, 2014).

Further, in response to many of the cited above reproach liberals, film criticism of the conservative wing confidently argue that *Sunstroke* is not propaganda, but a complex and multi-valued work of art (Rutkovsky, 2014; Tolkunova, 2014).

Opinions of film critics' community about the market conditions that contributed to the process of creating a media text (the dominant concepts: media agency, media technology, media audience, media / media texts category)

In general, film criticism of the liberal wing (simultaneously arguing with the conservative part of the audience) agree that *Leviathan* due to socio-critical orientation was in the center of the political debate in media (Belikov, 2015; Bogomolov, 2015; Malukov, 2015; Pavluchik, 2015; Plakhov, 2015).

Some critics have tried to uncover the reasons why the film was non-adequately received by the West: "West Europe did not understand the main thing: that the *Leviathan* is not just a story about a creepy private injustice, but also a political statement about the nature of modern Russia" (Gladilshnikov, 2015).

As for the most consistent opponents of *Leviathan*, they angered state financial support for the film, which have so radically critical position to donor (Yampolskaya, 2015).

Film criticism of the liberal wing noted with satisfaction the low box office of very expensive *Sunstroke* (budget: \$ 21 million, box-office: \$ 1.7 million, <https://www.kinopoisk.ru/film/586308/box/>) against much less budget of *Leviathan* (budget: \$ 3,7 million, box-office: \$ 2.5 million, <https://www.kinopoisk.ru/film/705356/>) (Bezruk, 2014).

Curiously, the film criticism of the conservative wing is not as primitive as it seems, for example, Y. Bogomolov (Bogomolov, 2014). They ironically notice that their liberal colleagues have the real "herd instinct" against the *Sunstroke* (Omecinskaya 2014).

Opinions film critics' community about the characters of media texts, their values, ideas, behavior, appearance, vocabulary, facial expressions, gestures, degree of stereotyping (the dominant concepts: media representation, media / media text category, media technology, media audience).

Film criticism of the liberal wing did not stint on the praise for the entire ensemble cast in *Leviathan* (Dolin, 2014; Kuvshinov 2014; Malukov, 2015; Plakhov 2014). For some reason they do not notice a distinct secondary actors' images created in the *Leviathan*: the works of the

actress E. Liadova (she recently played a similar role in the movie *The Geographer Drank His Globe Away*), actor A. Serebryakov (he played a lot of these fierce and nervous men over the past 20 years) and actor R. Madyanov (in his collection also a lot of similar nasty characters).

But some film critics accurately noticed that almost all the characters in *Leviathan* flawed, and not all may evoke viewers' sympathy (Razlogov 2014; Kudryavtsev, 2015) and pay attention to the ambivalence of these characters, even the most, seems to be negative (Ivanov, 2015).

Film criticism of the conservative wing immediately recovered the secondary image of the *Leviathan's* characters (Razlogova, 2014). The film also received accusations of improbability: in the nature of the character, and in their everyday life (Trofimenkov, 2015; Yampolskaya, 2015).

Although I can say that the film critics of the all "wings" are often jointly note that almost without exception, the *Leviathan's* characters do not cause any sympathy (Moskvina, 2015).

Yes, liberal criticism relates enthusiastically to the cast of *Leviathan*, but their relation to the actors and the characters of *Sunstroke* was ironical and negative (Bezruk 2014; Kichin, 2014; Matizen, 2014).

Of course, the views of the film criticism conservative wing about the characters and the actors of *Sunstroke* was differ from liberal. Acting rated as brilliant, successful, wonderful, excellent, etc. (Haknazarov, 2014; Moskvina, 2014; Omecinskaya, 2014; Rutkovsky, 2014; Tolkunova, 2014).

E. Yampolskaya makes in the course of analysis of *Sunstroke's* characters the conclusion: we must to rise above the fray of red and white, because no heroes in the civil wars, all people are the victims (Yampolskaya, 2015).

Opinions of film critics' community on the structure and narrative techniques in a media text (the dominant concepts: category of media / media texts, media technology, media language, media representation)

The main figure responsible for the structure and narrative techniques in the film is director, and Russian film critics of the liberal wing, as a rule, do not skimp on compliments (talented, courageous, powerful, virtuoso, polyphonic, wonderful, uncompromising, etc.) (Dolin, 2014; Plakhov, 2014; Stishova, 2014).

But in spite of such praises, some liberal film critics (and not so little) more subdued evaluating artistic result achieved in the *Leviathan* (thrift, straightness, superficiality, slurred, scarcity, falsity, emotional coldness, dramatic inconsistencies, etc.) (Bezruk, 2015; Bykov, 2015; Gireiev, 2015; Razlogov, 2014; Timofeevsky, 2015; Zelvensky, 2015).

Perhaps it is someone will seem paradoxical, but film critics of the conservative wing were as close as possible to their most critically-minded

liberal fellow in the evaluation of the artistic level of *Leviathan* (conservative critics use the words such as straightness, boredom, dramatic discrepancies, stamp, serial, etc.) (Kulanin, 2015; Loshakova, 2015; Moskvina, 2015; Rutkovsky, 2014; Yampolskaya, 2015).

So, liberal media criticism quite clearly divided into two camps in relation to the artistic level of *Leviathan*: the unconditional fans and those who are considered *Leviathan* a step backwards compared with previous works A. Zvyagintsev (*The Return, Exile, and Elena*). But not very many disagreements are among the liberals on the *Sunstroke*: in general, all the opinions are negative (heaviness, strained, weak, secondary, slowness, boredom, illustrative, tasteless, vulgar, dishonesty, false, anti-liberal propaganda, obsessive self-citations, etc) (Bezruk 2014; Bykov, 2014; Gireiev, 2014; Maslova, 2014; Zabaluev, 2014; Zelvensky, 2014).

Some liberal film critics very negatively responded to the erotic scenes in the *Sunstroke*. Critics considered this scene almost vulgar parody (Ivanov, 2014; Matizen 2014; Tyrkin, 2014). However, A. Dolin and V. Kichin several alleviate this critical blows, noting the artistry of the analyzed media text (Dolin, 2014; Kichin, 2014).

And of course, some of the liberal film critics' community did not escape the temptation to blame of Nikita Mikhalkov. They accused him of losing the creative form (Kudryavtsev, 2014; Stishova, 2014).

Naturally, film critics of the conservative wing very positive appreciated the artistic level of *Sunstroke*, arguing that Mikhalkov did not lost his skill and talent (Haknazarov, 2014; Omecinskaya, 2014; Rutkovsky, 2014; Surikov, 2014; Yampolskaya, 2015).

Conclusions

So, *Leviathan* and *Sunstroke*, in fact, has become an indicator of the political stratification of Russian film criticism: in many cases, films were analyzed, first of all, not as a works of art, but as social and ideological messages. However, this is not surprising, because of the bundle of Russian film critics' community. However, the Russian mass audience as a whole is much more conservative than media criticism community. And, of course which is more focused on entertainment component of media culture (and the lack of interest of the vast audience in serious problems eloquently showed modest box-offices of *Leviathan* and *Sunstroke*)...

References

Bazalgette, C. (1995). Key aspects of media education. Moscow: Russian Association for Film and Media Education, 51 p.

- Belikov, E. (2015). *Leviathan is Rusofobia's serpent*. 05.02.2015. <http://meownauts.com/leviathan-review/>
- Bezruk, M. (2014). *Sunstroke: Nasty anecdote*. *Tribune*. 16.11.2014. <http://tribuna.ru/news/2014/11/16/55776/>
- Bezruk, M. (2015). *Leviathan, spitting into the soul*. *Tribune*. 17.01.2015. <http://tribuna.ru/news/2015/01/17/59366/>
- Bogomolov, Y. (2014). *Sunstroke in the service of the anti-liberal propaganda*. 12.10.2014. http://www.echo.msk.ru/blog/bogomolov_y/1416986-echo/
- Bogomolov, Y. (2015). *Leviathan continues to intrigue*. *Echo of Moscow*. http://www.echo.msk.ru/blog/bogomolov_y/1482068-echo/
- Bykov D. (2014). *Pant. Profile*. 10.10.2014. <https://ru-ru.facebook.com/BykovDmitriyLvovich/posts/841875235856637>
- Bykov, D. (2015). All has died for a long time, including the Leviathan, that the worst. *Novaya Gazeta*. № 2. 14.01.2015. <http://www.novayagazeta.ru/arts/66790.html>
- Danilova, E. (2014). No ready answers. There is no right or wrong. *Ogonyok*. N 40, p. 40. <http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2583718>
- Dolin, A. (2014). Cannes 2014. Day Ten: punk prayer Zvyagintsev. 23.05.2014. <http://vozduh.afisha.ru/cinema/den-desyatyy-pankmoleben-zvyaginceva/>
- Dolin, A. (2014). *Mikhalkov. Abstracts*. 08.10.2014. <https://www.facebook.com/adolin3/posts/10204176005176576>
- Dolin, A. (2014). Three Valleys Whale. *Cinema Art*. № 7. <http://kinoart.ru/archive/2014/07/tri-kita-leviafan-rezhisser-andrej-zvyagintsev>
- Eco, U. (2005). The role of the reader. Research on the semiotics of the text. St. Petersburg: Symposium, 502 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Umberto Eco and Semitic theory of media education. *Innovations in Education*, № 5, pp. 56-61.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Contemporary Mass Media Education in Russia: In Search For New Theoretical Conceptions And Models. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*, N 1, pp. 53-64.
- Gireev, I. (2015). Bunin's motifs. *Your leisure*. 09.10.2014. <http://www.vashdosug.ru/cinema/movie/551046/tab-reviews/review74524/>
- Gireev, I. (2015). Leviathan: the final diagnosis. *Your leisure*. 14.01.2015. <http://www.vashdosug.ru/cinema/movie/546098/tab-reviews/review74937/>
- Gladilshchikov, Y. (2014). Why Mikhalkov needed Bunin. *Forbes*. 9.10.2014. <Http://stengazeta.net/?p=10041411>
- Gladilshchikov, Y. (2015). Leviathan against Leviathan. *New Time*. <http://www.newtimes.ru/articles/detail/92746>
- Haknazarov, E. (2014). 89 circles of hell: *Sunstroke* by Nikita Mikhalkov. *Fontanka.ru*. 11.10.2014. <http://calendar.fontanka.ru/articles/1848/>
- Ivanov, B. (2014). Mr. Little officer. *Film.ru*. <http://www.film.ru/articles/gospodin-oficerik>
- Ivanov, B. (2015). Laughter and Grief by the White Sea. *Film.ru*. 29.01.2015. <http://www.film.ru/articles/smeh-i-gore-u-bela-morya>
- Kichin, V. (2014). *Kick to the Bunin's solar plexus*. 10.10.2014. <http://valery-kichin.livejournal.com/488564.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2014). *Worst in Sunstroke is Sunstroke!* 05.11.2014. <http://kinanet.livejournal.com/3497539.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2015). *Leviathan in all of us*. <http://kinanet.livejournal.com/3552670.html>
- Kulanin, R. (2015). Much Ado About Nothing. *Afisha.ru*. 30.01.2015. https://afisha.mail.ru/cinema/movies/812117_leviafan/#review

- Kuvshinova, M. (2014). Cannes 2014: *Leviathan* by Andrei Zvyagintsev. *Seance*. 23.05.2014. <http://seance.ru/blog/reviews/canne2014-leviafan/>
- Loshakova, D. (2015). *Leviathan: all shades of gray*. <http://weburg.net/news/51901>
- Malukov, M. (2015). *Leviathan: The skeleton of the soul*. 12.10.2015. http://www.ovideo.ru/%D0%A0%D0%B5%D1%86%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B7%D0%B8%D1%8F_%D0%BD%D0%Bo_%D1%84%D0%B8%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BC_%D0%9B%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%B8%D0%Bo%D1%84%D0%Bo%D0%BD_1
- Malukova, L. (2014). Leviathan: what system are her drinking companions. *Novaya Gazeta*. № 56. 26.05.2014. <http://www.novayagazeta.ru/arts/63712.html>
- Maslova, L. (2014). For the Motherland, for the old. *Kommersant*, № 185. 13.10.2014, p. 14. <http://kommersant.ru/doc/2588555>
- Maslova, L. (2015). Whales our grave. *Kommersant*, № 18. 04.02.2015, p. 11. <http://kommersant.ru/doc/2659827>
- Matizen, V. (2014). Sun in apoplexy. *Novye Izvestia*. 13.10.2014. <http://www.newizv.ru/culture/2014-10-13/208881-solnce-v-apopleksicheskou-dare.html>
- Matiezen, V. (2015). Great monster in the spotlight. *Novye Izvestia*. 14.01.2015. <http://www.newizv.ru/culture/2015-01-14/212968-chudishe-oblo-v-svete-sofitov.html>
- Moskvina, T. (2014). *Sunstroke* by Nikita Mikhalkov. *The Hollywood Reporter*. 02.10.2014. <http://thr.ru/features/5081/>
- Moskvina, T. (2015). Andrei Zvyagintsev in the historic paperback. *Arguments of the Week*, № 4. 5.02.2015. <http://argumenti.ru/culture/n473/387917>
- Omecinskaya, E. (2014). Someone has to pull up the bell-ringer. *SK-News*, № 10, p. 12.
- Pavluchik, L. (2014). *Sunstroke* or a solar eclipse? *Trud*, № 144. 14.10.2014. http://www.trud.ru/index.php/article/14-10-2014/1318473_solnechnyj_udar_ili_solnechnoe_zatmenie.html
- Pavluchik, L. (2015). *Leviathan lives near us*. 06/02/2015. <http://kinopressa.ru>
- Plakhov, A. (2014). Keith from the abyss of the absurd. *Leviathan on the Cote d'Azur*. *Kommersant*. 24.05.2014. <http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2478727>
- Plakhov, A. (2014). Russia edged sword. *Kommersant*, № 187. 15.10.2014, p. 14. <http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2589474>
- Plakhov, A. (2015). Opinions of polar. *Leviathan* was the subject of passionate debate - from canonization to demonize. *Kommersant*. *Power*, N 2, p. 46. <http://kommersant.ru/doc/2643485>
- Razlogov, K. (2014). Leviathan in the multidimensional space of culture. *SK-News*, № 8, p. 10.
- Razlogova, M. (2014). Marine scarecrow. *Musical true*, № 10. <http://www.newlookmedia.ru/?p=36945>
- Rutkovsky, V. (2014). Mikhalkov Time: 8 reasons to watch *Sunstroke*. *Snob*. 13.10.2014. <http://snob.ru/selected/entry/82207?preview=print>
- Rutkovsky, V. (2015). Review of the film *Leviathan*. http://seance.ru/blog/reviews/press_leviathan/
- Shemyakin, A. (2015). Few considerations about *Leviathan*. 14.01.2015. <https://www.facebook.com/shemyakins/posts/10205913277421005>
- Silverblatt, A. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut - London: Praeger, 449 p.
- Solntseva, A. (2014). White-red war yellow-blue-red lining. *Novaya Gazeta*, № 114. 10.10.2014. <http://www.novayagazeta.ru/arts/65627.html>

- Solntseva, A. (2015). Jaws Empire. *Gazeta.ru*. 01/13/2015. <http://www.gazeta.ru/comments/column/solnceva/6374461.shtml>
- Stishova, E. (2014). Decalogue by Andrei Zvyagintsev. *Cinema Art*, № 7. <http://kinoart.ru/archive/2014/07/dekalog-ot-andreya-zvyagintseva>
- Stishova, E. (2014). *How did it all happen?* 13.10.2014. <http://kinoart.ru/blogs/kak-vse-eto-sluchilos>
- Surikov, V. (2014). Pier of broken hearts. *Expert*, № 43. <http://expert.ru/expert/2014/43/pristan-razbityih-serdets/>
- Timofeevsky, A. (2015). *Review of the film Leviathan*. http://seance.ru/blog/reviews/press_leviathan/
- Tolkunova, A. (2014). Blow from Mikhalkov. *Musical true*, № 20. <http://www.newlookmedia.ru/?p=38774>
- Trofimenkov, M. (2015). Skeleton suitcase. *Kommersant Weekend*, № 3. 30.01.2015, p. 18. <http://kommersant.ru/doc/2650884?isSearch>
- Tyrkin, S. (2014). *Very dark alley*. http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:5CoFLJbadYoJ:gorodakterov.com.ua/article.php%3Far_adr%3Darticle3169860+&cd=5&hl=ru&ct=clnk&gl=ru
- Tyrkin, S. (2015). Clinical portrait. *Komsomolskaya Pravda*. 01/13/2015. <http://www.kp.ru/daily/26235.7/3117203/>
- Vladimirov, S. (2014). Sunstroke by Mikhalkov: a film-pilgrimage. *Komsomolskaya Pravda*. 13.01.2014. <http://www.kp.ru/daily/26294.5/3172010/>
- Yampolskaya, E. (2014). A little sun in cold water. *Culture*. 10.10.2014. <http://portal-kultura.ru/articles/cinema/64168-nemnogo-solntsa-v-kholodnoy-vode/?print=Y&CODE=64168-nemnogo-solntsa-v-kholodnoy-vode>
- Yampolskaya, E. (2015). Defamation whale. *Culture*. 24.01.2015. <http://devec.ru/kultura/kino/1755-elena-jampolskaja-kleveta-na-kita.html>
- Zabaluev, Y. (2014). Treason and Homeland. *Gazeta.ru*. 07.10.2014. http://www.gazeta.ru/culture/2014/10/07/a_6253261.shtml
- Zelvensky, S. (2014). *Sunstroke* by Nikita Mikhalkov: drowned. *Afisha.ru*. 09.10.2014. <http://vozduh.afisha.ru/cinema/solnechnyy-udar-nikity-mihalkova-ona-tonula/>
- Zelvensky, S. (2015). Parable of the life of the Russian province. *Afisha.ru*. <http://www.afisha.ru/personalpage/191661/review/581990/>
- Zelvensky, S. (2015). Premiere Week of *Leviathan*: perfect movie for trolling Russian era. 4.02.2015. *Your leisure*. <http://vozduh.afisha.ru/cinema/leviafan-film-s-koncepciy-no-bez-serdca/>

About the Author

Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov is the former President of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (2003-2014). Now his is Honorable President of Russian Association for Film & Media Education and professor of Anton Chekov Taganrog Institute (Russia), editor-in-chief of the Journal *Media Education*.

He also has taught at the Russian New University. He is the member of Russian Academy of Cinematographic Arts & Sciences, Russian Union of Filmmakers, CIFEJ (International Center of Films for Children and Young People, Canada) and FIPRESCI.

He holds a MA degree from Russian Institute of Cinematography (VGIK, 1983), Ph.D.(1986) and Ed.D.(1993) degrees with an emphasis in media education from Russian Academy of Education (Moscow).

Postdoctoral affiliation: guest professor and visiting senior research scholar in: *Central European University* (Budapest, Hungary: 1998, 2006), *Kassel University* (Germany, 2000, grant DAAD), *Humboldt University* (Berlin, Germany, 2005, grant DAAD), *Maison des sciences de l'homme* (Paris, France, 2002, 2009, grants MSH), *Kennan Institute* (The Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, D.C., U.S., 2003), *Mainz University* (2010), *University of Frankfurt* (2014).

He received the scientific grants/fellowships from: *Russian Science Foundation* (2017-2019), *Russian Foundation for Basic Researches* (2018-2019). *Federal Target Program of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science* (2010-2012), *Program of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science "Development of Science University Potential"* (2006-2008), *Russian President Program for Leading Scientific Schools* (2003-2005), *MacArthur Foundation* (USA, 1997, 2003-2004), *Russian Foundation for Humanities* (1999-2010); *President of Russian Federation Cultural Foundation* (2002), *The Russian Ministry of Education The Program "Russian Universities"* (2002); *Soros Foundation* (USA): 1) *Research Support Scheme* (2000-2002); 2) *Program "Civil Society"* (1998-1999); 3) *HESP-CDC - Course Development Competition* (1998); *Education Program for the best text of university lectures* (1997); *Switzerland Scientific Foundation* (2000); *Russian Ministry of Education: research in humanities area* (1997-2000), etc.

He was the speaker in the many international media and media education/literacy conferences: World United Nation Forum 'Alliance of civilizations' (Media Literacy Section, Madrid, 2008), Council of Europe Conference "Media Literacy" (Graz, Dec. 2007), International Media Literacy Conference (Prague, Apr. 2007), UNESCO Media Education Conference (Paris, June, 2007), Information Technologies International Conference (Moscow, May, 2007), International Conference E-Citizen.

(Moscow, Feb. 2006), UNESCO Conference on the Information Society (St.Petersburg, May, 2005), Conference of Association for Media and Technology in Education, Concordia University (Montreal, Canada, May, 2003), National Media Education Conference: 'Literacy & Liberty' (AMLA: Alliance for Media Literate America) (Baltimore, U.S., June, 2003), World Congress 'Toys, Games and Media', University of London, Institute of Education (London, UK, Aug. 2002), The Council of Europe: Hearing on Internet Literacy (Strasbourg, France, March 2002), 3rd World Summit on Media for Children (Thessaloniki, Greece, March 2001), International Council for Educational Media ICEM-CIME - Conference 'Pedagogy and Media' (Geneva, Switzerland, Nov. 2000), World Summit 2000: Children, Youth and the Media - Beyond the Millennium (Toronto, Canada, May 2000), AGORA European Children's' Television Center Summit (Thessaloniki, Greece, June, 1999), Educating for the Media and the Digital Age: UNESCO International Conference (Vienna, Austria, UNESCO, Apr. 1999), World Media Education/Literacy Summit (Sao-Paulo, Brazil, May 1998), Media & Science Forum (Montreal, Canada, Oct. 1997), Youth and the Media, Tomorrow: UNESCO International Conference (Paris, France. UNESCO, Apr. 1997) and many others.

He is the author of 500 articles and 25 books about media culture, media education and literacy and film studies. E-mail: 1954alex@mail.ru

List of Selected Publications of Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov

Selected Articles:

- Fedorov, A. (1993). The Screen Arts and the Students Youth. In: *The Problems of Film Education Now*. Moscow: Association for Media Education, p.100-104.
- Fedorov, A. (1994). The Russian Screen since 1960. *Audience (USA)*, N 179, p. 20-22.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Film & TV – The Features of Mass Culture. *Audience (USA)*, N 184, p. 40-41.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Filmclubs Yesterday & Today. *Audience (USA)*, N 183, p. 15-17.
- Fedorov, A. (1996). Crime on the Russian Screen. *Audience (USA)*, N 186, p. 14-16.
- Fedorov, A. (1998). The Problem of Aesthetic Education of Students' Youth on the Screen Arts' Material. In: *Psychological & Pedagogical Problems of the Personality's Formation in the Education Systems*. Moscow: International Academy of Education, p. 129-138.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Cinema Art in the Structure of Russian Modern Media Education. In: *Educating for the Media and Digital Age*. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, p. 100-105.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Media Education in Russia. In: *Educating for the Media and Digital Age*. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, p. 93-95.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). The Cinema Market: What about Russia? *Canadian Journal of Communication*, N 24, p. 141-142.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). En Sammenlignende Analyse Mellom Tyskland og Russland. *Media I Skole og Samfunn* (Norway), N 4, p. 38-41.

- Fedorov, A. (2000). The Digital Media Challenge & Russian Media Education. In: *Pedagogy and Media: The Digital Shift*. Geneva: ICEM-CIME, p. 21.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). The Terminology of Media Education. *Art & Education*, N 2, p. 33-38.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Ungdom og Russisk Filmvold. *Media I Skole og Samfunn* (Norway), N 1, p. 16-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). A Russian Perspective. *Educommunication* (Belgium), N 55, p. 92-95.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Media and Media Education. *Alma Mater*, N 11, p. 15-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Media Education in France. *Alma Mater*, N 3, p. 46-47.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Problems of Audiovisual Perception. *Art & Education*, N 2, p. 57-64.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Violence on the TV and Russian Youth. *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities*, N 1, p. 131-145.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Von der Filmpadagogie zur Mediaenpadagogik. *MERZ: Mediaen + Merziehung* (Germany), N 4, p. 256-261.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Canada. *Higher Education in Russia*, N 1, p. 116-118.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Russia. *Alma Mater*. N 7, p. 29-32.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Secondary School in Russia. In: Hart, A, & Suss, D. (Eds.) *Media Education in 12 European Countries*. Zurich: The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, p. 100-110.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Problems of Media Perception and Audience's Development in the Area of Media Culture. *Practical Psychology*, N 2, p.84-89.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Russian Cinema: Very Short History. *Total DVD*, N 5, 38-45.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Elektroniske og digitale medier og russiske barn: Problemet med lovregulering. *Tilt* (Norway), N 4, p. 22-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. In: *MENTOR. A Media Education Curriculum for Teachers in the Mediterranean*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Mediebegivenheter I Washington. *Tilt* (Norway), N 3, 27-28.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Austrian Issue in the Mirror of Russian Media (1945-1955). *Mediaenimpulse* (Austria), N 12, p. 37-39.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). The Influence of TV & Screen Violence on the American Children Audience. *U.S. and Canada: Economics, Policy and Culture*, N 1, p. 77-93.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). The Right of the Child and Violence on the Screen. *Monitoring*, N 2, p. 87-93.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). The Specific Nature of Media Education for Students of Teachers Training Institutes. *Pedagogica*, N 4, p. 43-51.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Violence on the Screen. *Chelovek*, N 5.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Media Education, Media Literacy, Media Criticism and Media Culture. *Higher Education in Russia*, N 6, p. 134-138.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Russia//Media Education in Europe. *Media Education Journal*. (Scotland). N 37, p.20-21.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). The Basic Tendencies of Western Media Education Development in 70s-80s of XX Century. *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities*, N 1, p.180-191.
- Fedorov, A. (2006). Analys of Media Stereotypes on Media Education Lessons in Student's Audience. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 6, p.24-38.
- Fedorov, A. (2006.) Media Education Must Become Part and Parcel of the Curriculum. In: *Thinking Classroom*. Vol.7. N 3, p.25-30.
- Fedorov A. (2007). Theological Theory of Media Education. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 11, p.96-101.

- Fedorov A. (2007). Classification Parameters of the Development of Media Literacy of Students. In: *Journalism and the world of culture*. S-Petersburg: S-Petersburg State University, p. 137-149.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media as One of Opposition Ways Against Negative Influence of Screen Violence on the Minor Audience. In: *Youth and Society*, N 1, p. 110-116.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Critical Analysis of Media Violence Text on the Media Education Lessons for University Students. In: *Media Education*. N 4, p. 29-54.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Critical Thinking Development in the Media Education: Basic Conceptions. *Innovations in Education*. 2007. N 4, p.30-47.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Development of Media Education in the Modern Time. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 3, p. 40-51.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media Competence of Personality: From Terminology to Levels. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 10, p.75-108.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media Study in the Classroom: Creative Assignments for Character Analysis. *Thinking Classroom*. 2007. N 3. p.13-19.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media Violence and Young Audience (NGO Russian Association for Film and Media Education Survey). In: *International NGO Journal*. Vol. 2 (3), p. 041-050.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Model of Pedagogical University Students' Media Competence and Critical Thinking Development on the Media Education Lessons. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 7, p. 107-116.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Semiotic Analysis on the Media Education Lessons for University Students. In: *Education World*. 2007, N 4, p. 207-217.
- Fedorov, A. (2008). Structural Media Texts' Analysis on the Media Education Lessons in the University. In: *Innovations in Education*. 2008. N 6.
- Fedorov, A. (2008). Culture Mythology Analysis of Media Texts on the Lessons for Students. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 4, p. 60-80.
- Fedorov, A. (2008). Iconographic Analysis of Media Texts on the Media Education Lessons for University Students. In: *Innovations in Education*, N 2, p. 73-90.
- Fedorov, A. (2009). Autobiographical Analysis on the Media Education Lessons in the University. In: *Innovations in Education*. (Moscow). N 1, p.118-128.
- Fedorov, A. (2009). Media Education in Russia: A Brief History. In: Marcus Leaning (Ed.). *Issues in Information and Media Literacy: Criticism, History and Policy*. Santa Rosa, California: Informing Science Press, p.167-188.
- Fedorov, A. (2009). Basic Media Education Models. In: *Mediateque and World*. (Moscow). 2009. N 1, 24-28. N 2.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Mass Media Education: Professionals and Neophytes. In: *Innovations in Education*. 2010. N 8, p. 102-119.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Media Educational Practices in Teacher Training. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2010, Vol. 3, N 3, p.57-70.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Russian Media education Literacy Centers in the 21st Century. In: *The Journal of Media Literacy* (USA). 2010. Vol. 57. NN 1-2, p.62-68.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Umberto Eco and Semiotic Theory of Media Education. In: *Innovations in Education*. 2010. N 5, p. 56-61.
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Alfabetización mediática en el mundo. *Infoamérica*. 2011. N 5, p.7-23. http://www.infoamerica.org/icr/icr_05.htm
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Assessment of Students' Media Competence: Test Results Analysis. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2011, vol.4, N 4, p.67-81. <http://adn.teaching.ro>
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Modern Media Education Models. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2011, vol.4, N 1, p.73-82. <http://adn.teaching.ro>
- Fedorov, A. (2012). "The Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin": the Novel and its Adaptation to Media Education Lessons in the Student Audience // *European Researcher*. 2012. Vol. 30. № 9-3, p.1579-1584.

- Fedorov, A. (2012). Elevers grep om detektivfortellinger // Tilt. 2012. N 1. Mediepedagogene <http://www.mediepedagogene.no/elevs-grep-om-detektivfortellinger>
- Fedorov, A. (2012). Media education in Russia and Ukraine: comparative analysis of the present stage of development (1992-2012) // PedActa. 2012. Vol. 2. N 1. <http://dppd.ubbcluj.ro/pedacta/>
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Production Dynamics of Western Films Connected with 'The Soviet/Russian Topic'. Film International. 2012. N 2, p.53-64.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). Russia and Ukraine: Media Literacy Education Approaches // *European Researcher*. 2012. Vol. 30. № 9-3, p.1556-1578.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Hermeneutical Analysis of the Soviet Fantasy Genre of the 1950s – 1960s and Its American Screen Transformation in Media Studies in a Student Audience. *European researcher*. 2012. N 11-3, p.2042-2055.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Analysis of Stereotypes of Politically Engaged Media Texts in Media Studies in Student Audience (by the Example of Renny Harlin's films "Born American" (1986) and "Five Days of War" (2011)). *European researcher*. 2012. N 11-3, p.2037-2041.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Contemporary Mass Media Education In Russia: In Search For New Theoretical Conceptions And Models. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2012. N 1, p.53-64.
- Fedorov, A. (2013) The Image of the West on the Soviet Screen in the Era of the "Cold War": Case Studies. *European Researcher*. 2013. N 2. Vol.3, p. 497-507.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). The Ideological, Structural Analysis of the Russian Image Representation in the Cold War Times' Film 'White Nights'. *European researcher*. 2013. N 4, Vol. 3, p.1044-1050.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). The Image of Russia on the Western Screen: the Present Stage (1992–2013). *European researcher*. 2013. N 4, Vol. 3, p. 1051-1064.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Analysis of Media Stereotypes of the Russian Image in Media Studies in the Student Audience (example: the screen versions of Jules Verne's Novel "Michael Strogoff") // *European Researcher*, 2014, Vol.(83), № 9-2, pp. 1718-1724.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Hermeneutic Analysis of Soviet Feature Films of 1941-1942 on the Military Theme // *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 69, N 2-2, p.358-371.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Media Education in Russia: Past and Present // *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 67, N 1-2, p.168-175.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Media Education Literacy in the World: Trends // *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 67, N 1-2, p.176-187.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Moscow Media Education Centers for Non-professionals in the Media Fields // *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 69, N 2-2, p.176-187.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Nazi Feature Films on the Russian Topic: Hermeneutic Analysis // *European Journal of Social and Human Sciences*, 2014, Vol. 3, № 3, pp.111-117.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russian and Western Media Literacy Education Models // *European Researcher*, 2014, Vol. 73, № 4-2, pp. 764-780. URL: http://www.erjournal.ru/journals_n/1399226869.pdf
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russian Image on the Federal Republic of Germany Screen // *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 77, N 6-2, p.1194-1212.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). The Opinions of Russian School Students and Teachers about Media Violence // *European Researcher*, 2014, Vol. 73, № 4-2, pp. 781-804. URL: http://www.erjournal.ru/journals_n/1399226928.pdf
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russia. In: Silverblatt, A. (Ed.). *The Praeger Handbook of Media Literacy* (in 2 volumes). Santa Barbara, California and Oxford, England : Praeger, 2014, pp.918-929.

Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov 1954alex@mail.ru

Alexander Fedorov

**Cinema in the Mirror of the Soviet and Russian Film
Criticism. Moscow: ICO "Information for All", 2019. 214 p.**

Second (extended) edition

Monograph.

The electronic edition

Publisher:

ICO "Information for All"

Mailing address: Russia, 121096, Moscow, box 44

E-mail contact (at) ifap.ru

<http://www.ifap.ru>

© Alexander Fedorov, 2019.

E-mail: mediashkola (at) rambler.ru

When sending e-mails need to replace the (at) with @