



## *Media Culture*

### **Soviet film critics about Soviet cinema: from censorship to Gorbachev's perestroika**

*Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov,  
Rostov State University of Economics, Russia  
E-mail: [1954alex@mail.ru](mailto:1954alex@mail.ru)*

#### **Abstract**

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.

Yearbooks *Screen* became a mirror of the Soviet criticism of the 1960s - 1980s, reflecting all ups and downs, forced to default figures, ideological passages, thaw and perestroika hope... From the time of the first to last annual output has been a quarter century. Soviet film criticism changed significantly.

The main materials for this article was articles of Soviet film critics about Soviet cinema in *Screen* yearbooks. 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.

**Keywords:** film critic, film studies, Soviet, USSR, film, movies, cinema, censorship.

\* Article was written as part of research with the financial support of the grant of the Russian Scientific Foundation (RNF). Project № 14-18-00014 «Synthesis of media education and media criticism in the process of preparing future teachers," performed at the Taganrog Institute of Management and Economics.

#### **Introduction**

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.

### **Materials and methods**

The main materials for this article was 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).

### **Discussion**

#### *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 considers 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 have not been yet untouchable Soviet "cinematic generals" with untouchable "state significant topics" 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, p. 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, p. 69-72].

The yearbook scolded (and again - for good reason) and movies on the so-called historical-revolutionary theme. 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 this film of M. Khutsiev, 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, p.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, p.137, 142].

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

For example, I. Solovyova wrote that "Innokenty 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 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 revelation. ... 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, p. 29, 32].

A number of books' articles was devoted to the poetic cinema. Critics pointed out that in V. Derbenev's *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, p.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].

And 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 this 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've 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's 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, p.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 can not" [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, p.124-132], I. Lapikov [Zelenko, 1966, p. 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, J. Warsawsky (1911-2000), M. Zak (1929-2011), N. Zorkaya (1924-2006), N. Ignatieva, 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. Solovyova, 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. Paatashvili	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 can not 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, p.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, p.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, c.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. Alova (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"[Ivanov, 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 (1998-1981) [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 - Chekhov's hero, 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 naivete 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: "M. 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, p. 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's 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, p. 64-66] O. Iosseliani [Dolinsky, Chertok, 1968, p.41-45], S. Ursky, A. Batalov, P. Aleynikov, D. Banionis, T. Doronina, R. Bykov [Levshina 1968, p. 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, remain. 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. Khlopyankina wrote on other notable film about civil background – *There Were Two Comrades* (writers Y. Dunsky 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 come 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, unthought 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, can not 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 can not 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 was 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, p. 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 Chingiz 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. Ondrzichcek 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, fair" [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, p.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 significant 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 cliches 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, Ilienko, 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. Khloplyankina 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..." [Khloplyankina, 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 stylisation, 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, p. 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 can not 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. Gabrilovich, 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, p9. 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. Hloplyankina 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" [Hloplyankina, 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, p. 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 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 an 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 intransigent in the image of suffering, intransigent 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 weaks, 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 can not tolerate distance, she can not 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, p.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], *Centaurs* [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 can not 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 Trakovsky'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 win 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. Solovyov: "The man in the face of life, people in the face of great culture, a man to himself - there are Solovyov'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 Kovpak* 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, s.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 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. Solovyov [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, p.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 can not 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].

## Results

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" (with all the practical consequences ensuing therefrom), 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 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 Yearbookss, 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 instituts (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 <i>Screen Yearbook</i>	The number of articles published by these film experts, film critics on the subject of the Soviet feature films in the <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 (born in 1932), 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. Khlopyankina (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.

## Conclusios

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). Undefeated. *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.

- Khloplyankina, T. (1972). "With me that's what happens..." *Screen 1971-1972*. Moscow: Art, pp. 75-77.
- Khloplyankina, 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. 105-111.
- 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 170<sup>th</sup>. *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.
- Solovyova, 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.
- Zolotusky, 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.